Sessums Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sessums Elementary School

11525 RAMBLE CREEK DR, Riverview, FL 33569

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Alison Norgard

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2013

2019-20 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	87%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Table of Contents

Sessums Elementary School

11525 RAMBLE CREEK DR, Riverview, FL 33569

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	64%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	70%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	B	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Instill in all our students the love of learning through high expectations, innovative instruction, parent communication and involvement of family and community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Sessums: where potential is cultivated and leadership is grown.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Norgard, Allison	Principal	Oversee the teaching, learning and safety of all stakeholders.
Perry, Kathryn	Assistant Principal	Assist with overseeing the teaching, learning and safety of all stakeholders at school.
Wagner, Amy	Psychologist	Test students for various programs. Provide reports to parents.
Schlesinger, Teresa	Attendance/ Social Work	Oversee attendance and social emotional support to students and families.
Persaud, Indirah	School Counselor	Social and Emotional well being of students and staff. Oversees RTI process.
Velazquez-spady, Jaimi	Instructional Coach	Math Resource teacher, plans with teachers, helps assess data and student needs
Womack, Jesha	Assistant Principal	Assist with overseeing the teaching, learning and safety of all stakeholders at school.
Hester, Teresa	Instructional Media	Encourage independent reading and the use of technology for students and staff.
Shannon, Shelly	SAC Member	Ensure SIP is presented to SAC and govern process

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2013, Alison Norgard

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

74

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	87%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson

Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	144	145	145	140	160	170	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	904
Attendance below 90 percent	11	13	10	7	5	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	3	1	1	1	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	48	55	39	53	52	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	285
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	2	1	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/17/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	58%	52%	57%	52%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	55%	58%	47%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	31%	50%	53%	42%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	58%	54%	63%	60%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	61%	57%	62%	62%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	46%	51%	50%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	56%	50%	53%	44%	48%	51%

	EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey						
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**						**Total**
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	56%	52%	4%	58%	-2%
	2018	63%	53%	10%	57%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	55%	3%	58%	0%
	2018	57%	55%	2%	56%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	52%	54%	-2%	56%	-4%
	2018	54%	51%	3%	55%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	51%	54%	-3%	62%	-11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	60%	55%	5%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison	-9%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	59%	57%	2%	64%	-5%
	2018	64%	57%	7%	62%	2%
Same Grade Comparison	-5%					
Cohort Comparison	-1%					
05	2019	53%	54%	-1%	60%	-7%
	2018	58%	54%	4%	61%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison	-5%					
Cohort Comparison	-11%					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	54%	51%	3%	53%	1%
	2018	61%	52%	9%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison	-7%					
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	26	35	24	32	46	38	27				
ELL	34	35	38	42	56	50	41				
ASN	73			82							
BLK	48	40	27	44	56	29	45				
HSP	55	51	39	56	63	50	53				
MUL	90	82		68	53						
WHT	60	52	23	64	62	28	62				
FRL	50	48	28	49	57	37	47				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	25	49	45	33	60	46	38				
ELL	38	44	40	42	63	37	38				
ASN	82			100							
BLK	48	54	40	52	54	30	42				
HSP	57	58	50	57	67	50	55				
MUL	84	63		87	76		100				
WHT	62	54	42	70	70	47	75				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
FRL	54	55	45	56	60	39	59				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	17	29	25	32	46	39	11				
ELL	30	45	43	40	65	72	14				
BLK	46	57	44	51	54	19	34				
HSP	49	48	47	56	66	62	43				
MUL	76	47		76	75						
WHT	53	40	33	65	57	50	48				
FRL	40	42	37	49	58	48	31				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	408
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	44
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	78
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	41
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	73
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	50
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	47
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Bottom quartile in math and reading. RTI model was designed around whole groups instead of individual student needs. In some cases, iReady was not used or monitored effectively. ESE instructional delivery and assessment of progress was inconsistent. A majority of our bottom quartile consisted of students with multiple indicators.

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

4th and 5th grade math showed the greatest decline. Lack of consistency in instructional delivery and lack of grade level planning. No district math curriculum. We did not have a math coach to assist.

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.

Reading bottom quartile was 22% less than the state average. Our focus was on vocabulary. In hindsight, we have school wide gaps in phonics that need to be addressed. In some cases, iReady was not used or monitored effectively.

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

Our science achievement showed the most gains. 5th grade developed spiral daily review questions to keep topics fresh in students' minds.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

An area of concern is the number of students with attendance issues. However, this may not be a good focus for the coming year because of COVID related absences. We are going to have to come up with unique ways to meet families needs when self-isolating or during illness.

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

1. Increase percentage of bottom quartile in math and reading, including ESSA Federal Index ESE subgroup
2. Implement Phonics program K-2 (SIPPS) and Achieve 3000 3-5 and Increase accountability with iReady (tracking/journal).
3. Tracking and engaging all Sessums learners fluidly (eLearning or in the traditional setting)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Through differentiation we should meet the needs of all learners including the focus on increasing the gains of of bottom quartile in math and reading. As well as increasing the gains of the ESSA Federal Index ESE subgroup.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the gains of bottom quartile learners in reading and math including the ESE ESSA subgroup to at least 41% or higher.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Allison Norgard (allison.norgard@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will differentiate learning through the use of: SIPPS K-2 Phonics based program, Achieve3000 for grades 3-5 and iReady independent lessons and small group iReady Toolbox lessons.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	At Sessums, we have noticed a lapse in phonics instruction and the impact it has had on our learners. The K-2 SIPPS Phonics curriculum is researched based and will assist with strengthening students understanding of phonics and overall reading. The Achieve3000 for grades 3-5 will provide on-level individual access to high quality text. Achieve3000 is researched based and will assist with strengthening students overall reading. iReady lesson and Toolbox are also research based and will assist with strengthening overall reading and math.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	With an unprecedented pandemic, we must become adaptable to student learning needs. We anticipate students flowing between traditional school and the need for pockets of eLearning due to COIVID-19 issues. We know student engagement through learning is critical for success. Gaps in student attendance are likely to occur. We plan to implement a fluid process for students and families.
Measurable Outcome:	100% of students to be attendance daily and engaged - either in traditional learning or eLearning.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Allison Norgard (allison.norgard@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We must develop a monitoring and communication system for student attendance with the focus of fluid movement between traditional learning and eLearning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	With an unprecedented pandemic, we must become adaptable to student learning needs. We anticipate students flowing between traditional school and the need for pockets of eLearning due to COIVID-19 issues. We know student engagement through learning is critical for success. Gaps in student attendance are likely to occur. We plan to implement a fluid process for students and families.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

We included all three schoolwide improvement priorities in the plan above:
1. Increase percentage of bottom quartile in math and reading, including ESSA Federal Index ESE subgroup
2. Implement Phonics program K-2 (SIPPS) and Achieve3000 3-5 and Increase accountability with iReady.
3. Tracking and engaging all Sessums learners fluidly (eLearning or in the traditional setting)

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

At Sessums we will continue to increase business partnerships. We will continue to promote and support a healthy PTA. The Great American Teach-In helps connect the community and the school. Our intern partnership with USF fosters the relationship between the school and the university. ESE parent workshops will allow for parents to be connected and learn about their options. Sessums continues to foster relationship with surrounding high schools for high school students to earn community service hours. Sessums is a host to several Boy Scout and Girl Scout troops. Sessums continues to earn the Golden School Volunteer award annually.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**