Pride Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Pride Elementary School

10310 LIONS DEN DR, Tampa, FL 33647

[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.

Pride Elementary will prepare students for life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pride Elementary will provide an education and the supports which enable each student to excel as a successful and responsible citizen.

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
English, Paulette	Principal	Serves as the instructional leader, engages stakeholders, and collaborates with school and district personnel.
Humbert, Shelby	SAC Member	Serves as the School Advisory Council Chairperson.
Moncrief, Heather	Assistant Principal	Serves as instructional leader, engages stakeholders, collaborates with school and district personnel.
Noll, Elizabeth	Other	Responsible for providing support to students, teachers, and staff to ensure that students with disabilities demonstrate increased participation and performance in the classroom. Assists with fully and satisfactorily implementing the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and all related requirements. Provides leadership in the development and implementation of the ESE Strategic Plan that is aligned with both the state and district plans.
Garcia, Eva	Other	Creates and provides tools, resources, technical assistance, trainings, and assessments of students (WIDA) to ensure the school has the supports necessary to educate ELL students successfully.
Goff, Christine	School Counselor	Provides classroom education and skill building as well as counseling and support for students; provides training to teachers and staff; identifies students who are at-risk for harmful behaviors and intervenes to limit or eliminate the risk of harm and/or negative consequences; assists with setting goals and incentives for attendance; coordinates a school-wide character education program (7 Mindsets).

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.

Stakeholders include the parents and guardians, administration, faculty and staff of Pride Elementary School. After reviewing the parent survey results, the Instructional Leadership Team met during the summer to discuss and make suggestions for the instructional goals, including climate and culture, for the 2023-2024 school year. Grade level Team Leaders sought input from their teams. After reviewing the assessment and survey data from 2022-2023, the instructional goals were developed and presented during preplanning and integrated into the School Improvement Plan. The Pride Elementary School Advisory Council from 2022-2023 were also asked for input in regards to School Climate and Culture, with one parent of SAC responding. The School Advisory Council (SAC) will meet on August 28, 2023 to vote on the proposed School Improvement Plan.

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 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. Monitoring will be accomplished through monthly Instructional Leadership Meetings, weekly Leadership meetings, and quarterly School Advisory Council meetings. The school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement after Progress Monitoring assessment results are analyzed in the first quarter and middle of the school 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	79%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	28%
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	1	38	42	38	26	33	0	0	0	178
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	26	19	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	19	23	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	9	12	11	31	5	0	0	0	68

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	1	2	0	7	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	1	3	3	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	1	29	24	23	18	19	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	9	9	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	10	18	0	0	0	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	7	13	10	13	15	0	0	0	58

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	4	0	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	3	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	1	29	24	23	18	19	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	9	9	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	10	18	0	0	0	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	7	13	10	13	15	0	0	0	58

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	4	0	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	3	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	12
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*	75	50	53	80	53	56	79		
ELA Learning Gains				83			74		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				73			53		
Math Achievement*	78	56	59	83	50	50	79		
Math Learning Gains				82			67		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				65			45		
Science Achievement*	73	50	54	77	59	59	74		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	64	59	59	79			65		

* 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	73
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	363
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
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	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	31	Yes	1	1
ELL	70			
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	53			
HSP	66			
MUL	66			
PAC				

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%
WHT	67			
FRL	55			

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	50			
ELL	74			
AMI				
ASN	89			
BLK	61			
HSP	76			
MUL	71			
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	63			

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	75			78			73					64
SWD	29			41			32				4	
ELL	69			78			79				5	64
AMI												
ASN	89			94			91				5	55
BLK	56			55			46				4	
HSP	60			60			77				4	

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
MUL	66			69			64				3	
PAC												
WHT	68			72			58				4	
FRL	60			52			51				4	

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	80	83	73	83	82	65	77					79
SWD	36	68	62	46	62	54	20					
ELL	75	78	67	84	80		59					78
AMI												
ASN	91	92	85	97	90		95					76
BLK	63	67	59	62	69	57	52					
HSP	70	83	83	78	80	64	73					
MUL	70	78		71	76	70	60					
PAC												
WHT	81	82	72	80	78	67	73					
FRL	62	75	68	63	69	50	51					

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	79	74	53	79	67	45	74					65
SWD	32	29	25	35	29	21	11					
ELL	75	68	64	78	80		70					65
AMI												
ASN	93	86	82	97	90		88					68
BLK	60	52	27	57	57	38	50					
HSP	70	63		62	38		60					67
MUL	68			48								
PAC												
WHT	77	73		82	58		76					

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
FRL	61	51	37	57	40	33	45					57

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.
<u>The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide</u>
<u>assessments</u>.

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	77%	53%	24%	54%	23%
04	2023 - Spring	74%	54%	20%	58%	16%
06	2023 - Spring	*	47%	*	47%	*
03	2023 - Spring	70%	46%	24%	50%	20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	76%	55%	21%	59%	17%
04	2023 - Spring	76%	59%	17%	61%	15%
05	2023 - Spring	73%	53%	20%	55%	18%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	69%	47%	22%	51%	18%

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.

Our lowest performance was in the area of science.
Overall, 71% of our 5th graders demonstrated proficiency.
32% of our SWD subgroup demonstrated proficiency.
46% of our Black subgroup demonstrated proficiency.

Potential contributing factors may include that more focus was placed on supporting struggling students in ELA, the utilization of a push-in model for AGP math/science in 5th grade making class sizes large, and a high number of students in all intermediate classrooms.

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

Overall math proficiency decreased from 83% (prior year FSA) to 77% (2023 FAST).
SWD subgroup math proficiency decreased from 46% (prior year FSA) to 41% (2023 FAST).
Black subgroup math proficiency decreased from 62% (prior year FSA) to 56% (2023 FAST).

A potential contributing factor may be that more focus was placed on supporting struggling students in ELA, as well as the introduction of new curriculum materials.

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 components that had the greatest gaps when compared to the state average are as follows:
All data components at Pride Elementary indicate the percentage of students demonstrating proficiency to be between 17% and 24% higher than the state.

3 Math FL: 59% to 78% at Pride Elementary
4 Math FL: 61% to 78% at Pride Elementary
5 Math FL: 55% to 76% at Pride Elementary

3 Reading FL - 50% to 73% at Pride Elementary
4 Reading FL - 57% to 76% at Pride Elementary
5 Reading FL - 55% to 79% at Pride Elementary

5 Science FL - 51% to 71% at Pride Elementary

Pride is a suburban, high SES (28% FRL population) school with supportive parents and active parent involvement. For the 2022-2023 school year 85% of classroom teachers had two or more years of experience and were evaluated as highly effective. Teachers collaborated in PLCs twice monthly and planned with colleagues weekly or biweekly.

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

73% of 4th grade students demonstrated proficiency in ELA (FSA) in 2022. This group of students demonstrated 79% proficiency in ELA as 5th graders in ELA (FAST) in 2023.

Actions which may have contributed to this success include team planning and collaboration in PLCs, focus on student ownership of learning, and focus on vocabulary,

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

Based on EWS data, attendance is an area of concern. During the 2022-2023 school year, 178 students were absent 10% or more of the school year compared to 114 in 2021-2022.

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

Student attendance
Overall science proficiency
Overall math proficiency
SWD reading proficiency/growth
SWD math proficiency/growth

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 Early Warning System

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.

Description:
Positive culture and environment specifically relating to student attendance will focus on improving student attendance in order to positively impact student achievement, particularly with students who are chronically absent, defined as missing 10% or more of the school year.

Rationale:
In Gottfried's 2019 study (Chronic absenteeism in the classroom context: Effects on achievement),"students who are chronically absent have lower achievement outcomes." (p.25) "Students in classrooms with a higher percentage of chronic absentees have lower test scores." (p.26)

The percentage of all students with 90% or higher attendance, shown in EdConnect attendance reports:
Q1 2022-2023 86%
Q2 2022-2023 78%
Q3 2022-2023 80%
Q4 2022-2023 78%

The percentage of students with chronic absenteeism was 19% in 2022-2023.

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

Measurable Outcome 1:
The percentage of all students with 90% or higher attendance rate, as measured by EdConnect, will increase as follows compared to the 2022-2023 school year:
Q1 86% to 88%
Q2 78% to 82%
Q3 80% to 84%
Q4 78% to 80%

Measurable Outcome 2:
The percentage of students with chronic absenteeism, as measured by EdConnect, will decrease from 19% in 2022-2023 to 15% in 2023-2024.

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

Student attendance, led by the school leadership team, will be monitored daily, monthly, and quarterly by analyzing data from EdConnect, and other data sources. The data will be monitored and tracked to look for trends and patterns and used to intervene before chronic attendance can occur. The school leadership team will review attendance data at weekly meetings and adjust the SIP's Action Steps. The school leadership team will share attendance data with the staff, School Advisory Council, and parents/students monthly to inform and employ them in implementing action steps to improve student attendance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Paulette English (paulette.english@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.)

Response to Intervention (RtI):
RtI will be focused on strengthening Tier 1, 2, and 3 to improve student attendance, particularly with students
with chronic absenteeism.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for using RtI for attendance is to utilize a schoolwide process that supports students at all three
tiers. The following two sources document the effectiveness of RtI:
-John Hattie's Effect Size on Response to Intervention: 1.29
-Kim and Streeter's Strategies and Interventions for Improving School Attendance | Encyclopedia of Social Work (oxfordre.com)

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.

Monitor Data: The school leadership team will monitor attendance data at weekly meetings.

Engage Students & Families: ParentLink emails will be sent to families of students with unexcused or unknown reasons for absence. The weekly school newsletter will include information about attendance and correlation to student achievement.

Recognize Good and Improved Attendance: Morning Show reminders regarding attendance and recognition of attendance goals, quarterly perfect attendance recognition, monthly attendance trophies awarded to the class on each grade level with the highest attendance percentage, attendance challenges, improved attendance recognition

Personalized Outreach: Parents will receive a letter and/or phone call when a student accumulates 5 absences. Student attendance will be discussed at parent/teacher conferences. Phone calls and home visits will be made to assist with identifying and removing barriers contributing to absenteeism.

Person Responsible: Paulette English (paulette.english@hcps.net)

By When: Students with a history of chronic absenteeism will be identified and teachers notified in August/September. Other action steps will be implemented throughout the school year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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.

Based on the 2023 state science assessment, 71% of students in 5th grade scored at a proficiency level of three or higher. This is a decrease of 6% compared to the prior year (77%). A stronger focus will be placed on strengthening science instruction through hands-on learning experiences, students taking ownership of their learning through discussion, elaboration of their thinking, frequent monitoring of student understanding, and providing feedback to students. These steps will support an increase in student proficiency on the 5th grade state science assessment in the spring of 2024.

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

75% of 5th grade students will demonstrate proficiency on the state science assessment in the Spring of 2024.

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

The administration will encourage and monitor participation in district training opportunities, conduct fidelity classroom walk- throughs, review progress monitoring data, attend PLC meetings, and review PLC agendas and notes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Moncrief (heather.moncrief@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.)

Students will be provided with opportunities to take ownership of their learning through projects and processes, discussion in whole and small groups, collaboration with classmates, as well as opportunities to elaborate on their own thinking.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This evidence-based strategy is based on research which supports the idea that when students take ownership of their learning and teach reciprocally, they will see an increase in information retention.

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.

Teachers will design and implement hands on learning opportunities through investigations and experiments within the science instructional block. Opportunities will be provided for students to share and explain their thinking and engage in meaningful discussions with their classmates.

Immediate and constructive feedback will be provided to students within whole and small groups to further their understanding of the content.

Person Responsible: Heather Moncrief (heather.moncrief@hcps.net)

By When: Action steps will continue throughout the school year.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Not applicable to Pride Elementary School