Hiawassee Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Hiawassee Elementary

6800 HENNEPIN BLVD, Orlando, FL 32818

https://hiawasseees.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
Jenkins, Sharon	Principal	The principal's primary duties/responsibilities are to promote and maintain the highest level of academic, social, and emotional achievement for all students by providing curricular and instructional leadership, maintaining overall school site operations; receiving, distributing, and communicating information to enforce school, District and State policies; maintaining a safe school environment; coordinating site activities and communicating information to staff, students, parents and community members. Responsible for interviewing, hiring, and supervising school employees to ensure the highest performance standards.
Watts, Forrester	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal (AP) supports the principal in the overall administrative operations of the school. The AP assists the principal in providing instructional leadership to staff including curriculum planning, review, and implementation; as well as professional development. The role also includes helping to ensure the overall safety and well-being of students, staff, and school visitors; supporting school discipline, and enforcing school, district, and state policies.
Love, Towanna	Dean	The Dean of Students is responsible for ensuring that the school staff establishes and maintains a positive culture of behavior and learning, supporting teachers in behavior management and student discipline. The Dean of Students works with school administration to establish a professional rapport with students, staff, and families and meets with parents as deemed necessary regarding student discipline and behavior issues. He helps to ensure the school body maintains a safe, orderly environment that encourages students to take responsibility for their behavior and is also an asset in helping to create high morale among staff and students.
Simmons, Melanie	Math Coach	Instructional Coach: Supports the use of district curriculum and evidence-based intervention strategies; provide professional development for teachers; monitor grade level lesson planning and use of the CRMs (Curriculum Resource Materials); support professional learning communities and common planning; support new teachers and assign mentors; collaborate with grade-level teams on effective instructional practices, coordinate instructional observation rounds, model instructional lessons; provide resources for all academic areas including reading, mathematics, writing, and science; provide guidance on K-12 reading plan; facilitate and support data collection; serve as grade level support; support the implementation of the MTSS process.
Guevara, Brenda	Staffing Specialist	As the principal's designee, the School Staffing Specialist is responsible for coordinating the staffing and educational planning process for Exceptional Student Education (ESE) at Hiawassee Elementary. Specialists assist teachers

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		in planning and demonstrating full and satisfactory implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) as it relates to ESE student's individual goals. Specialists are responsible for providing support to schools to ensure that students with disabilities demonstrate increased participation and performance in the standard or Access curriculum, statewide assessments, and accountability systems with any necessary accommodations.

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.

Stakeholder engagement is vital to the success and improvement of our school. When schools, parents, families, and communities work together to support learning, students feel more encouraged, attend school more regularly, and participate in additional programs for improvement. Our School Advisory Council (SAC) reviews the school data in preparation of developing our school improvement plan goals. Making our stakeholders aware of our current status and where we need to go allows them to support student learning more strategically, collaborate with the school staff about student needs and progress, and advocate for our school at various levels. SAC committee members also assist the principal with decisions concerning the annual school budget based on various forms of data (academic, behavioral, attendance, etc.). In conjunction with SAC and PTO our Parent Engagement Liaison works with school administration to plan, implement, and manage school-wide parenting initiatives and activities to empower parents to become positive, active participants in their child's education with themed curriculum and family nights. Partners in Education and the Additions Volunteer Program is one more way that allows our school to engage community partnerships for goal-reaching support for their time and/or resources.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP is reviewed in sections each month in our SAC meetings with checkpoints for meeting our goals, and/or making adjustments as needed. During the SAC meeting, we will review state/district assessment data to monitor how students are progressing toward the final EOY goal and determine instructional adjustments and possible planning or training meetings that may be necessary to revise our plan.

Demographic Data	
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	98%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Identification	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)	
School Grades History	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: D
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	11	18	21	21	15	22	0	0	0	108
One or more suspensions	0	18	3	5	7	13	0	0	0	46
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	6	23	33	0	0	0	62
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	32	45	0	0	0	83
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	17	28	31	23	0	0	0	0	100

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	4	9	31	23	0	0	0	0	67

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	0	0	6	2	0	0	0	0	9
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	9	26	25	27	32	9	0	0	0	128
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	4	5	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	38	30	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	45	28	0	0	0	73
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	2	38	25	0	0	0	66

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
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	9	26	25	27	32	9	0	0	0	128
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	4	5	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	38	30	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	45	28	0	0	0	73
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	2	38	25	0	0	0	66

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
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	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	36	57	56	35	57	57
ELA Learning Gains	55	62	61	51	58	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40	50	52	50	52	53
Math Achievement*	40	61	60	40	63	63
Math Learning Gains	69	66	64	50	61	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60	56	55	49	48	51

Accountability Component	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	34	56	51	39	56	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress	66			71		

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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	400
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

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	28	Yes	3	1
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN				

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%
BLK	50			
HSP	55			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	49			

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)

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	36	55	40	40	69	60	34					66
SWD	10	39	37	18	41	23	12					46
ELL	30	47	39	41	68	75	21					66
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	34	56	41	38	69	63	32					64
HSP	43	38		50	69							77
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	35	55	42	37	69	61	32					63

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	28	32	38	28	31	36	25					51
SWD	8	15	18	13	30	25	14					22
ELL	29	39		29	45		30					51

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27	30	38	26	29	32	24					49
HSP	24			32								63
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	27	32	35	27	31	33	27					50

2018-19 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	35	51	50	40	50	49	39					71
SWD	28	31	33	21	31		38					64
ELL	31	55	61	42	57	55	34					71
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	52	53	41	52	49	40					69
HSP	40	40		30	30		36					81
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	39	52	44	42	51	47	39					72

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	33%	54%	-21%	54%	-21%
04	2023 - Spring	38%	60%	-22%	58%	-20%
03	2023 - Spring	39%	52%	-13%	50%	-11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	43%	59%	-16%	59%	-16%
04	2023 - Spring	34%	62%	-28%	61%	-27%
05	2023 - Spring	44%	55%	-11%	55%	-11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	41%	59%	-18%	51%	-10%

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 ELA (36%) and math (40%) proficiency data remained consistent from FSA 2022 to FAST 2023, and we still fell below the 41% threshold with our SWD. Teachers transitioned from FSA to BEST state standards with some different grade-level expectations. Teachers/coaches must continue to develop an understanding of the content limits and rigor required for the new BEST standards so they can be taught effectively. Since the BEST standards are newly adopted and implemented with vast differences from Common Core there are limited professionally, researched resources available that address the standards explicitly, fewer professional developments/workshops, and fewer educators to collaborate with outside of Florida. Also, becoming more familiar with the content of our new textbooks with increase effective instructional delivery.

In math specifically, there are some concepts that may not have been taught with fidelity from one grade level to the next as we transitioned to the new BEST standards, therefore leaving some gaps in learning. We will also continue to address basic math fact deficiencies.

This school year we have an experienced, full time ESE resource teacher that started at the beginning of the school. The ESE teacher will collaborate and push in to teach with the ESE students' homeroom teachers on state standards lessons using various strategies/scaffolds.

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

The fifth-grade ELA data shows the greatest decline from the previous year. This may be due in part to an increase in 3rd-grade level 1 students establishing good cause that were promoted to fourth grade and on to fifth grade with increasing reading and/or math deficiency gap. Continued understanding of the new BEST standards and the crosswalk of these expectations vertically, from one grade level to another will help to ensure that necessary standards are taught effectively.

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

According to the FAST PM3 state data ELA has the greatest achievement gap by 1% of our math with 19% below the state average. Reading may be more challenging due to language barriers, SWD and lack of exposure to a variety of reading materials that limit academic and domain specific vocabulary exposure/iinstruction.

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

Our 5th grade science assessment shows the greatest improvement, increasing from 34% to 41%. Our team juggled the academic block schedule to allot a double dose of science instruction and explicit vocabulary instruction during intervention for our bubble students while the struggling readers worked on foundational reading skills.

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

Based on the EWS data from Pt. 1 in comparison with 2022-2023 data the number of math level 1 students from 4th to 5th grade stayed the same and the number of ELA level 1 students from 4th to 5th grade only decreased by 5 students. Therefore, there is a concern that these may be the same students who made little to no improvement from one year to the next.

The other area of concern is that about 20% of our students are missing 18 days or more of school.

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

Since, reading was our lowest area of performance (36% overall proficiency 3rd-5th grade and is below the required 41% threshold for SWD) and reading is necessary to the success of the other subject area components, effective ELA instruction has to be a top priority for our school.

With an overall 40% proficiency in math for 3rd - 5th grade it is also a prior for improvement.

With room for improvement in both ELA and math and the identified challenges to learning the new state standards and new curriculum resources, it is necessary to provide teachers with professional development training and consistent feedback to ensure there is strategic, effective small-group instruction in reading and math that will differentiate instruction based on student needs.

Scheduled regular progress monitoring sessions will be conducted by teachers with data discussions and adjustments to student grouping and instructional decisions made.

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

With a consistent 36% for ELA overall proficiency from the FSA 2022 and FAST 2023 scores this area will require the most improvement with an emphasis on the lowest 25%, 5th grade bubble students and SWD both with only a 2% increase in overall proficiency.

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

Our plan is to improve the overall ELA and math proficiency by 7% or more in both subject areas from 36% to 43% and 40% to 47% respectively.

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

This focus area will be monitored for the desire outcome by conducting weekly classroom walkthroughs during the ELA and math block, especially during small group and extra hour reading instruction. The admin and leadership team will provide teachers with actionable feedback, conduct data discussions with teachers regularly, and have students track their progress on Exact Path lessons, Accelerated Reader tests, and review their common assessments during periodic data chats with teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sharon Jenkins (sharon.jenkins@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.)

Teachers will plan and implement differentiated, small group instruction for reading and math based on multiple sources of data and track student progress toward proficiency.

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

Small group instructional strategies for reading and math was selected because this form of teaching is focused precisely on what individual students need to learn next in order to continue moving toward proficiency. Ongoing small group observations of teacher instruction and students' response to instruction allows both teacher and student to have constructive feedback regularly combined with systematic progress monitoring.

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.

Based on the data collected and reviewed from the district approved diagnostic programs (FAST PM1, Exact Path, Success Maker and DIBELS (K-2)) students will be grouped based on their needs for intervention/enrichment.

Person Responsible: Sharon Jenkins (sharon.jenkins@ocps.net)

By When: Intervention/Enrichment groups will be created by September 13, 2023.

Teachers and leadership team members will attend professional development for maximizing the use of intervention and enrichment program materials they will utilize during their small group and extra hour instructional time based on their intervention group needs.

Person Responsible: Sharon Jenkins (sharon.jenkins@ocps.net)

By When: After the state assessment and district diagnostic assessments are conducted and data is reviewed for grouping students, September 18, 2023

Regularly scheduled professional learning community planning and data meetings will take place during a structured time set on the master calendar and/or as student data becomes available. Student data chats will be conducted as well.

Person Responsible: Sharon Jenkins (sharon.jenkins@ocps.net)

By When: Beginning September 18, 2023 and ongoing as new data becomes available

#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.

SWD continues to be an area of improvement. Hiawassee 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. Historically, students with disabilities have been an under-performing subgroup with a federal index score of ___% 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.

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, there will be a three percentage point increase in the students with disabilities ESSA Subgroup Federal index.

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

Teachers will be familiar with their SWDs' IEP goals and accommodations to intentionally plan standard-based lessons to meet their needs. A planning meeting agenda and notes will serve as documentation. Classroom walkthroughs will be conducted for effective instructional strategy implementation, and student assessment data will be monitored for student progress and instructional decisions/adjustments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Brenda Guevara (47231@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.)

Teachers will create and implement differentiated instruction geared toward meeting the needs of their lowest 25%. The Instructional leadership team will monitor data from common unit assessments, implementation of intervention program, SIPPs, which is a researched, evidence-based intervention. The instructional leadership team will support the development and implementation of small group instruction including push in support. Additionally the staffing specialist will work teachers to ensure proper program placement and support services.

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

When general education and ESE resource teachers work with the alterative foundational skills program SIPPS to support new and struggling readers, ELL and SWD to address the components and/or deficiencies for reading student improve student outcomes.

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.

Provide professional development training for teachers to continue to develop an understanding of students' IEPs and how to support their specific accommodations.

Person Responsible: Sharon Jenkins (sharon.jenkins@ocps.net)

By When: Preplanning and in PLC throughout the school year

Conduct a monthly ESE meetings to review academic data for ELA and math to make instructional decisions. Teachers will conduct/document data chats with students after each Exact Path ELA and Success Maker Math Diagnostic Assessment. Students will track their Exact Path ELA lessons and Success Maker Math progress and the teacher will review/chat/set goals with individual students about their weekly Exact Path ELA and Success Maker Math usage (minutes, accuracy expectancy (80% or higher) and lessons completed).

Person Responsible: Sharon Jenkins (sharon.jenkins@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing

#3. Positive Culture and Environment 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.

Based on our Annual Stakeholder data for Spring 2023 the overall perception of a positive working environment at the school is 88%. However, the perception of a positive tone that school leaders set for the school culture is 69%, 19% less than the school overall. Also, noted that teachers feel that students and colleagues lack enthusiasm with both at 56% positivity. So, we will need to focus on motivating from the top down to ensure our team leads by example.

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

We will improve in the area of positive attitude from leadership, staff and students by at least 10%.

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

We will conduct a mid-year in house survey that will measure leadership, staff and student perceived attitudes in order to get a pulse of how they perceived the year is going and to make any necessary adjustments. This can also be measured based on the aforementioned stakeholders participation in school functions, student behavior/discipline improvements and staff/student improved performance.

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.)

The evidence to measure these outcomes will ultimately be the stakeholder surveys conducted in the spring 2024.

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

The spring 2024 stakeholder survey will be a good, comparable measure to the spring 2023 results with the same kind of questions at the same point in the school year.

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.

Create a description of leadership's major roles and responsibilities to ensure they have a clear understand and to allocate the workload fairly.

Person Responsible: Sharon Jenkins (sharon.jenkins@ocps.net)

By When: September 8, 2023

Schedule leadership and staff meetings regularly that allow staff input. Encourage teachers to conduct class meetings for student input.

Person Responsible: Sharon Jenkins (sharon.jenkins@ocps.net)

By When: Monthly

Team building activities for both staff and students to build positive community and culture.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: Monthly

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).

Resource allocations will be directly connected to student achievement. Therefore, school administration will share the school FAST, Exact Path ELA and Success Maker Math data with the SAC committee to further validate the areas of focus and action steps chosen for our school's improvement plan. Based on the school's data we will determine the best programs and services to implement and monitor our plan and continue to visit our plan regularly to make any necessary instructional and/or funding decisions and/or adjustments.

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

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

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

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

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.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

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?

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

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.

The SIP plan is shared in digestible chunks with our stakeholders in our monthly SAC meetings with emphasis on our SIP goals, action steps and progress monitoring data as it becomes available. In each session there will be opportunities for stakeholder question/answer.

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))

Grade level teams send a Weekly Preview informing parents of homework, upcoming skill/subject area assessments and school events. We also schedule Report Card Conference Nights at least quarterly to keep parents informed of their individual child's progress based on data and interventions/enrichment that address their needs. Teachers are also on daily communication with parents via Talking Points to inform them of their child's daily behavior. The marquee and school messenger are other ways that we ensure the community is aware of Hiawassee happenings.

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))

Teachers will undergo trainings and modeling on the use of our newly adopted curriculum and state standards to ensure the level of rigor required for proficiency is delivered. Also, PLC meetings will be

focused on modeled instructional delivery with emphasis on the target, text/context and task. We will have extra hour focused on reading the first semester and focus on a reteach of math skills/standards the second semester. MAO tutoring from September - April will focus on math acceleration that will introduce math chapters/units taught in the regular class 3-4 weeks in advance to include math vocabulary, prerequisite skills, formulas, etc...

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))

We will have extra hour focused on reading the first semester and focus on a reteach of math skills/ standards the second semester. MAO tutoring from September - April will focus on math acceleration that will introduce math chapters/units taught in the regular class 3-4 weeks in advance to include math vocabulary, prerequisite skills, formulas, etc...

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))

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))

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).

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))

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))

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: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00

3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment:	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes