

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Sessums Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	87%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	57%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	71%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	B

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Womack, Jeshia	Assistant Principal	Assist with overseeing the teaching, learning, and safety of all stakeholders at school.
Schlesinger, Teresa	Attendance/Social Work	Oversee attendance, tardies, and social/emotional support to students and families.
Velazquez-spady, Jaimi	Other	Plans with teachers, develop and implement Professional Development, helps assess data and student needs.
Norgard, Allison	Principal	Oversee the teaching, learning and safety of all stakeholders.
Wagner, Amy	Psychologist	Test Students for various programs. Provide reports to parents.
Persaud, Indirah	School Counselor	Social and Emotional well being of students and staff. Oversees RTI process.
Hester, Teresa		Encourage independent reading and the use of technology for students and staff

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.*

3

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

53

Total number of students enrolled at the school

992

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	133	163	137	176	147	178	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	934
Attendance below 90 percent	42	52	46	51	41	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	280
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	40	32	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	39	46	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	45	30	36	61	38	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	250

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	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/23/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	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	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	0

2020-21 - 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	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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				58%	52%	57%	60%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	55%	58%	56%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				31%	50%	53%	44%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				58%	54%	63%	64%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				61%	57%	62%	67%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	46%	51%	43%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				56%	50%	53%	65%	51%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	56%	52%	4%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	58%	55%	3%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	56%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	62%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	59%	57%	2%	64%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2021					
	2019	53%	54%	-1%	60%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	54%	51%	3%	53%	1%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Teachers used i-Ready, FSA, SIPPS(K-2)

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	45/32%	70/50%	77/55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13/10%	14/12%	16/15%
	Students With Disabilities	6/8%	7/9%	7/9%
	English Language Learners	7/10%	8/11%	10/13%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	22%/30	25%/33	27%/37
	Economically Disadvantaged	10%/14	11%/15	10%/14
	Students With Disabilities	2%/3	5%/7	5%/7
	English Language Learners	12%/17	15%/25	16%/26

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	37%/53	40%/60	41%/62
	Economically Disadvantaged	17%/25	17%/25	19%/30
	Students With Disabilities	3%/5	5%/7	6%/9
	English Language Learners	6%/8	6%/8	10%/14
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17%/24	20%/28	25%/35
	Economically Disadvantaged	10%/14	12%/16	12%/16
	Students With Disabilities	3%/5	5%/7	6%/8
	English Language Learners	10%/14	10%/14	12%/16

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	49%/74	62%/89	52%/75
	Economically Disadvantaged	10%/14	15%/20	20%/25
	Students With Disabilities	5%/3	7%/5	7%/5
	English Language Learners	10%/14	8%/12	10%/14
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19%/28	30%/36	35%/42
	Economically Disadvantaged	10%/17	15%/23	17%/27
	Students With Disabilities	5%/8	7%/11	10%/17
	English Language Learners	10%/17	17%/27	20%/30

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	33%/55	40%/68	50%/82
	Economically Disadvantaged	15%/25	14%/24	14%/24
	Students With Disabilities	10%/14	15%/18	18%/20
	English Language Learners	25%/20	20%/16	25%/20
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	20%/34	28%/48	32%/55
	Economically Disadvantaged	10%/17	15%/24	20%/34
	Students With Disabilities	10%/17	8%/15	8%/15
	English Language Learners	10%/17	10%/17	15%/24

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34%/56	43%/72	50%/85
	Economically Disadvantaged	30%/50	33%/52	35%/54
	Students With Disabilities	15%/25	13%/23	13%/23
	English Language Learners	20%/33	22%/35	25%/37
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	25%/41	37%/61	45%/72
	Economically Disadvantaged	20%/32	25%/41	25%/41
	Students With Disabilities	5%/8	6%/9	10%/18
	English Language Learners	10%/18	11%/19	15%/24
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	20%/36	30%/54	49%/181
	Economically Disadvantaged	10%/18	15%/22	20%/36
	Students With Disabilities	5%/9	6%/10	10%/18
	English Language Learners	2%/4	4%/8	10%/18
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	18	41	57	22	44	48	18				
ELL	24	48		38	36		30				
BLK	46	42		41	45		31				
HSP	41	43	41	43	39	29	43				
MUL	67			67			45				
WHT	58	54		58	60	40	67				
FRL	43	45	57	44	46	45	41				
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							

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
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				
FRL	54	55	45	56	60	39	59				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	41
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	381
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	89%
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%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	36

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	40
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	60
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	56
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

All content areas and subgroups showed a decline in percentage of students achieving a 3 or higher on the FSA except for our ELA BQ which increased from 31 to 56 percent since 2019. Science achievement while down from previous years was still higher than the state and district average. Specifically 4th grade ELA was much lower than state and district percentages.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The greatest need for improvement can be seen in our 3-5 math gains in our upper quartiles. BQ Math gains only lost 1 point while the rest of the population lost 12 points. Last years 4th graders will also need supports in order to improve gains in ELA.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Some of the decline is most likely due to quarantines and E-learners with a lack of hands on in person instruction. This is seen across the board within the district and state data as well. Due to a lack of test scores from the previous year there has been a fall off of intense data driven instruction that would allow teachers to identify shortfalls much sooner. Teachers would need to work together in PLC's to design lessons that are data driven as well as implement meaningful small group instruction.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

BQ ELA scores improved drastically from 31 to 56 percent.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

We were able to improve this area with much more progress monitoring through the use of iReady and achieve 3000. With these programs, teachers were able to have student achievement data much more frequently in order to drive instruction. In lower grades an emphasis on increased phonics helped to increase reading gains for K-2.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Teacher Talent Developers (TTD) will assist with implementation of instructional best practices Strategies from the book "Driven to Data"
Monthly PD's

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Monthly PD's with optional Monday PDs.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Continue to increase teacher capacity in school wide systems to support growth in leadership.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Through data driven instruction/planning we will meet the needs of all learners including the focus on increasing the gains of the bottom quartile in reading and math. 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 and ESSA subgroups to at least 41% or higher.
Monitoring:	PLC Notes Training- Attendance Logs
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Allison Norgard (allison.norgard@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our instructional planning will be implemented through the book Driven by Data 2.0 from the works of Paul Bambrick-Santoyo.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	At Sessums, we have noticed a lapse in data driving our instruction and the impact it has had on our learners.

Action Steps to Implement

Training in data driven instruction.	
Person Responsible	Allison Norgard (allison.norgard@hcps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale:

We must become adaptable to student SEL needs.

Measurable Outcome: 100% of students to be in attendance and on time daily.

Monitoring: Attendance Rosters
 Panorama Survey

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Allison Norgard (allison.norgard@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We are going to implement SEL tools/strategies across all classrooms.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: On the Panorama survey from 20-21 students in grades 3-5 rated the component- self efficacy and emotional regulation 40th-59th national percentile.

Action Steps to Implement

SEL strategies/skills in all homerooms.
 Guidance implementing conflict resolution strategies/skills

Person Responsible Allison Norgard (allison.norgard@hcps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Our ELA data indicates a need for more students to be proficient in reading. In 2021 we had proficiency in grade 3 of 52%, grade 4 of 39% and grade 5 of 48% which indicates that grades 4 and 5 are below the 50% mark.

Measurable Outcome: The percent of students in grade 4 and grade 5 scoring at a level 3 or higher on ELA FSA will increase to at least 50% as measured by the 2022 ELA FSA scores.

Monitoring: We will monitor growth toward our measurable outcome through participating in the optional district ELA Progress Monitoring tools. We will utilize the tools from kindergarten through 5th grade. This will help ensure total school focus on the improvement of student in ELA. We will display the outcomes in the data room so that teachers can reflect on their class and their grade level's data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Allison Norgard (allison.norgard@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus is: working together in PLCs through Data Driven Instruction and common assessment to increase student proficiency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is our PLCs have not been data driven in the past. A focus on data driven work and common assessments will assist our teams with recognizing skill areas of strength as well as areas that need additional focus. This also allows teams the structure to re-look at data sets and see comparative data along the way.

Action Steps to Implement

Using the Book Driven by Data, grade 4 and 5 will participate in the Progress Monitoring Monthly district assessments and use the data to plan for small group instruction.

Person Responsible Allison Norgard (allison.norgard@hcps.net)

Grade 4 and 5 ELA teachers will participate in team planning to focus on standards for whole group instruction. Common texts will be used across the grade level.

Person Responsible Allison Norgard (allison.norgard@hcps.net)

Grade 4 and 5 students whose data indicates their performance is not yet performing at proficiency will be invited to attend an Extended Learning Program after school on Thursdays.

Person Responsible Allison Norgard (allison.norgard@hcps.net)

Grade 4 and 5 students whose data indicates their performance is not yet performing at proficiency will participate in an additional targeted ELA instruction during Response to Intervention time.

Person Responsible Allison Norgard (allison.norgard@hcps.net)

#4. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:****Measurable Outcome:****Monitoring:****Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:****Action Steps to Implement***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Primary Concern we will monitor: Number of Suspensions. According to the SafeSchoolsfor Alex.org we had 19 suspensions reported. The Sessums culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of discipline data through our monthly Student Services Team meetings. We will conduct staff training on de-escalation strategies. We will provide alternative solutions to out of school suspension when appropriate. We will include students who have tier 2 and tier 3 behavior plans in groups or one-on-one behavior modification groups.

Secondary Concern we will monitor: Number of Physical Attacks. According to the SafeSchoolAlex.org we had 5 situations of Physical Attack reported. The Sessums culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of discipline data through our monthly Student Services Team meetings. We will work with our our students on emotional regulation strategies. We will monitor the effectiveness of these strategies through the student Panaroma survey given to 3rd, 4th and 5th graders. .

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.

Stallion Way- School Creed
 SEL Lessons
 Stallion Way Tickets
 Inappropriate behavior is addressed and tools/strategies are explicitly taught and/or modeled.
 Parent Volunteers

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

All school personnel will display a welcoming, positive and friendly attitude during school hours.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00