
Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 11 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 22 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 22 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 25 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 29 |

Hungerford Elementary

230 RUFFEL STREET, Eatonville, FL 32751

<https://hungerfordes.ocps.net/>

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.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

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 |
|-----------------------|---------------------|---|
| Harris, Letecia | Principal | <p>Develops, implements, and evaluates the programs within the school; provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making; ensures implementation of all core programs; ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS; evaluates existing programs and practices; initiates continued improvement in curriculum and teaching methods; conducts an assessment of MTSS skills of school staff; ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation; communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities; observes teachers and provides immediate feedback to improve instruction.</p> |
| Cardona, Myrna | Assistant Principal | <p>Assists the principal in all functions of school operation. Develops, implements, and evaluates the programs within the school; provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making; ensures implementation of all core programs; evaluates existing programs and practices; initiates continued improvement in curriculum and teaching methods; observes teachers and provides immediate feedback to improve instruction. Coordinates school safety plans and activities.</p> |
| Jones, Sheila | Instructional Coach | <p>On-site professional developer who teaches educators how to use proven instructional methods to provide quality instruction. Coaches meet with teachers individually during a planning period or after school to identify specific students' needs and to discuss possible research-validated interventions that might help the teacher address those needs. To make it as easy as possible for a teacher to successfully use a new instructional method, coaches alleviate the burden on teachers as much as possible by preparing all handouts, assessments, overheads, and other materials that the teacher needs. They also demonstrate how the new instructional methods or interventions should be taught. In some cases, they provide checklists, reflection forms, or other observation tools.</p> |
| Moore-Gordon, Jawanna | Instructional Coach | <p>On-site professional developer who teaches educators how to use proven instructional methods to provide quality instruction. Coaches meet with teachers individually during a planning period or after school to identify specific students' needs and to discuss possible research-validated interventions that might help the teacher address those needs. In order to make it as easy as possible for a teacher to successfully use a new instructional method, coaches alleviate the burden on teachers as much as possible by preparing all handouts, assessments, overheads, and other materials that the teacher needs. They also demonstrate how the new</p> |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---------------------|---------------------|---|
| | | instructional methods or interventions should be taught. In some cases, they provide checklists, reflection forms, or other observation tools. |
| Dickerson, Courtney | Behavior Specialist | Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier III instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching. Assists with behavior coaching for students and academic intervention planning. |

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 in the Hungerford community include students, families, staff, local establishments, and businesses in the Eatonville and Maitland communities. Hungerford staff play an essential role in promoting a positive culture in day-to-day school operations and continue to implement SEL strategies in daily lessons. Hungerford staff will engage families to participate in Title I community outreach activities on a monthly basis as well as daily engagement with specific families and community members in need of support through our Parent Engagement Liaison. Local establishments support a positive culture and enlivenment here at Hungerford by continuing their relationships as our Partners in Education and taking an active role in supporting school operations (examples include local churches providing meeting space and breakfast for teachers during planning, national publishing companies providing college scholarships for Hungerford graduates). During the School Advisory Council meetings, the school leadership team, teachers, school staff, parents, and community members discussed and analyzed the Panorama Climate Surveys. The surveys were used to determine the needs of the school. All stakeholders were involved, shared ideas, and played a significant role in the development of the SIP.

SIP Monitoring

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

Professional development will be provided on Reading, Math, ELA, and Writing Strategies, throughout the school year. The leadership team will facilitate weekly PLCs twice a week for the planning of ELA, Math, and Science.

The administrative team will facilitate bi-weekly data and MTSS meetings with teachers to analyze data to make instructional decisions. The administrative team will utilize a CWT tool to provide actionable feedback to impact teacher instructional practices. The administrative team will utilize the Marzano Instructional Framework to provide actionable feedback to impact teacher instructional practices resulting in student achievement. The leadership team will take a deep dive into data regarding the Bottom 30% and ESE students.

Demographic Data

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

| | |
|--|--|
| 2023-24 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | Yes |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 95% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 100% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | Yes |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | ATSI |
| 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)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C |
| School Improvement Rating History | |
| DJJ Accountability Rating History | |

Early Warning Systems

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|---|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 4 | 7 | 19 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 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 | 10 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 5 | 4 | 27 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 |

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 | 2 | 2 | 20 | 10 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |

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 | 1 | 11 | 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) 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 | 13 | 20 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 58 |
| One or more suspensions | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in ELA | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in Math | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | | 0 | 3 | 10 | 14 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 40 |

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 | 9 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |

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 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 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 | 13 | 20 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 3 | 10 | 14 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |

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 | 9 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |

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 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 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* | 46 | 57 | 53 | 39 | 56 | 56 | 30 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 64 | | | 26 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 33 | | | 50 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 50 | 60 | 59 | 47 | 46 | 50 | 27 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 68 | | | 14 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 60 | | | 40 | | |

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Science Achievement* | 51 | 63 | 54 | 41 | 61 | 59 | 10 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 66 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 51 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 55 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | | 59 | 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) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 48 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 191 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 4 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 50 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 352 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 98 |
| 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 | 22 | Yes | 4 | 1 |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 45 | | | |
| HSP | 60 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | | | | |
| FRL | 46 | | | |

| 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 | 34 | Yes | 3 | |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 48 | | | |
| HSP | 50 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | | | | |
| FRL | 47 | | | |

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 | 46 | | | 50 | | | 51 | | | | | |
| SWD | 22 | | | 22 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 43 | | | 47 | | | 48 | | | | 4 | |
| HSP | 60 | | | 60 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 44 | | | 47 | | | 50 | | | | 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 | 39 | 64 | 33 | 47 | 68 | 60 | 41 | | | | | |
| SWD | 11 | 42 | | 28 | 55 | | | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 36 | 63 | 33 | 46 | 64 | 57 | 39 | | | | | |
| HSP | 53 | | | 47 | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 33 | 58 | 33 | 44 | 63 | 57 | 38 | | | | | |

| 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 | 30 | 26 | 50 | 27 | 14 | 40 | 10 | | | | | |
| SWD | 8 | | | 8 | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 | ELP Progress |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 31 | 26 | 50 | 29 | 15 | 40 | 8 | | | | | |
| HSP | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 28 | 20 | | 26 | 14 | | 6 | | | | | |

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 | 40% | 54% | -14% | 54% | -14% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 58% | 60% | -2% | 58% | 0% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 38% | 52% | -14% | 50% | -12% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 40% | 59% | -19% | 59% | -19% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 53% | 62% | -9% | 61% | -8% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 51% | 55% | -4% | 55% | -4% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 44% | 59% | -15% | 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.

The SWD subgroup showed the lowest performance. The two contributing factors of the low performance are a lack of consistent parental support and lack of motivation from the students.

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

According to 2023-24 FAST data, there were no declines in the data.

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.

Our ELA FAST proficiency percentage is 10% below the state average. Our percentage increased by 9% points from last year. Our proficiency percentage are increasingly improving.

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

Our ELA FAST proficiency scores showed the most improvement. Our ELA proficiency increased from 36% the prior year to 44%. Contributing factors in improving our gains were all students returning to full-time instruction here at school, increased focus on targeting deficiencies and addressing gaps from the pandemic years during interventions, common planning led weekly by instructional coaches, admin team leading data meetings with an increased focus on intervention planning and utilizing Tier 1 Interventionists to facilitate small groups and one-on-one interventions.

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

Our greatest area of concern is attendance. Twenty-two percent of our students were absent 10% or more days. Workshops for parents will be conducted. Teachers will be expected to use more engagement strategies for students throughout the day.

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

1. Improvement of the performance of our SWD
2. Improvement of instruction of the lowest 25% of students in ELA and Math
3. Improve attendance
4. Improve instructional delivery of Math Strategies
5. Improve instructional delivery of Science Lessons

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.

Hungerford's early warning system utilizes data to help accurately identify individual students likely to become disengaged and drop out of school. Our highest area of need identified by the Early warning system is attendance. Twenty-three percent of Hungerford students were absent 10% or more days.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Twenty-three percent of Hungerford students were absent 10% or more days during the 2022-23 school year. The percentage of students absent will decrease by 5% during the 2023-2024 school year. We will use the skyward attendance system to measure attendance.

Monitoring:

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

Students attendance will be monitored by teachers, registrar and parent engagement Liaison.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Letecia Harris (letecia.foster@ocps.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.)

We will begin this process by implementing the Division of Early Childhood Recommended Practices.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy was selected to help our instructional staff improve the learning outcomes for our students at-risk for developmental delays or disabilities.

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, School Counselor and the PEL, with the family, will identify skills to target for instruction that help a child become adaptive, competent, socially connected, and engaged and that promote learning in natural and inclusive environments.

Person Responsible: Letecia Harris (letecia.foster@ocps.net)

By When: Implementation will begin in August.

Teachers, School Counselor and the PEL will gather and use data to inform decisions about individualized instruction.

Person Responsible: Myrna Cardona (myrna.cardona@ocps.net)

By When: Implementation will begin in August.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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.

Hungerford Elementary will focus on increasing student proficiency in all content areas as a result of teachers consistently, purposefully, and collaboratively planning differentiated instruction while delivering rigorous lessons to include effective monitoring of student progress toward learning and the implementation of authentic monitoring strategies. There is a need to differentiate the small group instruction to support students in need of Tier II and Tier III MTSS support.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Historically, students with disabilities have been an under-performing subgroup with a federal index score of 34% in 2020-2021. Tier II and Tier III researched-based resources and assessments will be used to continuously progress monitor data of students identified as needing additional Tier II and Tier III support. By providing staff with ongoing professional learning that reinforces data-driven instruction, students with disabilities' individual needs will be met.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through the implementation of our intervention block and small group instruction. Students will be assessed every three weeks for progress monitoring purposes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Letecia Harris (letecia.foster@ocps.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.)

Hungerford will implement "Walk to Intervention" throughout every grade level. The following resources will be used-

- Being A Reader
- Multisensory Kits
- RAZ Plus
- Wonders Decodables
- Wonders Leveled Readers
- Scholastic Book Room

Students will be assessed every three weeks and moved to different groups as needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

"Walk to Intervention" will be implemented to meet the needs of students on different academic levels.

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.

Students will be assessed to determine their intervention group.

Teachers will choose strategies and resources according to the students' needs.

Students will participate in daily intervention groups.

Students will be assessed every three weeks and moved to different groups as needed.

Person Responsible: Jawanna Moore-Gordon (jawanna.moore-gordon@ocps.net)

By When: Action will begin August 2023

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

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.

Hungerford Elementary will focus on increasing student proficiency in all content areas as a result of teachers consistently, purposefully, and collaboratively planning differentiated instruction while delivering rigorous lessons to include effective monitoring of student progress toward learning and the implementation of authentic monitoring strategies. There is a need to differentiate the small group instruction to support students in need of Tier II and Tier III MTSS support.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Historically, students with disabilities have been an under-performing subgroup with a federal index score of 34% in 2020-2021. Tier II and Tier III researched-based resources and assessments will be used to continuously progress monitor data of students identified as needing additional Tier II and Tier III support. By providing staff with ongoing professional learning that reinforces data-driven instruction, students with disabilities' individual needs will be met.

Monitoring:

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

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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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 description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

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).

Hungerford Elementary reviews the use of resources that are allocated through general funds and those funds dedicated to school improvement activities. The deficiencies most notable include lack of time and/or people may have been a barrier to student achievement. These deficiencies are addressed through planning and learning processes offered in after-school opportunities for teachers to become more familiar with standards, content, and the pedagogical practices needed to increase student achievement.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

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

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

In grades K-2, 57% of students were on track to score a Level 3 or above according to the STAR EOY results. 1. 1. In Kindergarten, 71% of students were proficient on the STAR EOY.

2. In First grade, 72% of students were proficient on the STAR EOY.

3. In Second grade, 28% of students were proficient on the STAR EOY.

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

The proficiency levels in grades 3-5 were as follows according to the "RAISE Schools Identification 2023-2024" document:

1. In 3rd grade, 38% of students were proficient on the statewide ELA assessment.

2. In 4th grade, 58% of students were proficient on the statewide ELA assessment.

3. In 5th grade, 40% of students were proficient on the statewide ELA assessment.

Measurable Outcomes

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

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

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, 50% of students in grades K-2 will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidenced by the new progress monitoring system.

- 1) By the end of the year, at least 50% of students in Kindergarten will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidenced by the new progress monitoring system.
- 2) By the end of the year, at least 50% of students in first grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidenced by the new progress monitoring system.
- 3) By the end of the year, at least 50% of students in second grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment, as evidenced by the new progress monitoring system.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, 50% of tested students in grades 3-5 will achieve a proficient score on the state assessment which is an increase of 7 percentage points when compared to the previous school year.

- 1) By the end of the year, 50% of students in third grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment which is an increase of 12 percentage points when compared to the previous school year.
- 2) By the end of the year, 60% of students in fourth grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment which is an increase of 2 percentage points when compared to the previous school year.
- 3) By the end of the year, 60% of students in fifth grade will achieve proficiency and be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment which is an increase of 20 percentage points when compared to the previous school year.

Monitoring**Monitoring**

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

In an effort to support RAISE, Hungerford Elementary will use the beginning and middle of the year benchmark assessments through F.A.S.T. as well as the Exact Path and instructional tools. Monitoring will

also be accomplished using district common assessment data from the Standards-based Unit Assessments and data gained from documented MTSS interventions provided to students at Tier II and Tier III levels through such programs as SIPPS and Heggerty. Monthly data meetings will occur with grade-level teachers to review students' data and address adjustments that may need to be made in order to monitor response to intervention. Weekly reading walkthroughs by administrators will

occur to observe the teaching and learning processes including foundational skills and reading interventions.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Harris, Letecia, letecia.foster@ocps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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

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

The school will use evidence-based programs such as Exact Path and SIPPS for instruction and monitoring. The school will align with the district’s expectation of recommended curriculum, targeted professional development, and differentiated instruction for students who are identified as needing Tier II and Tier III support. The school will use the district-approved streamlined walkthrough tool weekly to monitor instruction and identify trends.

Rationale:

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

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

The following components of the Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding Practice Guide identifies strategies when used in tandem with appropriate educational programs like that of Heggerty, SIPPS and Exact Path meet a strong level of evidence to support ESSA subgroups:

-Use of the foundational pieces of the optional daily slides -Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.

-SIPPS-Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. Build students’ decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words.

Action Steps to Implement

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

| Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|
|-------------|-----------------------------------|

The MTSS process will be constantly monitored as students are properly placed in fluid Tiers based on their needs.

- Literacy Leadership - The Leadership Team will monitor Functional Basic Skills (FBS) and small group instruction by utilizing classroom walkthroughs.
- Literacy Coaching - Lessons for small group instruction will be addressed during the PLC process.
- Assessment - Assessment information gathered from FBS and small group instruction will be utilized to make adjustments to the student groups.
- Professional Learning - Training in the programs for SIPPS and Heggerty will be available to new employees

Moore-Gordon, Jawanna,
jawanna.moore-gordon@ocps.net

Teachers will attend PLCs to review details of upcoming lessons, plan text-based and benchmark-based questions, and plan for student responses.

- Literacy Leadership - Leadership Team members will attend and support PLCs as well as follow up with classroom walkthroughs along with data disaggregation so informed decisions about instruction can be made.
- Literacy Coaching - The Instructional Coach will provide side-by-side coaching and modeling of lessons to aid with the understanding or delivery of content.
- Assessment - Standards-based Unit Assessments will be utilized to determine students' understanding of content and make adjustments to future lessons. F.A.S.T. data is being used to initialize the student groups and upcoming diagnostic data will be used to update the student groups.
- Professional Learning - Training in SIPPS, Heggerty and B.E.S.T. standards will be available.

Cardona, Myrna,
myrna.cardona@ocps.net

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

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

Hungerford understands the importance of building and sustaining community partnerships that will share the responsibility for children's learning. The relationships are based on mutual respect and acknowledgment of the assets and expertise of each member. As an extension of this partnership, Hungerford emphasizes a broad base of community involvement. We utilize our Partners in Education coordinator to build and sustain effective supportive relationships. Local community partners have donated food, resources and time to assist with the social and instructional needs of our students. The school sustains the partnerships by developing and implementing strategies for promoting an effective school-family-community relationship. The target for parental involvement for the school is to have more families participate in school activities and increase PTO membership and involvement. We will build parent support by making sure parents are informed of all school events through flyers, monthly newsletters, and connect orange messages. We will continue to provide incentives and use business and community partners as well.

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

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

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, all schools engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. A core team of teachers and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for school stakeholders, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with stakeholders, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through district programs such as the Parent Academy. Schools utilize staff such as Parent Engagement Liaisons to bridge the community and school culture.

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

In order to build capacity in all educators, the principal will provide adequate time for implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the curriculum. All grade levels will have a collaborative common planning time with school coaches to discuss lesson plans and standards. Collaborative common planning will provide an opportunity for teachers to deconstruct the standards using Test Design Summary Blueprints and CRMs with the guidance of instructional coaches. Additionally, collaborative common planning provides opportunities for reflection and revision so that the lesson plans are updated, improved and aligned with Florida's standards on a regular basis.

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

The school leadership team facilitates common planning with teachers to build teacher capacity through the coaching cycle and analyze data to inform instructional decisions.
The MTSS team monitors core instruction and interventions to increase student achievement.

Title I, Title II, and Title III dollars are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through after-school programs or summer school.

The district coordinates with Title II and Title III to ensure staff development needs are provided.

The Migrant liaison provides services and support to students and parents by coordinating with Title I.

The district receives funds to support the Educational Alternative Outreach program. Services are coordinated with district Drop-out Prevention programs.

General Funds at Hungerford Elementary are used to build teacher capacity by providing funding for professional development and supplemental materials

District support is provided through the ELL department to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners.

The District Homeless Social Worker provides resources (clothing, school supplies, social services referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.

SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide after-school tutoring for Level 1 and Level 2 readers.

The school offers an anti-violence and anti-drug program to students that incorporates counseling.

Hungerford Elementary is a Provision 2 School; therefore, our cafeteria serves a well-balanced breakfast and lunch to all participating children at no charge for a period of 12 years.

The students at Hungerford Elementary have been provided the opportunity to participate in the Florida's Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program. This program is free to all students at Hungerford Elementary. On Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Fridays, students receive a fresh fruit or vegetable.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Hungerford ensures the social-emotional needs of all students by providing a nurturing and affectionate environment. Hungerford has a school counselor, an Alpha Counselor that is provided through The Center for Drug-Free Living, and a social worker, a district mental health specialist and behavior designee through Orange County Public Schools. Each of these resources provides support to

all of our students as needed. The Alpha program provides counseling and teaches life skills to all of our second through fifth-grade students. Additionally, the Boys and Girls club program provides mentors to support the needs of our students and provides guidance counselor services.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

na

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Data is collected and used to inform decision-making (identifying needs, setting an instructional purpose, selecting curriculum, and practice activities).

Students are grouped homogeneously.

Small group guided practice activities utilize mixed skill groupings allowing students to benefit from collaborative "study group" support.

Daily schedules are adjusted to include 30–45 minutes of small group instruction.

Small group activities are used for explicit instruction at the students' instructional level.

Guided practice activities and written assignments include content and skills that are currently being taught and previously taught. Readability (level of difficulty) is lowered to allow more working memory for applying skills; thus, teachers assign slightly less difficult leveled readers for guided practice activities.

Independent work is completed during center rotation after students receive teacher-led instruction in a small group.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Hungerford Elementary School recruits teachers by attending the OCPS recruitment fair. The school retains teachers by providing professional development in all areas based upon needs identified from deliberate practice plans. Coaches work directly with each classroom teacher to meet the needs of staff members on an individual basis. The principal strives to build a positive climate where teachers feel valued and respected. This climate is achieved through opportunities for fellowship and celebrations of success.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

The Pre-K Program offers the students a stimulating environment that provides a well-rounded academic curriculum before entering kindergarten. Parents and incoming pre-kindergartners are invited to attend "Meet the Teacher" before the first day of school. In addition, parents are encouraged to eat breakfast with their child and stay for a reading activity on the first day of school. This allows the students the chance to get used to the environment and lessen school anxiety before separating from their parents. The goal is to enhance cognitive, social, emotional, physical and intellectual development. The students are all screened with a developmental skills checklist. The checklist assesses motor skills, creative skills, language arts and mathematic skills. When students enter kindergarten they are screened with FLICKERS and DIBELS and interventions are implemented

based on results. The teachers prepare students academically by implementing organizational skills such as notetaking and various study skills. Fifth-grade students are given the opportunity to visit our zoned middle school for an orientation. This allows the students a chance to get acquainted with the new school. We encourage parents to get involved.

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: Early Warning System | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.B. | Area of Focus: -- Select below --: | \$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.

No