

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Summerfield Crossings 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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	17

Summerfield Crossings Elementary School

11050 FAIRWAY MEADOW DR, Riverview, FL 33579

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Brian Harvey

Start Date for this Principal: 2/4/2014

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)	97%
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 (56%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (48%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Summerfield Crossings Elementary School

11050 FAIRWAY MEADOW DR, Riverview, FL 33579

[no web address on file]

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	No	65%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	74%

School Grades History

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

Everyone Will Teach, Everyone Will Learn, Everyone Will Grow!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Together we will do "Whatever It Takes"!

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
Harvey, Brian	Principal	Instructional Leader, engages stakeholders, and collaborates in the school's decision making process.
Simenson, Kirsten	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader, engages stakeholders, and collaborates in the school's decision making process.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 2/4/2014, Brian Harvey

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

46

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)	97%
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 (56%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (48%)
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	107	136	125	140	164	125	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	797
Attendance below 90 percent	15	25	16	24	21	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	7	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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 10/29/2020

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	123	154	156	183	150	162	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	928
Attendance below 90 percent	18	20	19	22	13	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
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	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	

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	159	165	193	149	174	142	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	982
Attendance below 90 percent	18	16	13	16	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	2	2	0	3	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	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	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	1	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	53%	52%	57%	55%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	55%	58%	52%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	50%	53%	40%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	53%	54%	63%	53%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	67%	57%	62%	48%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	46%	51%	30%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	57%	50%	53%	49%	48%	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	46%	52%	-6%	58%	-12%
	2018	53%	53%	0%	57%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	60%	55%	5%	58%	2%
	2018	58%	55%	3%	56%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%
	2018	39%	51%	-12%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	44%	54%	-10%	62%	-18%
	2018	41%	55%	-14%	62%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	57%	-4%	64%	-11%
	2018	54%	57%	-3%	62%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
05	2019	57%	54%	3%	60%	-3%
	2018	45%	54%	-9%	61%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	51%	51%	0%	53%	-2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	34%	52%	-18%	55%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
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	16	46	41	21	51	42	32				
ELL	30	35	32	40	63	50	41				
BLK	42	49	36	44	62	50	42				
HSP	48	54	40	49	67	61	50				
MUL	70	74		65	74		91				
WHT	64	68	79	65	71	53	69				
FRL	44	50	41	46	61	51	49				
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	21	30	31	23	33	33	17				
ELL	32	35	47	36	55	46	9				
BLK	46	32	25	37	35	16	19				
HSP	46	39	29	47	47	39	38				
MUL	59	45		69	55		18				
WHT	64	55		53	48	23	48				
FRL	43	37	29	41	43	33	31				
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	25	37	28	25	23	13	12				
ELL	25	32	31	29	32	23	10				
ASN	58			58							
BLK	46	45	38	41	37	27	45				
HSP	47	47	46	49	49	21	40				
MUL	68	62		68	54						
WHT	70	60	15	66	53	38	67				
FRL	46	49	36	45	45	25	44				

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	55
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	51
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	440
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	43
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	46
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	52

Hispanic Students	
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	75
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	67
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	48
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.

During the 2018-2019 school year, our lowest performing data components were our ELA Bottom Quartile Learning Gains (47%) and our Math Bottom Quartile Learning Gains (54%). Even though these data points represent our lowest performing, they both represent gains from the previous year. ELA BQ Learning Gains increased 21 percentage points and our Math BQ Learning Gains increased 23 percentage points. As a school, we are continuing to increase our focus on differentiated small group instruction to continue increasing our BQ and overall learning gains scores.

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

During the 2018-2019 school year, Summerfield Crossings Elementary showed growth in every data component. Continued school-wide focus on our School Improvement Plan and RADAR Plan will allow us to sustain the overall growth (107 points) we displayed.

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.

During the 2018-2019 school year, the two data components that had the largest gap, when compared to the state average, were Math Achievement and ELA Bottom Quartile.

Our Math Achievement increased 4 percentage points to 53 percent, but was still 10 percentage points below that state average of 63 percent and 1 percentage point below the district average of 54 percent.

Summerfield Crossings' ELA Bottom Quartile increased 21 percentage points to 47 percent, but was still 6 percentage points below the state average of 53 percent. Our ELA Bottom Quartile score was also 3 percentage points below the district average of 50 percent.

We are continuing to focus on differentiated instruction that will meet the need for all of our students. The gap between the school scores and the state scores will continue to close as we remain focused on standards based, differentiated instruction.

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

During the 2018-2019 school year, Science achievement increased by 21 percentage points. Our ELA Bottom Quartile Learning Gains also increased 21 percentage points, while our Math Bottom Quartile Learning Gains increased 23 percentage points. Increased common planning time, a science specific PLC that was headed by a science liaison, and increased professional development focused on small group instruction all contributed to our increased scores.

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

After reflecting on our EWS data, a potential area of concern is "Attendance below 90 percent" at all grade levels, with a narrowed focus on our primary grade levels.

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

1. Increasing our ESSA Federal Index subgroup data for Students with Disabilities above 41 percent.
2. Increasing the amount of common planning time.
3. Continue to develop and provide PD around standards, standards based instruction and implementing purposeful small group instruction.
4. Reducing the number of students with attendance below 90 percent.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: -Our Area of Focus is intentional, rigorous, standards based instruction (core and small group). There will be an increased emphasis on our students with disabilities. -Ensuring our students are exposed to rigorous, standards based instruction that is differentiated and meets their individual needs is imperative to sustain and increase student growth.

Measurable Outcome: -The specific measurable outcomes that we want to see: ELA Achievement - 65%, Math Achievement - 65%, Science Achievement -65%, ELA Learning Gains - 65%, Math Learning Gains - 70%, ELA Reading Bottom Quartile Learning Gains - 65% and Math Bottom Quartile Learning Gains - 65%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Brian Harvey (brian.harvey@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: -Each day, learning targets will be visible to students, preparing them for instructional content delivery and assessment methods. Introducing learning targets that detail the specific standard(s) our students are learning and how the teacher will assess learning will provide vital information that increases student engagement and learning. Learning Targets will be coupled with differentiated, standards based, small group instruction. Skillful understanding of student strengths and weakness across all standards will drive small group instruction decisions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: -The strategies that we focused on are proven strategies that show positive effects on student engagement and learning per John Hattie's work in "Visible Learning". His hinge point for the average effect size for an intervention is .4. The strategies that we are using are all above the hinge point of .4. Teacher Clarity (Learning Targets) .75, Small Group Learning .47, and Teacher Expectations (Learning Targets) .43.

Action Steps to Implement

-Provide professional development and coaching around small group instruction in math.

Person Responsible Kirsten Simenson (kirsten.simenson@hcps.net)

-Provide professional development and coaching around small group instruction in math.

Person Responsible Kara Brush (kara.brush@hcps.net)

-Increase common planning time.

Person Responsible Brian Harvey (brian.harvey@hcps.net)

Professional development around Learning Targets.

- 1) A refresher for teachers that have implemented Learning Targets
- 2) A more detailed PD for staff new to Learning Targets.

Person Responsible Brian Harvey (brian.harvey@hcps.net)

Provide professional development and coaching around small group instruction in Reading.

Person Responsible Laura Schulte (laura.schulte@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Administration will partner with school leaders to continue to find opportunities that will allow our teachers to common plan during a PLC. Increased time with their grade level teams, focusing on standards based instruction, will benefit every student.

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.

In cooperation with our talented PTA, we host multiple events that bring our community into our school. We partner quarterly events with academically aligned events that allow our students and teachers to teach our community. Working together with our community has also allowed us to successfully host our Winter Dance that saw over 550 people attend. The support of our community and stakeholders crucial and we value it tremendously.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00