

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Mitchell 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	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	21

Mitchell Elementary School

205 S BUNGALOW PARK AVE, Tampa, FL 33609

[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.

To develop the desire, knowledge, and skills enabling students to reach their highest potential in the 21st century and beyond.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Inspiring lifelong learning and service for every student.

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
Best, Renee	Principal	
Nicholas, Trisha	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chair
Meyer, Kirsten	Assistant Principal	

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.

The school leadership team, staff, families, and community members make up the School Advisory Council. These members come together to make decisions that positively impact students. The school leadership team and stakeholders developed the School Improvement Plan, voted, and involved all staff and SAC members to vote for plan approval.

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 SIP will be regularly monitored throughout the year using FAST PM1, PM2, and PM3 data. Additionally, we will review STAR, iReady, DIBELS/UFLI, and quarterly data chats to determine adequate progress toward goals. The School Advisory Council will review the School Improvement plan periodically and the alignment to incoming data sources throughout the year.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	40%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	26%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	11	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	9	0	0	0	0	17
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	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	2	3	5	0	0	0	10

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	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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	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	1	3	0	0	0	0	4

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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	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	1	3	0	0	0	0	4

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	77	50	53	86	53	56	84		
ELA Learning Gains				74			81		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				67			63		
Math Achievement*	81	56	59	86	50	50	83		
Math Learning Gains				83			69		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				68			46		
Science Achievement*	74	50	54	84	59	59	77		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	73	59	59	74			78		

* 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	77
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	384
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	78

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	622
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
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	40	Yes	1	
ELL	61			
AMI				
ASN	88			
BLK	37	Yes	1	
HSP	67			
MUL	80			
PAC				
WHT	84			
FRL	54			

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	61			
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN	95			
BLK	67			
HSP	68			

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%
MUL	82			
PAC				
WHT	83			
FRL	62			

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	77			81			74					73
SWD	39			42			30				4	
ELL	57			52							3	73
AMI												
ASN	83			92							2	
BLK	33			40							2	
HSP	69			67			61				5	69
MUL	85			73			83				3	
PAC												
WHT	82			88			79				4	
FRL	54			58			20				5	69

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	86	74	67	86	83	68	84					74
SWD	56	56		56	75							
ELL	55	53	55	45	53	45						74
AMI												
ASN	100			90								

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
BLK	67			67								
HSP	78	71	43	76	78	57	73					71
MUL	83	93		74	79							
PAC												
WHT	88	75	75	91	85	76	88					
FRL	65	68	59	58	68	58	50					71

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	84	81	63	83	69	46	77					78
SWD	57			52								
ELL	52	75		41	50		43					78
AMI												
ASN	91			73								
BLK	64			43								
HSP	75	83	73	71	61	45	60					69
MUL	92			88								
PAC												
WHT	87	79		89	74		82					
FRL	64	85	69	57	59	53	60					76

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	75%	53%	22%	54%	21%
04	2023 - Spring	77%	54%	23%	58%	19%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	78%	46%	32%	50%	28%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	88%	55%	33%	59%	29%
04	2023 - Spring	85%	59%	26%	61%	24%
05	2023 - Spring	71%	53%	18%	55%	16%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	72%	47%	25%	51%	21%

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.

In reviewing 2022-2023 FAST PM1, PM2, and PM3 data it is evident that our Hispanic and Black subgroups exhibit the largest achievement gap. The factors that contributed to lower performance include, new assessment types, new benchmarks/standards, and changes in student population.

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

In 2021-2022 84% of students met proficiency levels on FSA in both reading and math. When looking at 2022-2023 FAST proficiency scores, only 77% of students met proficiency in reading based on PM3. Based on this decrease in proficiency, this will be an instructional priority. The factors that contributed are the changes to statewide assessments, and the correlation between performance, attendance, parental support, and behavior.

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.

According to the state average for FAST reading scores, 76% of students met proficiency. On the same assessment, Mitchell students performed at 77% proficiency. For math, the state average was 82% proficiency and on the same assessment, 83% of Mitchell students met proficiency.

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

Based on 2022-2023 FAST PM3 scores, significant growth was attained in both reading and math. 3rd grade students went from 45% proficiency (PM 1) in reading to 76% (PM3). 4th grade students grew from 61% proficiency (PM1) to 81% (PM3). 5th grade students grew from 63% (PM1) to 75% (PM3). In math, 3rd grade went from 18% proficiency (PM1) to 87% (PM3). 4th grade math proficiency grew from 26% proficiency (PM1) to 91% (PM3). 5th grade students grew from 28% (PM1) to 72% (PM3).

Throughout the 2022-2023 school year many new actions were implemented to contribute to student proficiency growth. The Extended Learning Program (ELP) was provided by certified teachers who utilized classroom and grade level data to better support student growth and achievement. Teachers were provided Professional Development (PD) on research-based small group interventions such as SIPPS. Additional PD was provided to support teachers with analyzing FAST scores and plan for instruction. Grade-level teams had frequent collaborative planning opportunities to discuss common assessments, small group data, create small group focuses, and conduct structured PLC meetings. Administrators guided teachers through data chats and created small groups based on STAR, iReady, SIPPS, and FAST data.

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

Data will be posted later

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

1. Increased focus on small groups
2. Increased opportunities for collaborative planning and common assessment development and analysis
3. Family and community stakeholder involvement and decision making

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

Administrators will provide teachers with consistent common planning time, as well as Professional Learning Communities to allow for collaboration and sharing data trends. These meetings will also allow administration and teachers to use assessment data to drive instruction in order to promote student growth and success. Team and planning norms will be determined at the beginning of the year and reviewed weekly to allow for respectful and productive conversations. To foster a high level of communication, teams will submit collaborative planning/PLC notes weekly, and administration will use the notes to provide detailed feedback to teachers/teams during administrative walkthroughs and data chats. Materials and support will be provided by the school and reimbursements through PTA. These collaborative planning sessions will allow teachers to discuss student progress and create engaging lessons that meet a wide variety of student learning styles. Students who are in programs such as AGP, ELL, and ESE will be part of planning discussions and the ESE, ELL, and AGP resource teachers will be utilized to help plan for instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With increased focus on small group collaborative planning, 80% of students will meet proficiency in math, reading, and science.

Monitoring:

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

Data chats will be conducted with individual teachers and grade-level teams to address achievement gaps, student progress, and plan for small group instruction. Administration will monitor progress through the use of weekly collaborative planning/PLC notes, walkthroughs, and data chats. Grade-level teams will use data walls to monitor the growth of students in STAR, FAST, iReady, DIBELS, SIPPS, as well as additional common assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Renee Best (renee.best@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.)

The evidence-based interventions for this Area of Focus include weekly PLC/collaborative planning notes/meetings and PD for FAST/STAR analysis.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These practices/programs described above meet the identified need of increasing student achievement through collaborative planning. PLCs/collaborative planning allows for continued monitoring, planning, and implementing structures/strategies that directly support the School Improvement Plan and instructional priorities.

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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

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.

Throughout the year, teachers will review District and State assessment to drive instruction. K-2 teachers will use time within the ELA frameworks to provide students with whole-group instruction through UFLI and review concepts within the frameworks allotted for small groups. K-5 teachers will provide students with individualized small group instruction where students are able to learn at an appropriate level, review grade level benchmarks, and close achievement gaps. When appropriate, data-based small groups will be created, and students will be offered additional supports through ELP before or after school.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With increased focus on small group instruction, 80% of students will meet proficiency in math, reading, and science.

Monitoring:

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

Progress will be monitored by reviewing data from PM1, PM2, and PM3 in FAST, iReady, and STAR. K-2 teachers will conduct weekly UFLI spelling assessments, tier 2/3 progress monitoring checks, SIPPS screeners/assessments, and DIBELS. When appropriate, teachers will utilize student data to monitor for MTSS/individualized educational plan purposes. All grade levels will utilize school, district, and state data to determine individualized student assessment goals and update data walls appropriately to demonstrate growth. Small groups are intended to be flexible and change as needed based on student and class assessment data. Throughout the year, data chats will be conducted with grade levels, and administration will provide resources, feedback, and guidance. They will guide team members to determine next steps, create small groups, and make instructional decisions that help students progress throughout the school year. Goal setting and small groups will also be utilized with students who have behavior and attendance goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Renee Best (renee.best@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.)

To increase student achievement by planning and utilizing small group instruction, K-5 teachers will use evidence-based interventions to support student achievement gaps. K-2 teachers will use SIPPS, UFLI, DIBELS, and Stemscores. K-5 teachers will utilize iReady, Wonders, and individualized small groups to achieve this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These practices/programs described above meet the identified need of increasing student achievement through small groups. These programs allow for consistent, systematic, and evidence-based teaching to happen in the instructional frameworks of math, science, and reading.

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

#3. 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.

Throughout the school year, families and community stakeholders will have the opportunity to be involved in schoolwide decision making. Based on our schoolwide data trends, we will create more opportunities for ELL families to be involved. An ELL resource room has been created to welcome families and provide community and instructional resources to bridge the gap between home and school. We will increase parent communication by the use of the ELL resource room and creating individualized small groups based on our bottom quartile students. Students and families will be offered increased supports in ELA and math through small group instruction and ELP. Additionally, families will have the opportunity to be involvement in PTA and SAC throughout the year. Stakeholder feedback will provide support and feedback on our instructional priorities in the way of PTA reimbursements, supplies, and data monitoring. By having additional supports available immediately within the classroom, there is an increase in individualized instruction provided to students and thereby increases student growth and achievement. Through these family donations, we are able to increase activity on campus, including opportunities for students to see their own families involved in their education by being on campus for volunteer opportunities. Students are able to feel that they are cared for at our school as a result of the stakeholder involvement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Parents will be present in schoolwide decision making. Increased opportunities for parents and community stakeholders will allow for families to become involved in decision-making goals that align to school improvement goals.

Monitoring:

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

Stakeholders will be present and active in schoolwide decision making, meetings, and reviewing schoolwide data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Renee Best (renee.best@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.)

SAC, PTA, conference night, and ELL parent events are evidence-based interventions that support increased stakeholder involvement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Providing more support for families will allow for increased communications and involvement that support school improvement goals. Community members, families, nearby universities, and business partners provide our school with an abundance of resources meant to increase and promote student achievement and support for teachers, students, administration, and the school as a whole. These resources/materials help teachers to develop interactive lessons that increase student growth and achievement. Nearby universities provide our school with opportunities to host interns, which provides students and teachers with a qualified individual to provide additional supports within the classroom.

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

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes