Hernando County School District

Suncoast Elementary School

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Suncoast Elementary School

11135 QUALITY DR, Spring Hill, FL 34609

https://www.hernandoschools.org/shes

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2017-18 Title I School**	**2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	44%

School Grades History

Year	**2017-18**	**2016-17**	**2015-16**	**2014-15**
Grade	D	C	C	C*

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hernando 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.

To develop students who are positive, respectful, and productive. We will do this by providing a safe, secure environment and utilizing technology to its fullest potential. We will create lifelong learners and celebrate the diversity within our school family.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Brighten the future with the light of knowledge!

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title
Piesik, Scott	Principal
Williams, Allison	Teacher, K-12
Troyer, Cecilia	Teacher, K-12
Bordonaba, Diana	Teacher, K-12
Baker, Kelly	School Counselor
Cameron, Kristen	Other
Hray, Karen	Teacher, K-12
Romanello, Jennine	Teacher, K-12
Connell, Ann	Teacher, K-12
Hughes, Dacey	Assistant Principal
D'Anna, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12
Brunner, Kaitlyn	Teacher, K-12
President, Skyler	Teacher, K-12
Liebler, Shannon	Instructional Coach
Zielinski, Heather	Teacher, K-12
DeMoss, Michael	Teacher, K-12
Moffitt, Janet	Teacher, K-12
Coker, Cynthia	Teacher, K-12
George, Paula	Teacher, ESE
Sullivan, Diana	Teacher, PreK

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Scott Piesik (Principal) and Dacey Hughes (Assistant Principal) work with instructional coaches to facilitate and monitor standards-based instruction.
Cecilia Troyer (Assessment Teacher) provides data from State and District assessments to guide standards-based instruction and remediation.
Shannon Hess (Literacy Coach) facilitates standards-based planning and provide support for teachers in implementing standards-based lessons.
Kelly Baker (Certified School Counselor) helps increase student attendance and teacher/student contact time through PBS and supports provided to students.
Kristen Cameron (Elementary Assistant) guides the MTSS process through facilitated grade level meetings, as well as parent meetings.
Karen Hray, Stephanie D'Anna, Kaitlyn Brunner, Allison Williams, Michael DeMoss, Diana Bordonaba, Diana Sullivan, Kelly Baker (Team Leaders) are responsible for receiving and disseminating information from administration to their teams.
Jeannine Romanello, Ann Connell, Skyler President, Heather Zielinski, Janet Moffitt, Cynthia Coker, Paula George, Cecilia Troyer (School-Based Leadership Team) are responsible for facilitating standards-based formative assessment SWAPs and reporting SWAP data at SBLT meetings.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	7	22	19	14	16	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	5	3	9	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in ELA or Math	13	14	9	3	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	20	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	7	7	4	6	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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	13	2	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected

Tuesday 8/28/2018

Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	6	24	18	16	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	2	2	3	2	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA or Math	12	4	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	9	11	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	6	3	3	3	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	6	24	18	16	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	2	2	3	2	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA or Math	12	4	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	9	11	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	6	3	3	3	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis
Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

Learning Gains, both overall and bottom quartile, performed the lowest. This is a school trend across subject area data for the 2017-2018 school year, however it is not a historical trend for Suncoast.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Learning Gains, both overall and bottom quartile, in ELA showed the greatest decline from the prior year.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

In comparison to the state average, ELA Learning Gains had the biggest gap with a 22% difference.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

Math Proficiency showed the most improvement, however this is not a trend.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

The departmentalization of teachers in fourth and fifth grade allowed for higher impact teachers to instruct multiple classes in math.

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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	45%	55%	56%	49%	51%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	33%	53%	55%	43%	48%	52%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	51%	48%	28%	40%	46%
Math Achievement	55%	62%	62%	56%	63%	58%
Math Learning Gains	40%	53%	59%	52%	58%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	43%	47%	41%	43%	46%
Science Achievement	40%	58%	55%	38%	54%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Attendance below 90 percent	7 (6)	22 (24)	19 (18)	14 (16)	16 (14)	17 (18)	95 (96)
One or more suspensions	0 (2)	5 (2)	3 (3)	9 (2)	8 (8)	7 (7)	32 (24)
Course failure in ELA or Math	13 (12)	14 (4)	9 (4)	3 (1)	5 (0)	5 (0)	49 (21)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	11 (9)	20 (11)	44 (25)	75 (45)

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	2018	53%	62%	-9%	57%	-4%
	2017	58%	61%	-3%	58%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	39%	53%	-14%	56%	-17%
	2017	45%	55%	-10%	56%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
Cohort Comparison		-19%				
05	2018	41%	53%	-12%	55%	-14%
	2017	47%	54%	-7%	53%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2018	61%	67%	-6%	62%	-1%
	2017	49%	66%	-17%	62%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	55%	60%	-5%	62%	-7%
	2017	57%	66%	-9%	64%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2018	42%	56%	-14%	61%	-19%
	2017	50%	57%	-7%	57%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2018	40%	56%	-16%	55%	-15%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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	14	26	35	29	29	29	31				
ELL	17	12		33	42						
ASN	77			69							
BLK	35	27		35	27						
HSP	42	25		54	43	25	48				
MUL	44	29		52	28						
WHT	45	35	33	57	40	38	35				
FRL	39	30	33	49	32	26	33				

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	24	44	52	30	48	56	28				
ELL	26	42		42	33						
BLK	29	42		38	58						
HSP	49	49	59	52	48	53	36				
MUL	64	58		45	58						
WHT	52	52	55	55	51	44	48				
FRL	48	48	58	49	53	51	33				

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	Standards-Based Instruction
Rationale	Planning and delivering standards-based instruction will help to increase student engagement and lead to an increase in student achievement.
Intended Outcome	The intended outcome is to increase the percent of student learning gains and percent proficient in all student success measures by 5%.
Point Person	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Action Step	
Description	Collaborative standards-based planning will occur weekly, during grade level PLC sessions, facilitated by the Instructional Coaches. Coaches will work collaboratively with teachers during PLC sessions to ensure lessons and assessments are aligned with the standards. Teachers will use these standards-based assessments to progress monitor student achievement and to guide instruction.
Person Responsible	Dacey Hughes (hughes_d1@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Instructional Coaches will monitor weekly planning during PLCs through sign-in sheets, collaborative planning with teachers, and collection of formative assessments. Instructional Coaches will monitor lesson delivery through walkthroughs. Adminstration will monitor standards-based lesson plans and delivery through Planbook and evaluative walkthroughs, as well as, monthly district walkthrough trend data. Instructional Coaches, Administration, and SBLT members will monitor student achievement through standards-based assessment data, including data from formative assessments and Standards Mastery assessments. Instructional Coaches, Elementary Assistant, and Administration will also monitor student growth on i-Ready diagnostic assessments.
Person Responsible	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Part V: Budget

Total:	**$0.00**