

Hernando County School District

Spring Hill Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
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: 7/1/2019

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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%)
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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 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	47%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	A

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Kristen Tormey

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

64

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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%)
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 .	

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	117	115	112	142	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	737
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	13	1	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	2	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/10/2020

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	
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	

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	
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	

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%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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	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%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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				
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				

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
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0

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%	0
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%	0
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%	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	59
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	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

Students within the lowest quartile, specifically SWD, both making adequate progress and learning gains show the the lowest levels of performance. This does appear to be a trend over the past 5 years. Contributing factors include but are not limited to: curriculum, transient factors, large MTSS

groups, insufficient ESE support personnel. Strong MTSS process and procedures, gradual release and differentiated instruction are needed to ensure a close in the achievement gap.

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

Students within the lowest quartile, specifically SWD, both making adequate progress and learning gains show the the lowest levels of performance. This does appear to be a trend over the past 5 years. Contributing factors include but are not limited to: curriculum, transient factors, large MTSS groups, insufficient ESE support personnel. Strong MTSS process and procedures, gradual release and differentiated instruction are needed to ensure a close in the achievement gap. Specific focus on tier 1 partnered with solid professional development and monitored by classroom walk-throughs and facilitated lesson planning through PLCs.

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. 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. Specific focus on tier 1 partnered with solid professional development and monitored by classroom walk-throughs and facilitated lesson planning through PLCs.

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

ELA lowest quartile showed the most improvement. Solidifying MTSS policies and procedures and continued approach to fluid walls has 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?

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/resource teachers will provide tier III support for all students K-5. Student attendance will be monitored by our site-based MTSS Coordinator, data entry and assessment. Attendance/truancy meetings will be scheduled when students have 5+ absences. Strict guidelines and policies will be enforced.

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

1. increased overall proficiency SWD both ELA & Math
2. increased overall proficiency LQ both ELA & Math
3. increased overall proficiency in Science
4. Solidifying MTSS policies and procedures for ELA and Math to include a schedule for remediation/resource teachers providing tier III supports for students K-5.
5. Monitor student & staff attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

SHE has continued to have elevated teacher turn over (specifically the natural evolution of veteran and new teachers to the profession). 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 indicates a decline of 3% in overall proficiency in grades 3-5 and 11% decline in 5th grade Math proficiency. Students with disabilities continues to show a decline in FSA Math proficiency historically. FCAT Science remains steady at 53% proficient the past two years. FSA Reading continues to be an area of focus. Based on 2019 FSA ELA data indicates an increase of 2% to 61% overall proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

Our overall goal is to increase overall FSA Math proficiency 5% (regaining 3% that was lost in 2019 plus 2% additional).

- *increase students making adequate progress by 5% in Math
- *increase lowest quartile learning gains to include students with disabilities by 10% in Math
- *increase overall proficiency in Science by 3%
- *increase overall proficiency in Reading by 5%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Strategy:

- *Professional development to include but not limited to: differentiated instruction in ELA & Math, gradual release model, achievement gap, iReady, LETRS, BrainPop, Reflex, STAR/AR, Prodigy, Zearn, Flocabulary/Nearpod, Promethian apps, MTSS, SWAP, data analysis)
- *Curriculum training provided by district ELA, Math and Science coaches
- *Lowest quartile/learning gain training by district Coordinator of Evaluation, Data Analysis & Research
- *Revamped MTSS policies and procedures to include scheduling for tier 3 supports with resource/remediation teachers & paras.
- *Increased use of technology to aide in differentiated instruction and best practices (iReady, AR, Reflex, Prodigy, Zearn, Flocabulary, Nearpod, Promethian apps, etc)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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 practice.

Professional development and curriculum training will assist new teachers and those that have changes grade levels by providing instructional support and strategies to include instructional best practices benefiting all students.

Increased use of technology to aide in differentiated instruction and best practices (iReady, STAR/AR, Reflex, Flocabulary, Nearpod, Promethian apps, etc).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Schedule ELA professional development with district Reading coach
2. Schedule Math professional development with district Math coach
3. Schedule Science professional development with district Science coach
4. Schedule SWD professional development with ESE specialists
5. Schedule lowest quartile/learning gains training with District Coordinator of Evaluation, Data Analysis & Research

6. Schedule MTSS training with site-based elementary assistant
7. Schedule for tier 3 instructional support for students in grades K-5 (resource/remediation teachers)
8. Continue to build upon teacher data chats through "coffee with the principal spreadsheets"

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

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/resource teachers will provide tier III support for all students K-5. Student attendance will be monitored by our site-based MTSS Coordinator, data entry and assessment. Attendance/truancy meetings will be scheduled when students have 5+ absences. Strict guidelines and policies will be enforced. The school leadership team will address improvement priorities through focused professional development and curriculum training (gradual release, school-based Math task force, facilitated lesson planning), classroom walk-throughs and timely attendance/ truancy meetings.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Spring Hill Elementary establishes strong communication with parents from the beginning of the school year. Grade levels provide weekly newsletters to parents informing them of upcoming events and curriculum. The administration encourages all staff to see families and students as partners in their child's education. We are here to serve our students and families as we build nurturing relationships. We outline mutual expectations by using Title I compacts and our Title I annual meeting. By developing this "contract" for parents and school staff 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 contact teachers directly and establish trust and lasting relationships. Spring Hill Elementary builds relationships with community partners by encouraging membership in SHES School Advisory Council (SAC) and Parent Teacher Organization (PTO). We have a strong volunteer community throughout the school year that helps provide valuable resources for students, parents and staff.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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