

Polk County Public Schools

Hartridge Academy School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	16
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	17
VI. Title I Requirements	19
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	20

Hartridge Academy

1400 US HIGHWAY 92 W, Winter Haven, FL 33881

<https://www.hartridgeacademy.com>

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.

The Mission of Hartridge Academy is to provide a high quality education for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Mission of Hartridge Academy is to provide a high quality education for all students.

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
RICHARDS, DEBRA	Principal	Administrator Parental contact / Family Liason Executive Director

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.

Staff gathers and present applicable data as well as in regards to demographics, scores, and finances. Teachers provide "wishlists" and other needs based on their students. Parents provide input on survey during orientation and meetings. SAC/board votes on applicable budget.

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))

Goals/objectives are reviewed by staff toward progress based on PM reports as well as individual reports from whole group, small group, and one on one interventions. Time and materials are refocused onto areas in need. SIP will be revised accordingly if necessary and a meeting called for SAC/board approval

Demographic Data

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	46%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	92%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	English Language Learners (ELL) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 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	0	7	11	6	4	3	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	5	4	2	8	6	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	0	5	4	2	6	5	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	8	10	4	8	6	0	0	0	36

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	5	8	4	7	6	0	0	0	30

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	2	2	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) 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	7	11	6	4	3	4	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	5	4	2	8	6	6	0	0	0	31
Course failure in Math	5	4	2	6	5	6	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	8	10	4	8	6	8	0	0	0	44
	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	5	8	4	7	6	7	0	0	0	37

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	2	0	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	7	11	6	4	3	4	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	5	4	2	8	6	6	0	0	0	31
Course failure in Math	5	4	2	6	5	6	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	8	10	4	8	6	8	0	0	0	44
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level								Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8
Students with two or more indicators	5	8	4	7	6	7	0	0	0	37

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	89	47	56	90	51	57
ELA Learning Gains	74	54	61	77	51	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	80	44	52	82	49	53
Math Achievement*	91	50	60	94	57	63
Math Learning Gains	89	56	64	90	56	62

Accountability Component	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	91	49	55	100	47	51
Science Achievement*	63	39	51	75	47	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress	46			58		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	78
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	623
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97
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				
ELL	46			
AMI				

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%
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	71			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	88			
FRL	77			

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	89	74	80	91	89	91	63					46
SWD												
ELL												46
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	83	50		91	85							48
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	91	81		95	93		79					
FRL	88	75		88	85							47

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	76	36		71	17		50					29
SWD												

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
ELL				60								29
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	70			70								33
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	79			77								
FRL	69			69								

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	90	77	82	94	90	100	75					58
SWD												
ELL	87	50		100	100							58
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	76	50		95	100							50
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	96	89		96	89		86					
FRL	76	50		91	100							64

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	55%	43%	12%	54%	1%
04	2023 - Spring	73%	53%	20%	58%	15%
03	2023 - Spring	52%	42%	10%	50%	2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	80%	51%	29%	59%	21%
04	2023 - Spring	65%	56%	9%	61%	4%
05	2023 - Spring	62%	44%	18%	55%	7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	69%	39%	30%	51%	18%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
 Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Though we exceeded the district and state, our ELA Grade 3 was the lowest. This grade level did not get as much on campus time during their primary years when reading foundations take place.

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

ELA

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.

We exceeded the state and dsitric. The gap in our favor thus not a focus or concern.

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

The most progress was in ELP progress. We added a bilingual para to support students, parents, and staff.

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

Though a small number, the reading deficiency in current students is an area of concern. Many of the students with 10% or more absences also performed below level in ELA.

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

Grade 3 ELA to perform at or above grade level; Grade 4 ELA to perform at or above grade level; Grade 5 ELA to perform at or above grade level; Improve ELP progress; Reduce # students with 10% or more absences

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 ELA**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.

Provide one on one ELA tutoring after school. This provides the teacher the ability to focus on specific skills identified on PM1s and 2 that are unique to each child. The private time environment allows the student to take risks, ask questions with peers looking on, read aloud, and at a flexible pace. It also provides a family-friendly opportunity to join the teacher and child.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The reading grade level (such as 3.2) will increase from the start of school baseline.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will graph or table the beginning STAR grade level and all subsequent results then submit to the Principal for review. .

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.)

One on one tutoring from the reading endorsed (or subject area) teacher will provide direct instruction that targets one or more skill that was indicated as an area of need of weakness on the STAR diagnostic/ analysis reports and or PM1 and 2 results.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

One on one tutoring with a reading teacher who is familiar with the child provides immediate feedback, redirection as needed, ability to apply customized lessons, and discovery of other areas of both academic and social emotional areas that may need support. This cannot be done in a full classroom during regular school instructional time.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Reading Baseline August/Sept identifies levels and needs
 Teachers are scheduled for after school tutoring
 Teachers meet with parent and discuss goal
 Goal and meeting documents are reviewed with Principal
 Monthly progress table/graph provided to principal
 Amend plans of students with no progress

Person Responsible: DEBRA RICHARDS (debra.richards@polk-fl.net)

By When: monthly

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

To provide a positive culture and environment that serves our growing Hispanic / ELL students and families, we will have at least one staff member fluent in English and Spanish available during school hours and parent conferences/meetings.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The school plans to employ or retain at least two bilingual (English/Spanish) staff members.

Monitoring:

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

Employment records will indicate that the employees are bilingual English/Spanish. Staff member will indicate on meeting documents if Spanish was utilized.

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 action steps were entered for this area of focus

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).

Title 1 funds will be used to pay para(s). Payroll records and attendance will serve as support documentation. Grant funds from CSSR, ARRA, etc, or similar will be used for after school tutoring to the extent they provide. Once depleted, Hartridge general or fund balance will be used. Payroll records will serve as support documentation.

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

n/a

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

n/a

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

n/a

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

n/a

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.

n/a

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

RICHARDS, DEBRA, debra.richards@polk-fl.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?

n/a

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?

n/a

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**

n/a

RICHARDS, DEBRA, debra.richards@polk-fl.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.

In addition to the website Title 1 tab at www.hartridgeacademy.com, the lobby contains a notebook for all stakeholders to view.

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 addition to an invitation on the website www.hartridgeacademy.com, Hartridge has a School Advisory Committee that includes a diverse membership from our community, families and staff. Each students' family is provided a individual meeting time with the teacher each grading period in a manner to their choosing - facetime, phone, text or on campus. Each student has Google classroom so assignment, grades, and announcements can be accessed 24 hours a day. Families are provided a direct text and email to reach the classroom teacher as well as the principal/family contact person. A bilingual staff member is available during school hours and at meetings afterschool if requested.

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)

School has scheduled one on one afterschool tutoring. School has employed a para to free the teacher to be able to assemble small groups during th school day. Students have access to online customized lessons for vertical and horizontal enrichment.

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))

Federal grant funds are applied to the after school tutoring program. The tutoring program also utilizes the nutrition meal program.

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))

Hartridge funds are given to the district to provide mental health 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))

Hartridge provides field trips to local career awareness programs such as Sun n Fun and distributes flyers of other community and district events to its families.

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).

We have an SRO role model. We utilize RTI and the Mental Health representative as needed. Parnets are provided information about community resources,

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))

We are members of FCPCS which includes Teacher Academy covering a wide range of in service a d specialized training. Staff also participates district trainngs from Assessment. Hartridge pays an annual add on to teachers possessing ESE endorsement and also requires staff to be "in-field"

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))

Hartridge works with local early childhood providers to roundup VPK and kindergarten. Walk in parents are assisted or directed to assistance for enrollment into VPK.

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: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$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