Hillsborough County Public Schools

Valrico 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 19

V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence 0

VI. Title I Requirements 0

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 0

Valrico Elementary School

609 S MILLER RD, Valrico, FL 33594

[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.

Engage Every Learner

Provide the school's vision statement.

Inspire lifelong learning and success.

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
Simonsen, Tricia	Principal	Cultivate school wide achievement focus and results orientation; Maintain instructional expertise; Management and development of employees; Sustain a positive school culture and support relationship building; Problem-solve and manage strategic change.
Bisesto, Heather	Assistant Principal	Assist Principal in cultivating school wide achievement focus and results orientation; Maintaining instructional expertise; Management and development of employees; Sustaining a positive school culture and supporting relationship building; Problem-solving and management of strategic change.

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.

Instructional Leadership Team discusses analysis of school data and solicits grade level team input on SMART goals and strategies aligned with student needs. Input is also solicited from the School Advisory Council.

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))

SIP Monitoring is embedded in ILT agendas quarterly and goals are adjusted based according to support student progress and needs. Instructional feedback is aligned with SIP strategies.

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	56%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	84%
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	42	35	26	29	28	24	0	0	0	184
One or more suspensions	5	1	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	10
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	14	7	15	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	6	23	0	0	0	38
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	3	18	23	11	13	0	0	0	70

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	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	4

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	5	0	1	0	0	0	13
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	30	20	28	24	19	0	0	0	122
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in 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	16	21	11	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	29	13	0	0	0	56
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	1	0	1	5	2	0	0	0	9

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	30	20	28	24	19	0	0	0	122
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in 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	16	21	11	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	29	13	0	0	0	56
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	1	0	1	5	2	0	0	0	9

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	65	50	53	69	53	56	65		
ELA Learning Gains				71			60		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				62			57		
Math Achievement*	65	56	59	71	50	50	60		
Math Learning Gains				76			52		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52			27		
Science Achievement*	59	50	54	71	59	59	60		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	71	59	59	65			59		

** 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	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	325
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	67

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	537
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	39	Yes	1	
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK	67			
HSP	59			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	69			
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	46			
ELL	69			
AMI				
ASN	86			
BLK	59			
HSP	64			

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	67			
PAC				
WHT	71			
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	65			65			59					71
SWD	36			44			38				4	
ELL	49			61			53				5	71
AMI												
ASN	85			85							2	
BLK	65			69							2	
HSP	61			59			50				5	67
MUL	59			65							2	
PAC												
WHT	68			69			71				4	
FRL	55			55			44				5	65

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	69	71	62	71	76	52	71					65
SWD	38	51	48	48	55	29	47					50
ELL	67	83	70	72	75		50					65
AMI												
ASN	86			86								

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	48	63	75	48	71	64	46					
HSP	65	74	58	65	72	45	66					70
MUL	56	67		58	85							
PAC												
WHT	76	70	59	82	78	50	83					
FRL	60	67	60	63	69	49	62					69

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	65	60	57	60	52	27	60					59
SWD	26	63	58	34	53	27	27					
ELL	57	81		55	31		71					59
AMI												
ASN	79			81								
BLK	33	42		25	17		25					
HSP	60	66		56	45		61					59
MUL	64			36								
PAC												
WHT	72	60	60	70	67		63					
FRL	60	59	52	52	48	24	54					62

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	58%	53%	5%	54%	4%
04	2023 - Spring	80%	54%	26%	58%	22%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	61%	46%	15%	50%	11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	67%	55%	12%	59%	8%
04	2023 - Spring	76%	59%	17%	61%	15%
05	2023 - Spring	53%	53%	0%	55%	-2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	58%	47%	11%	51%	7%

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.

35% of 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students scored a level 1 or 2, below proficiency, on the 2023 Summative FAST Math assessment.

Instruction based on new math standards, the use of new curriculum materials, and a new computer-based testing platform for assessment are factors contributing to the percentage of students scoring below proficiency. In relation to the computer-based testing platform, it should be noted that first and second grade quarterly monitoring assessments also showed a significant decrease in average scores when administered online. Additionally, gaps in the shift from the Florida Standards to B.E.S.T. Standards in Mathematics resulted in increased instructional time spent on building background and prerequisite skills.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year data was Grade 5 Science. 43% of these students were students with scores in the lowest 25%. Due to the low progression of students in the bottom quartile scoring a Level 3 or higher in ELA in the Spring, it is appropriate to hypothesize that reading ability had a significant impact on the grade level demonstration of proficiency in the area of science.

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 having the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Grade 5 FAST Math, with 53% of all students tested scoring at a level of proficiency. The state average of students scoring at a level of proficiency was 55%, and the district average was 53%. Shifting to the use of new curriculum materials, new standards, and computer-based assessment were factors contributing to this gap. In addition, only 3% of students who entered the grade level with scores in the bottom quartile increased their proficiency to a level 3 or higher on the Spring FAST Math assessment.

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 Grade 4 ELA. The 2022 Grade 4 FSA ELA showed that 63% of students scored at a proficiency level of 3 or higher. The 2023 FAST ELA summative assessment showed that 80% of students in Grade 4 scored at a proficiency level of 3 or higher. The 2022-23 Grade 4 ELA team of teachers planned collaboratively to develop standards-aligned lessons, utilize curriculum materials that best-supported student needs, and include student reflection and self-assessment opportunities.

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

The number of students with 10% or more days absent has increased from 122 to 184. 77 of the identified students are in grades K and 1.

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

-Increase proficiency in Math for students with scores in the bottom quartile
-Increase proficiency in ELA for students with scores in the bottom quartile
-Increase overall proficiency in Science

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.

According to the Early Warning System, 184 students had an attendance rate below 90%. 77 of these students were in Grades K and 1.

Positive culture and environment specifically relating to student attendance is a critical factor for students in the development of foundational skills necessary for overall achievement.

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).

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

The percentage of students with chronic attendance (defined as missing 10% or more of the school year), as measured by EdConnect, will decrease from 24% in 2022-2023 to 20% in 2023-2024.

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

Student attendance, led by the Student Services Team and Guidance/MTSS Committee, will be monitored daily, monthly, and quarterly by analyzing data from EdConnect and included in the Schoolwide Data reports shared with the Instructional Leadership Team. The data will be monitored and tracked to look for trends and used to intervene before chronic attendance can occur. The Data Processor will submit daily attendance reports to the School Social Worker so that attendance plans can be implemented and/or adjusted as needed. Attendance data will be shared within the Instructional Leadership Team and Guidance/MTSS teams quarterly to address action steps for improving student attendance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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) will be utilized to improve student attendance, particularly with student who are chronically absent.

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 sources document the effectiveness of RtI:
-J. Hattie's Effect Size on RtI is 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.

-The School Social Worker will be included on the agenda to present/review our school wide attendance plan.

Person Responsible: Tricia Simonsen (tricia.simonsen@hcps.net)

By When: August, 2023

Attendance information will be provided during the first SAC meeting of the school year as part of the school wide data overview to inform stakeholders of the importance of attendance in connection with student achievement.

Person Responsible: Heather Bisesto (heather.bisesto@hcps.net)

By When: August, 2023

The Guidance/MTSS Team meets quarterly to address grade level team RtI data, which will include attendance.

Person Responsible: Heather Bisesto (heather.bisesto@hcps.net)

By When: Quarterly throughout the school year.

During Parent Information Night, grade level teams will share the importance of attendance including the connection to academic performance.

Person Responsible: Tricia Simonsen (tricia.simonsen@hcps.net)

By When: September, 2023

Monthly school wide parent newsletters will include attendance information to encourage positive daily attendance rates.

Person Responsible: Tricia Simonsen (tricia.simonsen@hcps.net)

By When: Throughout the school year.

Good attendance will be recognized daily with banners placed on the outside of classroom doors for recognition by students and staff.

Person Responsible: Heather Bisesto (heather.bisesto@hcps.net)

By When: Throughout the school year.

Mentors will be assigned to students for daily/weekly check-ins and encouragement.

Person Responsible: Heather Bisesto (heather.bisesto@hcps.net)

By When: Throughout the school year.

The Student Services Team will ensure appropriate support is provided upon identification of barriers (homelessness, transportation, food scarcity, physical/mental health issues).

Person Responsible: Tricia Simonsen (tricia.simonsen@hcps.net)

By When: Throughout the school year.

Parent/Teacher conferences will include discussion about student attendance.

Person Responsible: Heather Bisesto (heather.bisesto@hcps.net)

By When: Each semester and throughout the school year as needed.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

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.

According to the 2023 summative FAST Math assessment data, 35% of students in grades 3, 4, and 5 scored below proficiency.

Instructional practice relating to differentiation within the Math instructional framework will positively impact student achievement by increasing equity and accelerating progress toward learner potential.

According to Carol Ann Tomlinson (1997), "...differentiating instruction means that the teacher anticipates the differences in students' readiness, interests, and learning profiles and, as a result, creates different learning paths so that students have the opportunity to learn as much as they can as deeply as they can..."

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

The percentage of students who score Level 1 or Level 2 on the summative FAST Math assessment will decrease from 35% to 30% by May 2024. Conversely, the percentage of students who score Level 3 or higher will increase from 65% to 70%.

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

FAST Progress Monitoring data will be utilized at the beginning, middle, and end of the school year using the online testing platform (TIDE) and reporting system. Teachers have direct access to individual student scale scores for each subcategory related to the BEST Math Standards, classroom summary data, and grade level comparison data. Individual scale scores will indicate relative growth toward proficiency. The FAST data will be shared with the Instructional Leadership Team after each assessment period to support instructional implications.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tricia Simonsen (tricia.simonsen@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.)

Teacher estimates of achievement is described as teacher judgments that can help set expectations, be used to anchor on past understanding, are involved in setting the next challenges, identify those who may have early signs of difficulties, inform placement and intervention choices, and influences instructional choices. These judgments come from questioning, observing, written work presentations, how the student reacts to increased challenge, and assignments and tests.

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

Teacher estimates of achievement have the potential to considerably accelerate achievement, with an effect size of 1.29 according to J. Hattie (2018).

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.

K-5 Teachers will utilize backward planning strategies, at least monthly, during Instructional Design Sessions to deliberately plan checks for understanding and possible lesson adaptations to address multiple levels of student acquisition of lesson skill targets.

Person Responsible: Tricia Simonsen (tricia.simonsen@hcps.net)

By When: October of 2023 and throughout the school year.

K-5 Teachers will implement flexible small group instruction based on student progress toward standard mastery, aligned with daily lesson targets, using information gathered from formative lesson data (including questioning and discussion, observation, and written work).

Person Responsible: Tricia Simonsen (tricia.simonsen@hcps.net)

By When: Throughout the school year

K-5 Teachers will utilize student self-assessment and reflection strategies to support differentiated learning experiences for all students.

Person Responsible: Tricia Simonsen (tricia.simonsen@hcps.net)

By When: Throughout the school year

K-5 Teachers will analyze informal data to reflect on effectiveness of small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Tricia Simonsen (tricia.simonsen@hcps.net)

By When: Weekly throughout the school year

K-5 Grade level teams will analyze progress monitoring data to support backward planning and instructional next steps according to student needs.

Person Responsible: Heather Bisesto (heather.bisesto@hcps.net)

By When: At least monthly throughout the school year

Formal and informal classroom observation post conferences will include feedback related to differentiation strategies as evidenced by evidence collected for Domain B, The Learning Experience.

Person Responsible: Tricia Simonsen (tricia.simonsen@hcps.net)

By When: December of 2023 and March of 2024

The K-5 Math Vertical Team will participate in a book study using "Math in Practice" to support differentiation practices, including but not limited to asking questions, helping students communicate about math, and learning from meaningful formative assessment. Vertical team members will be responsible for sharing book study findings with grade level team members.

Person Responsible: Heather Bisesto (heather.bisesto@hcps.net)

By When: Quarterly 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).