

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Sessums Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Sessums Elementary School

11525 RAMBLE CREEK DR, Riverview, FL 33569

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Alison Norgard**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2012

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	87%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: B (57%) 2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: B (57%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A

\* 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Sessums Elementary School

11525 RAMBLE CREEK DR, Riverview, FL 33569

[ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Title I School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>87%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>71%</p>

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2018-19</b>
<b>Grade</b>	B	C	C	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.**

Sessums will have a culture of belonging and inclusion where each student will master essential learning outcomes through urgency of instruction.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Growing all students to grade level and beyond.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

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.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wilbon, Kelli	SAC Member	1st grade teacher and SAC Chair
Norgard, Allison	Principal	Oversee the learning and operation of the school
Persaud, Indirah	School Counselor	Takes care of the well being and social development of students
Hester, Teresa	Other	Model Lessons, school-wide literacy
Schlesinger, Teresa	Other	Attendance, FBAs, Removing barriers for school/home
Wagner, Amy	Psychologist	Evaluation of students, behavior resource

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Wednesday 8/1/2012, Alison Norgard

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

12

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

25

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

45

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

942

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

6

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.**

6

**Demographic Data**

**Early Warning Systems**

**Using prior year's 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	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	125	150	150	150	150	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	875
Attendance below 90 percent	5	10	6	3	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
One or more suspensions	5	3	2	3	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	44	21	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	37	28	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	30	45	32	35	20	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	177

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	10	13	8	30	23	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104

**Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":**

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	2	6	9	11	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
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**

Tuesday 8/30/2022

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

**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	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	
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	55%	53%	56%				58%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	67%						51%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%						31%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	56%	50%	50%				58%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	63%						61%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%						40%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	49%	59%	59%				56%	50%	53%

**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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	56%	52%	4%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	58%	55%	3%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2022					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	56%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	62%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	59%	57%	2%	64%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2022					
	2019	53%	54%	-1%	60%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	54%	51%	3%	53%	1%
Cohort Comparison						

**Subgroup Data Review**

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	34	64	54	32	46	42	23				
ELL	35	49	64	44	64	50	38				
BLK	46	71	65	46	60	65	35				
HSP	51	64	50	53	63	52	39				
MUL	62	60		65	75		80				
WHT	66	70	73	67	63	27	69				
FRL	48	63	57	46	57	44	39				
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							
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				

**ESSA Data Review**

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	463
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
Percent Tested	99%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	55
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	68
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	62
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	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### 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?

Positive trends that emerged from the 2022 School Data Review Include:

- A 5% increase in ELA achievement
- A 19% increase in ELA Learning gains
- A 4% increase in ELA bottom Quartile
- a 7% increase in Math achievement
- A 14% increase in Math learning gains
- A 12% increase in Math bottom quartile

#### Sub group trends

Our SWD students increased their ELA achievement 16% and ELA learning gains 23%.. In Math our SWD students increased 10% in achievement and 2% in learning gains.

Our ELL students increased their ELA achievement 11% and ELA learning gains 1%. In Math our ELL students increased 6% in achievement and 28% in learning gains.

Our Black students maintained their ELA achievement at 46% proficient, and increased their learning gains by 28%. In Math our Black students increased 5% in achievement and 15% in learning gains.

Our Hispanic students increased their ELA achievement by 10% and learning gains by 19%. In Math our Hispanic students increased 10% in achievement and 24% in learning gains.

Our Multicultural students decreased their ELA academic achievement by 5%. In Math our Multicultural students decreased by 2% in achievement.

Our white students decreased in their ELA academic achievement by 8% and increased in learning gains by 16%. In Math our White students increased 9% in achievement and 3% in learning gains.

In Science our Achievement remained the same with 49%

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?**

- On the 2022 state assessment, our 5th grade students only demonstrated 49% proficiency in science.
- Math Gains on the state assessment were only at 56% and bottom quartile gains only at 51% 5th grade math was only at 47% proficient.
- In looking at our sub group data, students identified with disabilities scores the lowest in 6 of 7 categories and our ELL students scored second to the last in multiple categories.

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

Sessums must take a close look at equity of practice to determine why the students with disabilities as well as the ELL students are not scoring more closely with their peers. Contributing factors may have been delivery of service, small groups, access to resources as well as emotional belonging and inclusion.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

The most improvement in scores was the 19% increase in ELA Learning gains across grades 3, 4 and 5. The second largest improvement was a 14% increase in Math learning gains - although this was also an area that is identified as the an area for continued improvement as well.

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

For the 2021-2022 school year, we focused on the principals of Driven by Data 2.0 and a renewed focus and accountability of PLCs and PLC protocols. We also had Teacher Talent Developers who worked closely with teacher practice and planning.

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

- Use the principals in Ken Williams book Ruthless Equity
- Meet in structured PLCs weekly from 2:30-3:20 using the Plan, Do, Act, Check Format
- Identifying Essential Learning Outcomes for each grade level in math and reading
- Ensuring each student and staff member has a sense of belonging and inclusion at Sessums

**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.**

- Book Study by the leadership team on Ruthless Equity by Ken Willimas
- Book Study of staff with Ruthless Equity
- Book Study on Whose Doing the Work?
- Protected planning time on Tuesdays from 2:30-3:20 with a team log that is turned in
- Internalization planning for ELA each 6 weeks to as a team dive into the instructional pieces and standards that we upcoming and make instructional decisions based on the needs of the students
- Decide how to reteach student to ensure mastery of the identified essential learning outcomes to ensure mastery of all students in the grade level

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

- Our Teacher Talent Developers will continue to work with the adults on campus to increase capacity with the most essential asset to the school - the teachers.
- Increased feedback by administration to teachers regarding best practices in the classroom

**Areas of Focus**

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:



**#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to belonging and inclusion**

**Area of Focus  
Description and  
Rationale:  
Include a  
rationale that  
explains how it  
was identified as  
a critical need  
from the data  
reviewed.**

Based on Instructional staff survey, staff indicated that across Sessums there are not consistent expectations and consequences for student behavior. This amounted to a 36% deficient from the national average. On the student Panorama survey 37% of students indicated they can pull themselves out of a bad mood. On the Panorama survey 54% of students responded that people at your school understand you as a person. On the Panorama survey only 41% of students responded that they were able to clearly describe their feelings.

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

- Staff Survey will increase to 50% in the area of consistent expectations and consequences for student behavior
- Panorama Survey will increase to 50% that students will be able to pull themselves out of a bad mood
- Panorama Survey will increase to 100% that people at your school understand you as a person
- Panorama Survey will increase to 100% that students will be able to clearly describe their feelings.

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

We will have an intermediate school survey for teaches and students.

**Person  
responsible for  
monitoring  
outcome:**

Allison Norgard (allison.norgard@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based  
Strategy:  
Describe the  
evidence-based  
strategy being  
implemented for  
this Area of  
Focus.**

On-going PD with a focus on strategies for belonging and inclusion.

**Rationale for  
Evidence-based  
Strategy:  
Explain the  
rationale for  
selecting this  
specific strategy.  
Describe the  
resources/criteria  
used for selecting  
this strategy.**

When adults and students feel a sense of belonging and inclusion it should aspire to create a culture where every student and every staff member feels appreciated, validated, accepted and treated fairly; a culture where every student is provided what they need, when they need it, with urgency, to ensure mastery of essential learning outcomes.

**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.

-Book Study on Ruthless Equity - leadership team and teachers - Norgard will monitor

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

-Kelso Conflict resolution with students through classroom and group guidance - Davidson and Roll will monitor

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

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**  
**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Based on the data, teacher teams identified the need to work together in PLCs and collaborative planning to create a clear purpose of learning, engagement in learning and assessments that lead to student mastery of essential learning outcomes in all content areas.

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

100% of students at mastery of grade level identified essential learning outcomes as measured by common assessments.

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

We will track each student for mastery of the essential learning outcomes

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Allison Norgard (allison.norgard@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Clearly defined PLC teams with a Plan, Do, Act, Check, Cycle

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Having PLCs will allow us to create a clear purpose of learning, engagement in learning and assessments that lead to student mastery of essential learning outcomes in all content areas.

**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.

-PLC training

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

-Identifying essential learning outcomes for math and reading

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

## RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

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

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

- In KG 76% of students improved their placement in iReady from diagnostic 1 to diagnostic 3. Only 49% of students met their annual typical growth.
- In 1st grade 62% of students improved their placement in iReady from diagnostic 1 to diagnostic 3. Only 47% of students met their annual typical growth.
- In 2nd grade 68% of students improved their placement in iReady from diagnostic 1 to diagnostic 3. 57% of students met their annual typical growth.

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

In third grade only 48% of the students scored at proficiency (level 3 or higher) on the state FSA assessment.

In 4th grade 63% of the students scored at proficiency (level 3 or higher) on the state FSA assessment.

In 5th grade 51% of the students scored at proficiency (level 3 or higher) on the state FSA assessment.

### Measurable Outcomes:

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

- Each grade K-3, using the new 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: Measureable Outcome(s)

- KG at least 100% of the students will demonstrate proficiency on the state ELA assessment in May, 2022.
- 1st grade at least 100% of the students will demonstrate proficiency on the state ELA assessment in May, 2022.
- 2nd grade at least 100% of the students will demonstrate proficiency on the state ELA assessment in May, 2022.

### Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

- 3rd grade at least 100% of the students will demonstrate proficiency on the state ELA assessment in May, 2022.
- 4th grade at least 100% of the students will demonstrate proficiency on the state ELA assessment in May, 2022.
- 5th grade at least 100% of the students will demonstrate proficiency on the state ELA assessment in May, 2022.

### 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 take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

In Grades KG-5, we will use school-wide running records that are turned in quarterly to monitor student progress. We will be able to see students progress through the reading levels and determine who is on-track and who is in need of additional interventions.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Norgard, Allison, allison.norgard@hcps.net

### Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

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. Â§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?

- Small Group Instruction - either skill based or by level
- Shared Reading utilizing on-grade level text
- Uninterrupted 90 minute reading block
- Identification of Essential Learning Outcomes for each grade level
- PLCs and common standards based planning

**Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific 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 practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

-Small Group Instruction - either skill based or by level - this practice allows students to meet in a small group with their teacher for targeted reading instruction

-Shared Reading utilizing on-grade level text - this practice ensures that students are taught on grade level standards at a text that they will demonstrate proficiency on

-Uninterrupted 90 minute reading block - this practice allows students to focus for extended periods of time on ELA instruction

-Identification of Essential Learning Outcomes for each grade level - this practice ensures equity for ALL students in with the identification of which learning outcomes are essential

-PLCs and common standards based planning - this practice allows for the structure for planning to occur to ensure rigorous, standards based instruction happens across each classroom

**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
-Teachers will meet in PLCs each Tuesday from 2:30-3:20 to work through the 'Plan, Check, Do, Act' cycle centered around essential learning outcomes for the grade level	Norgard, Allison, allison.norgard@hcps.net
-Teachers will work collaboratively through Internalizations of each unit of study. This is calendared for both intermediate and primary teachers.	Norgard, Allison, allison.norgard@hcps.net

## 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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

### **Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.**

This is part of our school SIP goals and our instructional priorities. When adults and students feel a sense of belonging and inclusion it should aspire to create a culture where every student and every staff member feels appreciated, validated, accepted and treated fairly; a culture where every student is provided what they need, when they need it, with urgency, to ensure mastery of essential learning outcomes.

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

School culture involves all stakeholders. At Sessums this year classroom teachers are working to identify on-going ways build belonging and inclusion. The Student Services team is taking a pro-active approach through identifying things such as ACT NOW, Red Ribbon Week, Start with Hello to build school culture. The guidance team is teaching students the KELSO curriculum for conflict resolution.