

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Summerfield Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents	
School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	19

Summerfield Elementary School

11990 BIG BEND RD, Riverview, FL 33579

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Andrea Bryner

Start Date for this Principal: 2/13/2016

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 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 (49%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (47%) 2014-15: C (52%)
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	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	19

Summerfield Elementary School

11990 BIG BEND RD, Riverview, FL 33579

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	75%
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	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	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.

Students of Summerfield Elementary will become educated, responsible, and productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Summerfield Elementary we aspire to provide a safe, caring, orderly, and respectful environment where every child can reach his/her potential.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Alfano, Carmine	Principal	Oversee implementation of school SIP plan with all stakeholders actively involved in the decision making processes regarding school improvement. Expenditures regarding supplemental resource teachers/staff and additional supports to support the schools Comprehensive Needs Assessment plan for this year.

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	102	127	122	141	128	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	741
Attendance below 90 percent	29	28	21	27	26	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	79	74	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	262

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	14	15	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	2	4	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

62

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/8/2019

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	2	26	22	24	18	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	5	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	48	72	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	207

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	3	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	2	26	22	24	18	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	5	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	48	72	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	207

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	3	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	48%	52%	57%	51%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	55%	58%	53%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	50%	53%	48%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	51%	54%	63%	63%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	50%	57%	62%	54%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	46%	51%	48%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	50%	50%	53%	55%	48%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	102 (0)	127 (0)	122 (0)	141 (0)	128 (0)	121 (0)	741 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	29 (2)	28 (26)	21 (22)	27 (24)	26 (18)	16 (6)	147 (98)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (5)	1 (0)	0 (3)	2 (8)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	79 (48)	74 (72)	109 (87)	262 (207)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	49%	52%	-3%	58%	-9%
	2018	55%	53%	2%	57%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	47%	55%	-8%	58%	-11%
	2018	46%	55%	-9%	56%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	40%	54%	-14%	56%	-16%
	2018	35%	51%	-16%	55%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	49%	54%	-5%	62%	-13%
	2018	58%	55%	3%	62%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	49%	57%	-8%	64%	-15%
	2018	52%	57%	-5%	62%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2019	48%	54%	-6%	60%	-12%
	2018	42%	54%	-12%	61%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	49%	51%	-2%	53%	-4%
	2018	41%	52%	-11%	55%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
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	31	41	35	27	36	40	14				
ELL	23	42	69	37	42	33	32				
BLK	40	46	38	34	46	50	39				
HSP	42	44	53	46	38	38	43				
MUL	55	68		58	62						
WHT	56	47	50	59	61	40	63				
FRL	40	47	56	44	42	44	41				
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	20	31	28	26	33	25	8				
ELL	31	29	39	45	37	38	18				
BLK	41	35	20	48	44	42	46				
HSP	43	40	37	51	40	30	34				
MUL	41	33		44	27						
WHT	57	38	33	65	49	31	46				
FRL	41	35	32	48	39	36	39				

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	15	35	39	30	50	53	31				
ELL	34	45	45	44	50	48	31				
BLK	49	52	71	61	63	62	48				
HSP	42	43	25	52	44	38	40				
MUL	44	83		72	58						
WHT	60	60	59	71	58	67	77				
FRL	41	51	50	55	51	50	46				

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	53
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	80
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	423
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
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	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	42
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	48
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	61
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	54
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	49
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

Our Science achievement for students with disabilities, and our Math achievement with students with disabilities was our lowest performing areas. Another concern was our Black lower 25% group that was over 10 proficiency points below our other subgroups in the 25% lower performance group.

Our overall students with disabilities only achieved 38% proficiency based on the Federal Index for that subgroup. The contributing trends that have appeared over the past two years is our service delivery model we have used with our Severely Learning Disabled, Other Health Impaired, and Language students who have specific reading, math and writing goals on their IEP's. A more rigorous model of support facilitation that provides push-in services into core instruction aligned with teacher and ESE teacher planning will be the driving force for this new intervention. Another contributing factor is the transparency of accommodations that students use based on their IEP's and how those strategies are embedded into daily instruction.

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

Math proficiency dropped 4% points from the prior year. Two major factors contributed to this decline. A new curriculum was introduced in pre-planning that did not resonate with the Math teachers. It was hard to access and even more difficult to plan with. Our second factor was our struggle with vocabulary development that intersects with the math problem solving questions.

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.

Our Grade 5 ELA proficiency component dropped 16% points below the state average. The prior year it was 20%, however it still drags behind by a considerable amount. The groups that fell low in this ELA category were our SWD's, ELL, and our Black students in the lower 25% grouping.

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

Our Grade 5 Science scores increased 10% in proficiency from the prior year. We used Student tutoring on specific science standards six weeks before testing to ensure gap instruction deficits were addressed and vocabulary clarity was targeted as the primary intervention. Our vocabulary interventions, especially in Science focused on data from diagnostic testing and interim testing that provided meaningful use of words, repetition of new vocabulary words and ultimately the integration of these words into instructional and mostly non-instructional text passages.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

One area of concern is the number of students in grades 3-5 that fall into the level one category of achievement. Another area of concern is our attendance rates in our classes, especially in the Primary grades. With this continued trend over the past few years, those early learning grades are impacted by students arriving to school late or not at all. The late students often miss the launching of the ELA or Math blocks of instruction which hinders their development during the most critical years of formative instruction.

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

1. Standards based planning within PLC's, driven by ILT facilitators to address gap instruction based on data.
2. Small group instruction across all grade levels.
3. Vocabulary development within guided reading, shared reading and independent reading core instruction in all subject areas, especially ELA, Math and Science.
4. Progress monitor using Look-For data and diagnostic data to drive shifts in instruction.
5. Professional development that is grade-level specific to the needs of their progress monitoring data reviews.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Vocabulary development and integration into the core curriculum for all sub-groups.
Rationale	Our school diagnostic data from last year reveals that vocabulary comprehension within all subjects tested was the driving factor in student proficiency and ultimately performance. The correlation of unpacking ELA, Math and Science standards will facilitate the planning needed to address rich vocabulary development with all types of written genres. Embedded planning that strives to incorporate integrated and repetitive use of vocabulary words that support the standard being taught will be addressed in small group instruction and repeated in whole group review in all subjects.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Research shows that meaningful use of vocabulary that is repetitive, and integrated directly to standards that are planned in daily core instruction leads to gains in comprehension. Comprehension is one key elevator lift for our lower sub-groups, especially our Students with Disabilities who struggle with word usage.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Carmine Alfano (carmine.alfano@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Interim data analysis, diagnostic data reviews (I-ready) and student work with core units will allow progress monitoring checkpoints during quarterly data reviews from administration. In addition, walk-through Look-For data on a weekly basis will elicit the effectiveness of vocabulary usage directly linked to learning targets within daily classroom instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Hard data can be directly pulled from Diagnostic reports in the areas of ELA and Math using I-ready. Small group instruction in Guided Reading and Math allows for direct corrective feedback regarding vocabulary within daily instruction. School wide Look-For's regarding standards based planning linked to vocabulary connections within daily instruction will drive hard data collected during administrative walk-through sessions. School wide review of Look-For data will be evaluated and discussed twice per month during Instructional Leadership Meetings with one grade-level representative at the table. Constant shifts and adjustments will be made based on barriers within planning, standards and small group sessions that arise from this hard data.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use Title i funds to provide substitute teachers so that each teacher can examine data with the I-Ready trainer in order to increase their laser focus of interventions that can be used with our diagnostic program (I-Ready). This is usually done after Diagnostic 2 around mid-year. 2. Use Look-For data to make shifts in grade level implementation of standards based lessons focused on vocabulary enhancement within core instruction (small group student driven) episodes. 3. Analyze school wide trends at bi-monthly I.L.T. (Instructional Leadership Team) meetings. 4. Implement PD needed per grade-level or school wide to address trends observed from Look-For data and other forms of data like Interim and grade level common assessments each team uses. 5. Target E.L.P. (Extending Learning Program) tutoring to sub-groups that show gap deficits.

Person Responsible Carmine Alfano (carmine.alfano@hcps.net)

#2

Title Guided Reading Coaching Cycles using Seravello Text (Small group conferencing lessons) to enhance vocabulary development in a variety of reading materials.

Rationale 1:1 coaching cycles with all K-5 teachers who teach ELA and writing. Using the Seravello text mini lessons as interventions to increase vocabulary instruction and comprehension development.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve Diagnostic data shows annual goal development and stretch goal levels increase proportionately for the lower 25% in our sub-groups. Focus will be on Students with disabilities and English Language Learners.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Carmine Alfano (carmine.alfano@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy Reading coach data logs progress monitoring coaching cycles with each teacher and the student data notes from those coaching cycles. Quarterly data chats with administration will capture the school wide hard data progress.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy Mid year growth that is at least 50% increased from Diagnostic test 1 to Diagnostic test 2.

Action Step

Description 1. Planned coaching cycles with all ELA teachers K-5.
2. Data log of coaching feedback based on data collected.
3. suggested Seravello strategies designed for each teacher coached.
4. Grade level summary of trends and PD needs.
5.

Person Responsible Carmine Alfano (carmine.alfano@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Utilize our Full time Social worker to be more precise and rigorous regarding attendance, late arrivals and early departures from school by our students. The use of the Time Lost tool on Education Connect and hard data presented at each PSLT meeting bi-monthly will allow for a laser focus on the trending need to develop parent and family interventions that can support our struggling parents of poverty.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Our plan has many elements that support building relationships with all our stakeholders. Our parent and family involvement room allows strong resource support for our parents who struggle financially with free and reduced lunch, wrap-around services brochures and other materials they can check-out that we have purchased using Title I funds to support the home environment. Our implementation of SEL concepts within all our student/family functions are taught and used across the entire campus. Three academic nights and one Family Fitness Night is planned to support how parents can increase proficiency with their children in regards to homework remediation, activities to build home culture and ways to keep all students and families physically active and fit. In addition we have scheduled 6 events with local stakeholders to support their businesses and allow families a social venue to meet other families. This strategy allows our most neediest groups to socially interact in a setting that is conducive to emotional and social stability.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

The School Board of each Florida district is required by state law to establish a comprehensive program for student progression that is based on an evaluation of each student's performance including an assessment of how well the student masters the performance standards approved by the state board. The district's program for student progression is based on mastery of the English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies standards. (F.S. 1008.25)

The HCPS Student Progression Plan includes information on initial placement, reporting student progress, reading remediation, academic acceleration, grade promotion and retention, graduation requirements, transfer credits, student recognition, accommodations, dual enrollment, and extended learning opportunities.

For complete information, please visit our Student Progression Plan at: <http://www.sdhc.k12.fl.us/docs/00/00/21/33/studentprogressionplan.pdf>

HCPS utilizes a variety of strategies for assisting students as they transition from one school to another.

HCPS employs multiple strategies for preparing children for entry into kindergarten. Over 6,000 children participate in one of several preschool programs offered by the School District (Head Start, VPK and PreK-ESE). Developmental screenings are available for all families prior to entry into kindergarten through Child Find, a service within the Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System (FDLRS). Additionally, the district works closely with School Readiness providers to share information.

HCPS utilizes multiple strategies for preparing students for their next school, including transitioning from elementary to middle school, middle school to high school, or simply moving to a new school mid-year. Examples include:

- Bring 6th/9th graders back early for orientation
- Train a cadre of student ambassadors to help orient other students
- Parent information and/or education opportunities
- Hold articulation meetings between 5th and 6th grade teachers
- Campus visits
- Shadow days

Middle school students visit, tutor and or perform at elementary schools
High school students visit, tutor, or perform at middle schools.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

To ensure efficient/systematic allocation and use of resources, the PSLT/ILT utilizes an RtI/MTSS framework to improve learning for all. Resources allocated support a continuum of academic and behavioral supports, ensuring all students have fluid access to instruction (varying intensity levels matched to most appropriate available resources).

Title I:

PartA

Funding enriches eligible schools with additional instructional staff, PD, ELP, and supplemental resources for raising student achievement in high-poverty schools.

PartC- Migrant

The migrant advocate provides services and support to students, parents, teachers and other programs to ensure that students' needs are met. Supplementary services include identification and recruitment, advocacy, health/social services, academic support, parental involvement and family literacy.

PartD

Funds support the Alternative Education Program, providing transition services from alternative education to school of choice, and includes mentoring, intervention services and educational support using transition specialists, teachers, paras and tutors.

TitleII

Funds for PD to provide/promote high quality professional learning that supports improved job performance for all resulting in increased student achievement. PD includes alternative certification, instructional support training and teacher induction program.

TitleIII

Services are provided to ensure ELLs have access to academic content that is equal in scope, sequence, breadth, and depth to the curricular offerings available to all. Services include educational materials and ELL district supported services such as interpreters, translators, bi-lingual support services, teachers, parent involvement and community outreach programs, improving education of immigrant and ELLs.

TitleX- Homeless

Coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school, reading coaches, and extended learning opportunities. Federal funds are "braided" to support supplemental academic resource teachers at district school sites and to support selected professional learning opportunities for teachers.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

HCPS strategies to advance college and career awareness include: Career interest inventory offered to students through Florida Shines; District College Nights; District Financial Aid Nights; Postsecondary representative visits at high schools; Field trip opportunities for career awareness; Field trip opportunities

to technical colleges; and Opportunities for students to take courses within their area of interest at their high school, via virtual school, and through dual enrollment.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Our school wide strategy is to focus on our KPI data which shows trends on how students have a much stronger probability to graduate and do post-secondary education if they attend school, stay out of behavior issues and meet grade-level criteria in the key grades of third, eighth and tenth.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Vocabulary development and integration into the core curriculum for all sub-groups.				\$1,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	7200	140-Substitute Teachers	4211 - Summerfield Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$1,000.00
			<i>Notes: Provide substitute teachers to cover grades K-5 to pull teachers for data reviews that look at diagnostic data from I-Ready Diagnostic reports and student reports.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Guided Reading Coaching Cycles using Seravello Text (Small group conferencing lessons) to enhance vocabulary development in a variety of reading materials.				\$85,646.88
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5000	100-Salaries	4211 - Summerfield Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$85,646.88
			<i>Notes: Supplemental unit 1.0 FTE for Reading Coach.</i>			
Total:						\$86,646.88