Suncoast Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Suncoast Elementary School

11135 QUALITY DR, Spring Hill, FL 34609

https://www.hernandoschools.org/shes

Demographics

Principal: Scott Piesik

Start Date for this Principal: 9/14/2020

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: C (52%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (44%)
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

Suncoast Elementary School

11135 QUALITY DR, Spring Hill, FL 34609

https://www.hernandoschools.org/shes

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	98%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	41%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	D	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hernando County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The staff of Suncoast Elementary will promote academic excellence through high expectations and academic rigor while encouraging the love of learning through the use of a differentiated instructional approach that recognizes the uniqueness of each student.

Provide the school's vision statement.

It is the vision of Suncoast Elementary to create a community of academic excellence that will produce lifelong learners.

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
Piesik, Scott	Principal	The principal facilitates school based leadership meetings, shares district and school data with the team, and supports with the communication between the district and the staff.
Williams, Allison	Teacher, K-12	Responsible for collecting and presenting grade level data to the school leadership team. Shares information from administration with team and communicates team questions/needs to administration.
Troyer, Cecilia	Teacher, K-12	Assessment teacher assists with preparing school wide data to share with the school based leadership team. Provides support to teachers with testing.
Baker, Kelly	School Counselor	Relays information from administration to team and shares team questions/concerns with administration. Also shares information regarding PBS with leadership team.
Cameron, Kristen	Other	Shares information regarding MTSS/updates with leadership team.
Hray, Karen	Teacher, K-12	Responsible for collecting and presenting grade level data to the school leadership team. Shares information from administration with team and communicates team questions/needs to administration.
Hughes, Dacey	Assistant Principal	Assists with facilitating school based leadership team meetings and preparing data to be presented.
D'Anna, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	Responsible for collecting and presenting grade level data to the school leadership team. Shares information from administration with team and communicates team questions/needs to administration.
Liebler, Shannon	Instructional Coach	Share any information regarding curriculum and district assessments with school based leadership team. Use data from SBLT meetings to prepare for PLCs and support teachers.
Sullivan, Diana	Teacher, PreK	Responsible for collecting and presenting grade level data to the school leadership team. Shares information from administration with team and communicates team questions/needs to administration.
Staton, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	Responsible for collecting and presenting grade level data to the school leadership team. Shares information from administration with team and communicates team questions/needs to administration.
Bennett, Philip	Other	Share discipline and attendance data with school based leadership team.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Howard, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	Responsible for collecting and presenting grade level data to the school leadership team. Shares information from administration with team and communicates team questions/needs to administration.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 9/14/2020, Scott Piesik

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.*
1

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.*
16

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: C (52%) 2017-18: D (40%)

	2016-17: C (51%)
	2015-16: C (44%)
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide 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

Monday 9/14/2020

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	132	133	164	170	152	141	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	892
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	5	6	8	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA or Math	8	6	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	21	34	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94

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	8	6	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
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	132	133	164	170	152	141	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	892
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	5	6	8	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA or Math	8	6	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	21	34	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94

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	8	6	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		22
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	52%	54%	57%	51%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	53%	58%	51%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	52%	53%	57%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	54%	58%	63%	53%	63%	61%
Math Learning Gains	57%	57%	62%	51%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	48%	51%	46%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	49%	54%	53%	45%	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	49%	57%	-8%	58%	-9%
	2018	53%	62%	-9%	57%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	59%	-8%	58%	-7%
	2018	39%	53%	-14%	56%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	51%	52%	-1%	56%	-5%
	2018	41%	53%	-12%	55%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		12%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	49%	62%	-13%	62%	-13%
	2018	61%	67%	-6%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	62%	-4%	64%	-6%
	2018	55%	60%	-5%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	49%	54%	-5%	60%	-11%
	2018	42%	56%	-14%	61%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	50%	55%	-5%	53%	-3%
	2018	40%	56%	-16%	55%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
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	18	40	33	29	44	36	17				
ELL	34	55	64	36	64	65	38				
ASN	82			73							
BLK	39	35		29	50		30				
HSP	50	56	58	55	58	50	47				
MUL	48	67		57	47						
WHT	54	53	46	56	57	50	53				
FRL	49	50	42	49	52	44	47				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	14	26	35	29	29	29	31				
ELL	17	12		33	42						
ASN	77			69							
BLK	35	27		35	27						
HSP	42	25		54	43	25	48				
MUL	44	29		52	28						
WHT	45	35	33	57	40	38	35				
FRL	39	30	33	49	32	26	33				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	24	44	52	30	48	56	28				
ELL	26	42		42	33						
BLK	29	42		38	58						
HSP	49	49	59	52	48	53	36				
MUL	64	58		45	58						
WHT	52	52	55	55	51	44	48				
FRL	48	48	58	49	53	51	33				

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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	81
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	446
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	55
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	78
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57
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	55
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	53
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	52
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.

Our lowest performing subgroup in 2018-2019 was our students with disabilities. That year, we had two long term subs in our ESE inclusion positions that serviced classes in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades. Our students with disabilities population has been below the Federal Index for the last two years.

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

The greatest decline in 2018-2019 was in 3rd grade math. There was a lack of differentiated instruction.

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.

3rd and 5th grade math achievement had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Again, there was a lack of differentiated instruction.

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

The greatest improvement was 4th and 5th grade ELA. We currently have an Instructional Practices Coach who supports teachers with data-driven decision making, differentiated instruction, and planning engaging lessons.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Two areas of concern are student attendance and the amount of level 1s and 2s on the FSA.

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

1. Data-based decision making
2. Differentiated instruction
3. Use of High-Impact Reading Strategies by students

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	School Grade data shows that 48% of our students in ELA and 46% of our students in Math are not proficient. The data also shows that 47% of our students in ELA and 43% of our students in Math are not making learning gains. According to the Federal Index percent our Black population is at 37% and our students with disabilities is 31%.
Measurable Outcome:	The intended outcome is to increase the percent of student learning gains and percent proficient in all student success measures by 5%. The Federal Index percentage of our black population and our students with disabilities will increase to 41% or higher.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Data-based decision making 2. Differentiated instruction 3. Use of High-Impact Reading Strategies by students
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiated Instruction will allow teachers to meet the instructional needs of all students. Data Driven Decision Making will allow teachers to plan their instruction based on the areas of need. High Impact Reading Strategies will help increase the students' ability to comprehend complex text.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Designated time in the master schedule for common team planning to analyze data and develop differentiated instruction.
2. Low performing subgroups will be monitored in ELA and Math using i-Ready Diagnostic and formative assessment data. The data will be shared with teachers during PLCs.
3. Teachers will participate in half-day PLCs that will incorporate data driven decision making and will be monitored by sign-in sheets and collected formative assessment data.
4. Teachers will implement high impact reading strategies during instruction that will be monitored by lesson plans and administrative walkthroughs.
5. Designated time in the master schedule for differentiated instruction in reading and math.
6. Teachers will provide differentiated instruction in reading and math that will be monitored by lesson plans and administrative walkthroughs.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The School Based Leadership Team will monitor student attendance data at monthly meetings. Attendance incentives will be given to students who receive monthly perfect attendance awards. The Guidance Counselor and the Dean of Students will identify students with poor attendance, and will assign those students attendance mentors. The mentors will check their assigned students' daily attendance and meet with those students weekly. If attendance does not improve, the mentor will reach out to families.

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.

Suncoast Elementary plans on strengthening relationships with parents by hosting several family friendly events/workshops later in the year when Covid restrictions are lifted. All families and community members are invited to participate in our School Advisory Council, Parent Teacher Association, and our Title 1 meetings through membership, attendance, and surveys. Suncoast communicates with families and the community through student agendas, phone/digital/in person conferences, social media, and the Bloomz communication app. In order to increase positive communication with families, teachers will make a phone call home for each of their students to celebrate successes in the classroom. Suncoast collaborates with community businesses to provide resources for students, parents, and staff throughout the year.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.