

Hernando County School District

Spring Hill 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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Spring Hill Elementary School

6001 MARINER BLVD, Spring Hill, FL 34609

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/pges>

Demographics

Principal: Kristen Tormey

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

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: B (55%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: B (56%) 2014-15: C (50%)
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 Hernando 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	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Spring Hill Elementary School

6001 MARINER BLVD, Spring Hill, FL 34609

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/pges>

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	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	46%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	A	B

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.

Spring Hill Elementary School's mission is to provide a quality education in a safe and orderly environment which will foster student's physical, social, emotional and academic growth. Parents, educators, community and business members must work collaboratively and consistently to promote student success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Participation
Attitude
Willingness =
Success

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
Tormey, Kristen	Principal	To work collaboratively with formal and informal leaders to plan, implement and assess school change initiatives to ensure alignment and focus on intended results and to monitor and transfer practice from professional development into action. Leads learning walk team members in monitoring the transfer of knowledge into practice.
Frazier, Tracy	Other	Site-based assessment coordinator- To ensure that student achievement data is utilized to drive decisions at the classroom and school level. Works with individuals or groups to facilitate conversations around data driven instructional decisions.
Ledford, Leigh Ann	Other	Elementary Assistant- To align curriculum and instruction to meet the needs of all students. Coaches teachers on methodologies and best practices that can be used to deliver content. To design collaborative, job-embedded, standards based professional learning. Assists with coordinating and planning site-based professional development.
Visceglie, Stacey	Other	Elementary Assistant- To align curriculum and instruction to meet the needs of all students. Coaches teachers on methodologies and best practices that can be used to deliver content. To design collaborative, job-embedded, standards based professional learning. Assists with coordinating and planning site-based professional development.
Woop, Maria	Other	Title I Facilitator- Ensures that SHES abides by federal and local regulations while meeting the instructional needs of students.
Grinnen, Scott	Assistant Principal	To work collaboratively with formal and informal leaders to plan, implement and assess school change initiatives to ensure alignment and focus on intended results and to monitor and transfer practice from professional development into action. Participates as a learning walk team member to monitor transfer of knowledge in to practice.
Saavedra, Natasha	Other	Site based MTSS Coordinator - Coordinated MTSS parent/ teacher problem solving conferences, assists in building MTSS schedule and groups, monitors MTSS data, shares data with leadership team and faculty in order to adjust instructional practices.

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	136	152	124	153	130	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	832
Attendance below 90 percent	14	21	16	17	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	13	3	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	24	24	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89

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	17	32	14	19	21	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131

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	3	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

52

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/28/2019

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	8	6	12	7	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	1	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	22	66	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143

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	1	0	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	8	6	12	7	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	1	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	22	66	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143

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	1	0	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	62%	54%	57%	52%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	53%	58%	55%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	52%	53%	68%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	62%	58%	63%	69%	63%	61%
Math Learning Gains	56%	57%	62%	72%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	48%	51%	65%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	53%	54%	53%	59%	54%	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	136 (0)	152 (0)	124 (0)	153 (0)	130 (0)	137 (0)	832 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	14 (8)	21 (6)	16 (12)	17 (7)	13 (5)	10 (9)	91 (47)
One or more suspensions	1 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)	1 (1)	6 (2)
Course failure in ELA or Math	13 (0)	3 (0)	8 (0)	6 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	30 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	24 (22)	24 (66)	41 (55)	89 (143)

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	67%	57%	10%	58%	9%
	2018	72%	62%	10%	57%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	59%	8%	58%	9%
	2018	52%	53%	-1%	56%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	50%	52%	-2%	56%	-6%
	2018	53%	53%	0%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	66%	62%	4%	62%	4%
	2018	72%	67%	5%	62%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	62%	5%	64%	3%
	2018	61%	60%	1%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	52%	54%	-2%	60%	-8%
	2018	63%	56%	7%	61%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	54%	55%	-1%	53%	1%
	2018	53%	56%	-3%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
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	30	46	47	18	35	30	19				

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
ELL	47	63	73	38	43	33	13				
BLK	49	45		36	55		20				
HSP	64	51	54	60	51	27	48				
MUL	52	43		60	50						
WHT	65	61	64	69	60	34	63				
FRL	62	58	62	59	55	32	51				
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	26	29	40	23	41	42	27				
ELL	48	44		61	68	64					
BLK	57	50		46	25						
HSP	64	57	58	72	62	57	59				
MUL	58	45		61	43		47				
WHT	60	59	56	67	55	38	54				
FRL	57	51	52	62	51	39	47				
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	16	39	46	26	56	57	25				
ELL	28	46		41	46						
BLK	41	50		38	79		30				
HSP	48	47	61	67	61	62	47				
MUL	37	45		68	70						
WHT	56	62	77	73	76	63	67				
FRL	50	55	70	67	71	65	59				

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	57
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	72
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	457
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
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	48
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	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	53
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	51
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	
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	59
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	57
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.

Math overall proficiency, percent making adequate progress and the percent of bottom quartile making learning gains showed the lowest performance. This does appear to be a two year trend. Strong MTSS "Fluid Walls" process and procedures is needed to address students not making adequate gains in Math.

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

Math percent of students making adequate progress and the percent of bottom quartile making learning gains showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Strong MTSS "Fluid Walls" process is needed to address students not making adequate gains in Math. Specific focus on tier 1 Math instruction monitored by classroom walk-throughs and weekly facilitated planning sessions.

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.

Math lowest quartile and students making adequate progress had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Strong MTSS "Fluid Walls" process is needed to address students not making adequate gains in Math. Improved tier II and tier III supports will be in place for students in grades K-5. EWS data indicates a strong concern with student attendance rates.

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

ELA showed the most improvement. Solidifying MTSS policies and procedures and continued approach to fluid walls helped bridge the gap. Solidifying tier I instruction to include small group instruction has supported learning gains.

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

EWS data indicates a strong concern with student attendance rates and achievement gap of students with retentions. Solidifying MTSS policies and procedures and continued approach to fluid walls will help bridge the gap. Remediation/ resources teachers will provide tier III supports for all students K-5. Student attendance will be monitored by our site-based MTSS Coordinator and data entry. Truancy meetings will be scheduled when students have 6+ absences. Strict guidelines and policies will be enforced.

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

1. Math proficiency (overall level 3 and above)
2. Math lowest quartile (showing learning gains)
3. Science proficiency (overall level 3 and above)
4. Solidifying MTSS policies and procedures for ELA & Math to include a schedule for remediation/ resource teachers providing tier III supports for students K-5.
5. Monitor student attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Culture & Relationships
Rationale	SHES has continued to have elevated teacher turn over. Lack of consistency on grade level teams leads to lower levels of trust, lack of cooperative team planning and shared best practices. Based on 2019 FSA Math, data indicated a 3% overall decline in proficiency and 11% decrease in Math proficiency in 5th grade. FCAT Science has remained steady at 53% proficient the past two years. Students with disabilities has shown a 16% decline in FSA Math from 2018 to 2019 historically. Based on 2091 FSA ELA scores SHES went up 1% in proficiency, remained the steady at 56%in learning gains, and increased 7% in the lowest quartile making gaines
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>Our overall goal is to increase 5% overall FSA Math proficiency.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * regain 3% that was lost in 2019 * plus 2% additional * increase 5% of students making adequate progress * increase 16% in our percent of bottom quartile making gains to include SWD <p>Increase 3% in overall Science proficiency.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * increase proficiency, learning gains, and FSA lowest quartile in ELA by 3%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kristen Tormey (tormey_k@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Professional Development to include: differentiated instruction in Math, Science & SWD *Curriculum training provided by district Math & Science coaches *Lowest quartile/ Learning gain training by district Coordinator of Evaluation, Data Analysis & Research * Revamped MTSS policies & procedures to include scheduling for tier III supports with resource/remediation teachers * Increased use of technology to aide in differentiated instruction and best practices (iReady, AR, Reflex, Flocabulary, Nearpod, promethian apps, etc.). <p>SHES has continued to have elevated teacher turn over. Lack of consistency on grade level teams leads to lower levels of trust, lack of cooperative team planning and shared best practices.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Professional development and curriculum training will assist new teachers and those that have changed grade levels by providing instructional support and strategies to include best practices benefiting all students.</p> <p>Increased use of technology to aide in differentiated instruction and best practices (iReady, AR, Reflex, Flocabulary, Nearpod, promethian apps, etc.).</p>
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Scheduled Math Professional Development with district Math Coach 2. Scheduled Science Professional Development with district Science Coach 3. Scheduled Lowest Quartile/ Learning gain training with district Coordinator of Evaluation, Data Analysis & Research 4. Scheduled MTSS/ SWD training with district Coordinator of Exceptional Student Support Services 5. Fluid walls schedule built in to daily master schedule 6. Schedule for tier III instructional supports for students in grades K-5 (resource/ remediation teachers)

7. Weekly PLC schedule

8. Social Emotional Resource teacher focused on RtIb, mental health and building student relationships to work with individual students, small groups and classes. Strategies will focus on de-escalation strategies and sensory needs.

9. Differentiated instruction through use of various technology components (iReady, AR, Reflex, Flocabulary, Nearpod, promethian apps, etc.).

Monitored by classroom walk-through data, progress monitoring data (iReady, SAM, STAR, etc.) and classroom student performance indicators.

Person Responsible Kristen Tormey (tormey_k@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

#2

Title

Rationale

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

Person responsible for monitoring outcome [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

Action Step

Description

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

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).

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.

SHES establishes strong communication with parents from the beginning of the school year. A weekly newsletter is sent to parents informing them of upcoming events and curriculum. The administration encourages all staff to see the families and the students as our partners in education. We outline mutual expectations by using the Title I compact. By developing this "contract" we can articulate behavioral

expectations and establish the baseline for professional and courteous exchanges between staff and parents. We will do our best to educate parents to deal with teachers directly and establish trust and lasting relationships.

Spring Hill Elementary builds relations with community members by asking them to join the Student Advisory Committee (SAC) and support our school. We have volunteer community members that reads and works with our students. SHES collaborates with community members throughout the year that help provide resources for students, parents, and staff.

PFEF Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEF), 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.

At Spring Hill Elementary we strive to meet the social and emotional needs of our students by providing counseling support in the classroom, small group, and individual settings. Additionally, our counselors offer referrals and information on various outside support agencies as needed. Teachers and staff across campus serve as student mentors. ESE teachers will provide support services to a student identified, through IEP, as at-risk or in need. As a proactive approach, the ISS para-professional will begin to implement a research-based program called "Access", which develops positive character traits and leadership skills. Title I this year implemented a social-emotional resource teacher to work with individual students, small groups, and classrooms to help build character and teach de-escalate strategies. SHES also has a sensory hallway for the students to use on a as-needed basis.

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

Every year, SHES hosts an incoming Kindergarten event that offers parents best practices, tips, and insight as to ways they can support the effective transitions from Pre-K to K. In addition, our school implements a screening program to identify student readiness and allows teachers to instruct at appropriate levels. All incoming Kindergarten students will be assessed with the Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screener (FLKRS) to determine reading strengths and weaknesses. Kindergarten students will also take the i-Ready diagnostic assessment during the first assessment window. Based on the results, along with on-going progress monitoring, students will participate in a rigorous and differentiated learning environment.

At the school site, we conduct Individualized Educational Plan (IEP) staffings as needed. Our speech, occupational and physical therapist also, provide services to qualifying children prior to their entry to school. We offer similar IEP meetings for exiting 5th graders and coordinate with our feeder middle schools to provide middle school guidance counselor assemblies, on-campus middle school tours, and advertise for middle school family nights at the school they will attend. In addition, SHES offers e-school courses for advanced students.

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.

SHES will focus on solving problems identified with our student performance data; the team will identify school-wide, grade level, and subgroup problem areas and apply problem-solving techniques to design interventions and strategies. The team will meet bi-monthly to discuss current assessment data. The team will develop interventions for the problem areas, identify professional development needs, then

communicate with and train the staff. Support for MTSS is provided through scheduling time to present teachers with quality training/modeling, time to carry out MTSS data-based problem solving process at the school/grade level, providing research-based materials, funding from multiple sources, and guidance and accountability from the leadership team/administration.

Individual student data is the basis for determining the development and implementation of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) and MTSS. SIP development team teachers survey the staff, analyze student performance, discipline, and attendance data, and then develop our goals, barriers, strategies, and evaluation processes and tools aimed at improving student performance at SHES. The MTSS problem-solving process is applied to the new data; data is analyzed, problem areas identified, interventions developed, and tracking methods established, then training and interventions are applied which are all designed to meet our SIP goals. The SBLT re-evaluates these strategies as they review the next set of performance data and modifications are made when data indicates a need to refine our practices. Resources, allocation of staff and supports, as well as funding considerations, are determined. The SBLT team determines school-based, grade level, and subject level needs. In addition, the team ensures students are receiving appropriate Tier 1, 2 & 3 services/interventions with fidelity as well as placement along the continuum of services in the best interest of each student. The team evaluates the professional development needs of the staff and appropriate tools for the overall implementation of the SIP and MTSS.

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

N/A