

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Mendenhall Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 9 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 0 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 17 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 19 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

Mendenhall Elementary School

5202 N MENDENHALL DR, Tampa, FL 33603

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections | Title I Schoolwide Program | Charter Schools |
|--|---|------------------------|
| I-A: School Mission/Vision | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1) |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3) | |
| I-E: Early Warning System | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-A-C: Data Review | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(3) | |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection | ESSA 1114(b)(6) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4) |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii) | |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g) | |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Mendenhall is committed to rigorous standards-based instruction in order to achieve high levels of learning for every student. Parents may access Mendenhall's SIP on our website.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Mendenhall's students will become lifetime learners and leaders who are prepared for life.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Guyer, Skylaar | Principal | |
| Jaime, Melanie | Assistant Principal | |
| Smith, Katie | Curriculum Resource Teacher | |
| Perry, Kathryn | Teacher, K-12 | gifted teacher |

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Various stakeholders (school leadership team, teachers, staff, and parents) were surveyed throughout the 2022-2023 school year and their input was used to develop the SIP.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The school leadership team will closely monitor the effectiveness of the SIP plan and its impact on student achievement by analyzing PM1, PM2, and PM3 assessments in ELA, math, and science.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

| | |
|--|--|
| 2023-24 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | Yes |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 91% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 100% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | Yes |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | N/A |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C |
| School Improvement Rating History | |
| DJJ Accountability Rating History | |

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 33 | 26 | 18 | 14 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 110 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 31 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 27 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 10 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 31 | 25 | 13 | 18 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 24 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 32 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 31 | 25 | 13 | 18 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 24 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 32 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | 45 | | | 49 | 53 | 56 | 50 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 60 | 61 | 61 | 62 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 43 | 54 | 52 | 57 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 51 | | | 60 | 60 | 60 | 47 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 75 | 69 | 64 | 41 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 69 | 61 | 55 | 33 | | |

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Science Achievement* | 42 | | | 48 | 49 | 51 | 38 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 0 | 50 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | | | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | | | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | | | | |
| ELP Progress | 75 | | | 65 | | | 66 | | |

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 50 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 248 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 59 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 469 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|---|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 36 | Yes | 1 | |
| ELL | 49 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 37 | Yes | 1 | |
| HSP | 48 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 71 | | | |
| FRL | 47 | | | |

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|---|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 49 | | | |
| ELL | 61 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 53 | | | |
| HSP | 59 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 64 | | | |
| FRL | 58 | | | |

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
|--------------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| All Students | 45 | | | 51 | | | 42 | | | | | 75 |
| SWD | 31 | | | 41 | | | 44 | | | | 5 | 54 |
| ELL | 39 | | | 52 | | | 43 | | | | 5 | 75 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 40 | | | 44 | | | 33 | | | | 4 | |
| HSP | 43 | | | 49 | | | 41 | | | | 5 | 74 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 64 | | | 77 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| FRL | 43 | | | 49 | | | 43 | | | | 5 | 74 |

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 | ELP Progress |
|--------------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| All Students | 49 | 60 | 43 | 60 | 75 | 69 | 48 | | | | | 65 |
| SWD | 34 | 43 | 31 | 50 | 78 | 69 | 35 | | | | | 48 |
| ELL | 47 | 60 | 41 | 62 | 80 | 81 | 48 | | | | | 65 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 48 | 53 | | 57 | 53 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 49 | 62 | 43 | 61 | 77 | 70 | 48 | | | | | 65 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 54 | 60 | | 64 | 79 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 47 | 62 | 45 | 58 | 73 | 68 | 47 | | | | | 61 |

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 | ELP Progress |
|--------------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| All Students | 50 | 62 | 57 | 47 | 41 | 33 | 38 | | | | | 66 |
| SWD | 36 | 36 | | 28 | 13 | | 20 | | | | | 61 |
| ELL | 39 | 57 | | 46 | 57 | 40 | 29 | | | | | 66 |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 | ELP Progress |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 48 | | | 33 | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 50 | 67 | | 47 | 44 | 40 | 43 | | | | | 70 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 61 | | | 48 | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 48 | 62 | 62 | 44 | 41 | 38 | 39 | | | | | 66 |

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 46% | 53% | -7% | 54% | -8% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 38% | 54% | -16% | 58% | -20% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 28% | 46% | -18% | 50% | -22% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 34% | 55% | -21% | 59% | -25% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 47% | 59% | -12% | 61% | -14% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 52% | 53% | -1% | 55% | -3% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 32% | 47% | -15% | 51% | -19% |

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Math and reading achievement in third grade dropped significantly. According to ELA FAST assessment, only 32% of third graders were proficient. According to Math FAST, only 38% of third graders were proficient. Science scores were well below the state average, with only 39% of fifth grades scoring a level 3 or higher.

Collaborative planning was inconsistent and teacher's lacked knowledge of the new BEST standards.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

SSA science showed the greatest decline from the previous year. The scores went from 48% to 39% proficient.

We believe there is a misalignment between science assessments, monitoring student progress, collaborative planning, and classroom instruction.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average was the SSA assessment. We believe there is a misalignment between science assessments, monitoring student progress, collaborative planning, and classroom instruction.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The data component that showed the most improvement was math proficiency in 4th and 5th grades. The actions taken for this improvement included standards-based targeted small group instruction, as well as the use of coaching to improve the overall math instruction.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Phonics and vocabulary are two areas of concern based on our formal assessment data. Our curriculum lacked high-quality phonics and vocabulary intervention. We will be using UFLI which was developed to focus on foundational reading skills of children, specifically phonics and vocabulary.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Collaborative planning
2. Standards-based instruction
3. Student goal setting

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Weekly collaborative planning was inconsistent and teacher observation data collected found teachers needing improvement in the areas of student engagement, differentiated instruction and student-led learning. Collaborative planning will help teachers incorporate DI and engagement strategies to meet the needs of all students. It will support the implementation of high-quality instructional practices for Tier 1 and Tier 2/3 levels of instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Our school will increase our ELA proficiency from 48% to 62% and increase Math proficiency from 54% to 62%.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Collaborative planning will be scheduled once a week for an hour for each teacher. The area of focus will be monitored during weekly scheduled collaborative planning with grade-level teams, academic coaches, and admin. Data collected from classroom walkthroughs and observations will also help monitor the desired outcome. Specific feedback will be given to teachers based on the walkthrough data collected.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Skylaar Guyer (skylaar.guyer@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Instructional strategies to engage all students.

Goal setting process for students to set goals and monitor progress.

Differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research shows that when teachers collaboratively plan, it leads to school improvement because it connects teachers with one another and allows them to share in the pursuit of school goals. Collaboration also allows teachers to play to their strengths and learn from one another.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

We work with all stakeholders to create a positive school culture and environment. We send weekly Parent Links with important updates, schoolwide student agendas for teacher/parent communication, quarterly progress alerts, hold parent teacher conferences and have monthly parent workshops to create a meaningful partnership and enhance parent communication.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

As measured by Mendenhall's parent survey 1, the survey reported that 60% of our parents and families felt school and classroom communication needed to be improved and more frequent. By February's parent survey 3, there will be a decrease by 30% of our parents and families feeling that school and classroom communication needs to be improved and more frequent.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will monitor our parent communication by having our stakeholders complete three surveys during the year based on high-quality parent communication. We will analyze each surveys' response data to see the areas we need to improve.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melanie Jaime (melanie.jaime@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

More frequent parent communication will include:

Weekly Parent Newsletters

Weekly Parent Links

Schoolwide student agendas will be used for teacher/parent communication and sent home daily.

Parent Workshops

Parent/Teacher Conference Nights

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research has found that frequent and high-quality parent communication has a significant positive effect on a child's academic performance.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Based on the 2023 ELA STAR scores 34% of students in grades K-2 scored at proficiency. This score was due to over 60% of students are one to two grade level below in reading. Teachers inconsistent collaborative planning and lack of knowledge of the B.E.S.T Standards played a role in our school's proficiency score. Mendenhall's area of focus will be collaborative planning to ensure that all teachers provide engaging, differentiated, standards-based instruction.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

Based on the 2023 ELA FAST scores, 48% of students in grades 3-5 scored at proficiency. This score was due to over 50% of our students being one to two grade levels below in reading. Also, we believe that teachers inconsistent collaborative planning and lack of knowledge of the B.E.S.T Standards played a role in our school's proficiency score. Mendenhall's area of focus will be collaborative planning to ensure that all teachers provide engaging, differentiated, standards-based instruction.

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Reading proficiency will increase in grades K-2 from 34% to 54% based on the state assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Reading proficiency will increase in grades 3-5 from 48% to 62% based on the state assessment.

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Weekly classroom walkthroughs with actionable feedback by Admin team-based on ELA classroom walkthrough tool.

Learning walks

Progress monitoring of monthly district ELA assessments and PM1, PM2, and PM3 assessments.

Monthly data chats

Student goal setting

Weekly bubble lunches with students in grade 3-5 to review and monitor goals.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Guyer, Skylaar, skylaar.guyer@hcps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Collaborative planning ensures that are practices are aligned with the BEST ELA Standards.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Research shows that when teachers collaboratively plan, it leads to school improvement because it connects teachers with one another and allows them to share in the pursuit of school goals. Collaboration also allows teachers to play to their strengths and learn from one another.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

| Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|
| Literacy Leadership - Admin and coaches will conduct learning walks on identified look-for evidence to collect individual and trend data. Data trends will be used to provide feedback to staff and to provide additional support to staff. | |
| Literacy Coaching -The Literacy Coach will conduct standards-based collaborative planning and PLCs in ELA with a focus on teacher clarity and check for understanding to ensure high quality instruction. | Jaime, Melanie, melanie.jaime@hcps.net |
| Assessment - Progress monitoring of monthly district ELA assessments and PM1, PM2, and PM3 assessments. | |
| Professional Learning - ELA Professional Learning Communities will be focused on standards-based planning, student work analysis, and analyzing data from common assessments. | |

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

A Parent Link will be sent to parents about our Open House which will include reviewing the SIP with parents and stakeholders. A copy of the SIP will be placed in main office for parents to review. During our faculty meeting, leadership meeting and collaborative planning, we will embed the relevant data and the necessary steps to ensure that all teachers and staff are aware of our SIP and the progress throughout the year.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available.
(ESSA 1116(b-g))

Mendenhall's Family Engagement Plan will help ensure that we are building positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders. We will host monthly parent involvement events, schoolwide student agendas sent home daily, and Parent Links with updated information sent home each week.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

During collaborative planning we will discuss standards-based, engaging, and accelerated instruction. Additionally, we will discuss DI for small groups and make weekly plans to meet the needs of all students.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A