

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Summerfield 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 | 17 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 25 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 25 |

Summerfield Elementary School

11990 BIG BEND RD, Riverview, FL 33579

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Andrea Bryner

Start Date for this Principal: 2/13/2016

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 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 (49%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (47%) |
| 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 | 17 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 25 |

Summerfield Elementary School

11990 BIG BEND RD, Riverview, FL 33579

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p> | <p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p> | <p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>74%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>69%</p> |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

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

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 2/13/2016, Andrea Bryner

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.*

2

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

59

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 (49%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (47%) |
| 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 | 126 | 103 | 138 | 133 | 147 | 128 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 775 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 19 | 17 | 10 | 11 | 19 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| 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 | 7 | 26 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 43 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/29/2020

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 | 102 | 127 | 122 | 141 | 128 | 121 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 741 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 29 | 28 | 21 | 27 | 26 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 147 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 74 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 262 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 15 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | 102 | 127 | 122 | 141 | 128 | 121 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 741 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 29 | 28 | 21 | 27 | 26 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 147 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 74 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 262 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 15 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 48% | 52% | 57% | 51% | 52% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 48% | 55% | 58% | 53% | 55% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 52% | 50% | 53% | 48% | 51% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 51% | 54% | 63% | 63% | 53% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 50% | 57% | 62% | 54% | 54% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 44% | 46% | 51% | 48% | 46% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 50% | 50% | 53% | 55% | 48% | 51% |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| | (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% | 52% | -3% | 58% | -9% |
| | 2018 | 55% | 53% | 2% | 57% | -2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 47% | 55% | -8% | 58% | -11% |
| | 2018 | 46% | 55% | -9% | 56% | -10% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -8% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 40% | 54% | -14% | 56% | -16% |
| | 2018 | 35% | 51% | -16% | 55% | -20% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -6% | | | | |

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

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 49% | 51% | -2% | 53% | -4% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 41% | 52% | -11% | 55% | -14% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 8% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Subgroup Data

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 31 | 41 | 35 | 27 | 36 | 40 | 14 | | | | |
| ELL | 23 | 42 | 69 | 37 | 42 | 33 | 32 | | | | |
| BLK | 40 | 46 | 38 | 34 | 46 | 50 | 39 | | | | |
| HSP | 42 | 44 | 53 | 46 | 38 | 38 | 43 | | | | |
| MUL | 55 | 68 | | 58 | 62 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 56 | 47 | 50 | 59 | 61 | 40 | 63 | | | | |
| FRL | 40 | 47 | 56 | 44 | 42 | 44 | 41 | | | | |

| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 20 | 31 | 28 | 26 | 33 | 25 | 8 | | | | |
| ELL | 31 | 29 | 39 | 45 | 37 | 38 | 18 | | | | |
| BLK | 41 | 35 | 20 | 48 | 44 | 42 | 46 | | | | |
| HSP | 43 | 40 | 37 | 51 | 40 | 30 | 34 | | | | |
| MUL | 41 | 33 | | 44 | 27 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 57 | 38 | 33 | 65 | 49 | 31 | 46 | | | | |
| FRL | 41 | 35 | 32 | 48 | 39 | 36 | 39 | | | | |

| 2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD | 15 | 35 | 39 | 30 | 50 | 53 | 31 | | | | |
| ELL | 34 | 45 | 45 | 44 | 50 | 48 | 31 | | | | |
| BLK | 49 | 52 | 71 | 61 | 63 | 62 | 48 | | | | |
| HSP | 42 | 43 | 25 | 52 | 44 | 38 | 40 | | | | |
| MUL | 44 | 83 | | 72 | 58 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 60 | 60 | 59 | 71 | 58 | 67 | 77 | | | | |
| FRL | 41 | 51 | 50 | 55 | 51 | 50 | 46 | | | | |

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|------------------------------|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | TS&I |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 53 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 80 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 423 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|----------------------|--|
|----------------------|--|

| Students With Disabilities | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
|-----------------------------------|--|

| | |
|---|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 38 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| English Language Learners | |
|----------------------------------|--|
|----------------------------------|--|

| | |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 45 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 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 | 42 |
| 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 | 48 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

| Hispanic Students | |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 61 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 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 | 54 |
| 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 | 49 |
| 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.

I-Ready Math in grades 1,3 and 4 after Diagnostic 2 showed 10-15 points below the district avg..

Factors were due to the varied resources the district provided with Math, the teachers seemed confused about a direct targeted path to attack the standards with the overwhelming amount of resources that were provided during pre-planning last year. Also Math is a reading test in many ways and our school wide vocabulary levels were low for this group. Our main tool is our I-Ready data used in Diagnostic 2. There has been a direct correlation of the data gathered in this assessment window for all grades KG-5 as to how each student will finish the year. There is an additional correlation between how students score on or above their targeted grade level in grades 3-5 in relation to how they would score in the FSA ELA and Math annual state assessments.

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

Grade 4 I-Ready Math. We were 15 points below the district I-ready diagnostic 2 level and this group who moved up from grade 3 the prior year in FSA were 5% points below the district avg. in the 2019 testing year.

Factors in this area are directly related to vocabulary development. Our I-Ready usage data was below our I-Ready reading on-time of task over the past calendar year. We also didn't start the district monthly assessment format for grades 3-5 until January. Most of the other schools that were low in achievement launched that platform in September. The focus here was multiple text use and vocabulary development. Math focus was directly related to visual model development and drill and kill of basic facts. We continue to provide literature to take home to those families in school events like All Pro Dad's and IMom monthly events. Free literacy resources and focus are the basis of these often we attended functions.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Our 4th grade Math group was minus 12 points below the State avg. entering grade 5. This group dropped 9 % points from their grade 3 proficiency level within FSA testing the prior year. The deficit in the area of informational test and vocabulary are the two key contributing factors that show why our students leave grade 3 and have declined in math as they move onto grades 4 and 5. We did purchase Math resources for our Lower SES families to utilize and check-out. Our implementation of our ELA focus also included specific targets at vocabulary across literacy genres in order to improve overall literacy focus on vocabulary development that would cross-over to Math and Science Assessments. We also targeted subgroups with Extending Learning Program tutors for those students who needed additional gap instruction in ELA in grades 3-5. The families that need the resources and learning strategy focus are the families we often don't get to our main school functions. With this being said, it is hard to expect those families to access our parent and family resources on a consistent basis. The transitions to more visual models of Math development has been a huge barrier for our parents. The basic standard algorithm is what most parents have learned in their educational training as students and now each child is expected to represent their Math proficiency by the additional step of showing Math equations in more abstract forms in all grade levels.

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

Our Science Proficiency grade for our 5th grades increased by 10% points and was only 4% below the state avg. as compared to 14% the prior year. Our immediate attention to launch the year was directed towards vocabulary development and application to the informational text specifically. We also used some of our Title I dollars to provide 6 tutoring sessions on all the standards that were lacking in Science in grade 5 right before the FSA assessment to close gaps across all the domains tested in grade 5 for FSA. The additional use of journal entries for each Science block for all the teachers in grade 5 allowed a great reference tool for each learner to do a deep dive on vocabulary and laboratory experiments when they reviewed for monthly assessments.

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

1. Our current class of fourth-graders entering grade 5 have a large pool of Level 1 students in both Reading and Math Proficiency..
2. Our school wide attendance shows 91 students from the prior year below 90% attendance.

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

1. Parent Involvement and Family Engagement

We have low parent/family attendance at our after-school functions; particularly at our academically-based functions (Literacy night, Math Night, FSA Prep Night, etc.)

School data shows that parents are not happy with the communications from our school. Our school data shows that the event times are not convenient for many of our parents. Parents may not feel comfortable attending these events. Parents may not feel connected to our school and when there is no connection, there is no willingness to be more involved.

We provided surveys to determine what times might work better for our families when we do hold school functions and academic nights. Integrated our internal communication with PTA on their functions. Pre-planned the school calendar of events and included that with our first-day packet to inform parents earlier of upcoming events (especially academic nights) for the 2019-2020 school year. We incorporated a Literacy Night, a Community Math Night at a local vendor and a Grade Level FSA/Testing night during our Open House in the Fall.) Purchased literacy and math games and resources that are housed in our Parent and Family Involvement area so families could check-out resources they could use at home to support their young learners.

Our Open House event was not as effective as we anticipated due to the timing of the night. Because it was scheduled a few weeks after our Meet and Greet Night to launch the school year we had a moderate turn-out. We have discussed maybe combining our Meet and Greet and Open House focus into one evening to launch the 2020-2021 school year. Our Literacy Night was also not as large as we needed. The families we needed to draw didn't attend in volume. We may have to entice those families with daycare for their kiddos and some type of dinner or snack to pull them out. We have learned that events with dinner choices help draw out our populations we need to attend.

2. Math Proficiency and Learning Gains directly related to Problem Solving and vocabulary. Our hinderance to achieve academic gains in math proficiency is directly tied to our challenge with academic vocabulary development.

Our students lack the confidence to attack academic vocabulary. Our students are highly mobile; which directly affects their schema because of the gaps in the curriculum.

The curriculum resources for math have not been consistent over the last few years, which has resulted in teachers creating their own materials to supplement the curriculum and teach the standards. Teachers do not have anyone to help them plan and prepare materials.

3. ELA/Writing Learning Gains with an added focus on SWD's.

We are below district and state levels in ELA Achievement. Our teachers are struggling with fitting in the amount of time required to effectively support this skill (i.e. comparing two text sets, conferencing, etc.).

Our students are struggling when it comes to writing in response to reading. As a school and as a district, we have been struggling with how to balance time appropriately between reading and writing. Students now need reading stamina in order to test successfully in writing.

We are working to gain proficiency in our ELA scores and this must include the ability to compare multiple texts, understand complex vocabulary and write an informative or opinion paragraph, which is not currently a common practice in our classrooms.

Through the use of our Reading Coach we targeted vocabulary development, reading stamina, small group instruction using Guided Reading Coaching and multiple text exposure. Our Extended Learning Program utilized tutors to directly attack vocabulary development within multiple genres of literature.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching

Provide coaching to all content area, because everyone teaches reading in their subject area. PD training using the Guided Reading Book: The Next Steps Forward in Guided Reading by Jan Richardson. Training will occur monthly with book study in PLC and Faculty designated meetings. 48 Teachers who drill down to ELA standards will be involved with this training, including resource teachers in ELL, ESE Specialist, Media Specialist, Administrators (2) and selected Support staff members that tutor for state testings. Monitor and provide coaching to all content area, because everyone teaches reading in their subject area. PD training using the Guided Reading Book: The Next Steps Forward in Guided Reading by Jan Richardson. Training will occur monthly with book study in PLC and Faculty designated meetings.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Action Steps:

1. Reading coach will work with PLC's on targeted planning of the grade-levels standards that show areas to target based on I-ready and other baseline assessments as well as mid-year diagnostic assessments.
2. Small group Extended Learning tutoring during the school day will use retired teachers to work in small group instruction focusing on standard specific deficit areas established through PLC team analysis of data from Interim and formative assessments.
3. The use of subs to cover teacher centered data chats with administration regarding I-ready data aligned with the diagnostic windows 1 (baseline) and 2 (mid-year) will be used to attack data analysis of student annual and stretch goals for Reading/Math.

Bi-Monthly PLC and faculty book study PD sessions. Focusing on instructional practices targeted at small group instruction and remediation.

Measurable Outcome:

Only 38% of our SWD met proficiency in state assessments in the 2018-2019 school year. With no testing last year, our focus is to increase small group instruction with elevated Guiding Reading Professional Development. With precision of differentiated supports within the ELA block directly embedded in Guided Reading, our focus of improving vocabulary depth and proficiency will elevate comprehension, fluency and stamina for this struggling sub-group.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carmine Alfano (carmine.alfano@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

48 Teachers who drill down to ELA standards will be involved with this training, including resource teachers in ELL, ESE Specialist, Media Specialist, Administrators (2) and selected Support staff members that tutor for state testings. Monitor and control daily usage of i-Ready software that dianostically monitors student learning in ELA.

ELP tutoring with highly qualified tutors throughout the school year. The target is gap instruction for our SWD learners in a small group setting for students in grades 3-5. The area of focus will be ELA, Math and Science. Science will only target those in grade 5 who take the state assessment.

**Rationale
for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

Through PSLT reviews and coaching cycles weekly the implementation of standards based planning directly related to Guided Reading Instruction will elevate our Tier 2 and Tier 3 small and individual interventions for reading vocabulary, comprehension and fluency. The end result is higher comprehension in multiple texts with stamina needed for each targeted grade level.

Proficiency in Grades 3-5 will increase a minimum of 10% to go to 48% proficient for this ESSA subgroup for all SWD's in Math, Reading and Science.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly feedback notes of best practices targeting standard specific objectives with the use of small group instruction through data obtained during systematic class walk throughs.

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

Pedagogical instructional strategies within PD Monday's and faculty meetings monthly focusing on Guided Reading practices that align with phonemic awareness and phonics development within small group instruction.

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

Weekly feedback notes of best practices targeting standard specific objectives with the use of small group instruction.

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

Pedagogical instructional strategies within PD Monday's and faculty meetings monthly focusing on Guided Reading practices that align with phonemic awareness and phonics development within small group instruction.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Gap instruction directly related to Math vocabulary development. The carryover from the small group work in the ELA professional development will cross-over to other Core content areas, especially math and science.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ELP tutors will target complex vocabulary words embedded within questioning for students in grades 3-5 with an emphasis on grades 4-5 to achieve gain points related directly to proficiency.
 The use of subs to cover teacher centered data chats with administration regarding I-ready data aligned with the diagnostic windows 1 (baseline) and 2 (mid-year) will be used to attack data analysis of student annual and stretch goals for Math.

Measurable Outcome: Close the gap between grades 3-5 from roughly 10 points per grade related to state averages. Goal is to have the proficiency in grades 3-5 meet the district and state averages.

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

To monitor I-Ready Math usage to insure all students are achieving their annual and stretch goals by Diagnostic 2 around the mid-year mark. Progress monitoring lesson success and usage with the diagnostic tool will keep each learner on track to hit their stretch goal.

Evidence-based Strategy: ELP tutoring with highly qualified tutors throughout the school year. The target is gap instruction for our SWD learners in a small group setting for students in grades 3-5. The area of focus will be ELA, Math and Science. Science will only target those in grade 5 who take the state assessment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: There is a direct correlation between I-Ready success and FSA performance levels over the past two years for our district. We will also correlate grades 3-5 with district Interim assessments in math as well as the monthly assessments we began last year in grades 3-5.

Proficiency in Grades 3-5 will increase a minimum of 10% to go to 48% proficient for this ESSA subgroup for all SWD's in Math, Reading and Science.

Action Steps to Implement

Data dives into monthly district assessments in all grade levels. Strong emphasis on grades 3-5. Focus is to build math stamina in the word application processes and to isolate strand specific standard areas that need small group instruction, scaffolding.

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

Small group tutoring in grades 4-5 from January until testing in April. Repetitive use of additional practice sessions with basic math vocabulary and equations such as multiplication, division, decimal point placement, visual models to enhance gap instruction deficits.

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

Math Night in the early Spring to incorporate basic addition, subtraction and use of money within a community setting for all families who attend.

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

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We provided surveys to determine what times might work better for our families when we do hold school functions and academic nights. Integrated our internal communication with PTA on their functions. Pre-planned the school calendar of events and included that with our first-day packet to inform parents earlier of upcoming events (especially academic nights) for the 2019-2020 school year. We incorporated a Literacy Night, a Community Math Night at a local vendor and a Grade Level FSA/Testing night during our Open House in the Fall.) Purchased literacy and math games and resources that are housed in our Parent and Family Involvement area so families could check-out resources they could use at home to support their young learners.

Measurable Outcome: We provided surveys to determine what times might work better for our families when we do hold school functions and academic nights. Integrated our internal communication with PTA on their functions. Pre-planned the school calendar of events and included that with our first-day packet to inform parents earlier of upcoming events (especially academic nights) for the 2019-2020 school year. We incorporated a Literacy Night, a Community Math Night at a local vendor and a Grade Level FSA/Testing night during our Open House in the Fall.) Purchased literacy and math games and resources that are housed in our Parent and Family Involvement area so families could check-out resources they could use at home to support their young learners.

Attendance of school events, use of resources and then comparison of survey results from 2018-2019 to 2029-2020.

Our measurable outcome is to double our parent participation in school Night time events.

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

Evidence-based Strategy: The strategy is to use needs assessment surveys to inquire parent availability to the times we schedule and to couple our informational events with Zoom opportunities so parents can see recorded functions or visit virtually while the function is presented across the campus.

The creation of brochures and flyers as well as school created materials to support academic and social functions allow information to be transferred to each stakeholder. Additional use of sign-in sheets allows us to monitor and capture participation for every school function.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The use of Daily student planners to communicate with our working families about academic, behavioral and social events directly related to each child and family. Any school correspondence is captured with the daily planners.

Rationale is that parents cannot navigate their own schedules to attend many of the academic and social events we drive at our site. The use of virtual presentations and posting the link on our district site and Facebook page allows parents access either live or later when they have more time to view the presentations or events.

Action Steps to Implement

The use of daily planners to highlight calendar events for each family to participate within. These are also reinforced by weekly parent link messages targeting key academic nights, events and targets throughout the year.

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

Literacy night in the virtual platform model due to COVID-19. School wide presentation at every grade level using fiction and non-fiction text to promote independent reading and text comparison strategies within all grade levels.

Person Responsible Karen Simpson (karenm.simpson@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Due to COVID-19 the delayed start of IMOM and All Pro Dad's breakfast bunches inciting parents to have breakfast and work on basic social and academic celebrations they can have with their child when they are at home to reinforce practices we utilize within the school setting.

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

Distribution of Literacy, Math and social board games and resources to each family through a check-out system to enhance gap deficits within the Tier 2 and Tier 3 levels of support needed to enhance MTSS data.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

1. Parent and Family Engagement: Although we did get some general feedback about events and scheduling regarding our annual yearly communication, we need to get more targeted times. One focus moving forward may be to have more Saturday events or nights that precede a three day weekend. These considerations should be the focus of our scheduling plans for the upcoming school year. Utilizing academic resources may involve more internal strategic targets of classrooms, students and families that may need the resources but never come to school to access them or sign them out for use.

2. Math Proficiency and Learning Gains directly related to Problem Solving and vocabulary: We did purchase Math resources for our Lower SES families to utilize and check-out. Our implementation of our ELA focus also included specific targets at vocabulary across literacy genres in order to improve overall literacy focus on vocabulary development that would cross-over to Math and Science Assessments. We also targeted subgroups with Extending Learning Program tutors for those students who needed additional gap instruction in ELA in grades 3-5. This included Administration pulling targeted subgroups in grades 4 and 5 in the areas of ELA, Math and Science. The focus here was multiple text use and vocabulary development. Math focus was directly related to visual model development and drill and kill of basic facts. We continue to provide literature to take home to those families in school events like All Pro Dad's and IMom monthly events. Free literacy resources and focus are thELA/Writing Learning Gains with an added focus on SWD's.e basis of these often we attended functions.

Our Math Night is scheduled for early January at a local Grocery store that is used by many of our parents. This evening is designed to teach parents how the Math concepts are applied to real world shopping. The event is designed to bring in more of our lower SES families who do not have the modeling of applying Math concepts to real world problems. The goal to elevate our turnout at least 100% greater than last year is achievable. We instituted a Math presentation/ games night in 2018-19 and the turnout was minimal. Roughly 50 families attended that function and the focus was not directly related to application of Math concepts. This years focus is probelm solving using real-life applications to family shopping and planning of their resources.

3. ELA/Writing Learning Gains with an added focus on SWD's: Because of our budget cuts in tutoring dollars using Title I funding, we have to push back our targeted tutoring focus in grades 3-5 and be more strategic in those subgroups we select. Small group instruction is Look-For focus of the school in all grade-levels and that fidelity of daily Core Instruction with standards based focus in small group work is critical to our student achievement gap instruction focus. We also will implement a schoolwide Professional Development focus on Guided Reading driven by the Research based work of Jan Richardson and her book titled, The Next Step Forward in Guided Reading. All teachers teach reading regardless of the subject area. The faculty will utilize this book to drive a schoolwide book study and a series of PD breakout sessions throughout the 2020-2021 school year to increase our understanding of the importance of all the strategies that support Guided Reading instruction. This training will be spearheaded by the Reading Coach and Administration as a target area for the upcoming school year.

Gap instruction tutoring was effective with our lower quartile students and our gains scores in grades 4-5. Vocabulary development was hard to guage because it is directly related to many reading skills in language development and then comprehension applications. Our direct focus on vocabulary development with the Science groups we tutored in grade 5 showed a 7% gain in proficiency in the annual State assessment of FSA. Another support we utilized to enhance stamina and identify gap instruction needs was driven with our commitment to the i-Ready data and the standard directly correlated to each students diagnostic profile. Through multiple sessions with the Area trainer who supported each teacher through individual conferences we developed more efficient ways to utilize the i-Ready toolbox resources, cloze reads and the manipulation of controlling student lessons to enhance the learning paths for each learner.

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.

The school starts this process with our Student-Teacher-Parent compact we use annually to make a commitment to the learning and communication between all the key stakeholders. We also use Conscious Discipline as our Tier i Behavioral support system to create the school family and develop classroom and campus culture. Our events at night support academic conversations in the area of ELA, Math and Science which were scheduled based on our Impact survey results we gathered this past Spring. We also host monthly breakfast events utilizing the All Pro Dad's and IMOM's programs which are research based and provide a sense of belonging for all our stakeholders who attend. Many other social events are driven by our PTA and those business partners who have established. Our goal this year is to increase our PTA participation from the family side, as well as our SAC participation.

We have also established touch point mentors on our staff to make direct connections with those youngsters who need a check-in person daily or even more frequently depending on their unique situations at home. The focus on making students ready for instruction can only be achieved if we alleviate any stressors those youngsters are dealing with daily. This SEL framework is discussed and facilitated by our PSLT weekly as well as the work our two School Counselors do daily.

Another contributing factor this year will be the use of Zoom virtual invitations to those who cannot attend school functions and still want to participate in the growth of our school family.

The use of FACEBOOK and Twitter with our district webpage and parents links helps bridge the communication gap between the district, the school and the community.

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: Instructional Coaching | | | | \$145,345.90 |
|---|----------|--|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-----|--------------|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 6400 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 4211 - Summerfield Elementary School | Title, I Part A | 1.0 | \$91,345.90 |

| | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|--|---|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|
| | | | <i>Notes: Purchase one full-time reading coach to implement Guided Reading Coaching as well as implementation of the total ELA program in grades K-5. I direct focus will be targeted to the SWD group that performed below 40% proficient.</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 4211 - Summerfield Elementary School | Title, I Part A | 0.0 | \$50,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: 4 ELP tutors used to do gap instruction (standards based) with small groups in grades 3-5 based on Interim assessments that are aligned with FSA proficiency specifically in ELA (reading and writing).</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 140-Substitute Teachers | 4211 - Summerfield Elementary School | Title, I Part A | 0.0 | \$4,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Substitute teachers used to cover classrooms while homeroom teachers in K-5 do data analysis with administration or with district trainers who support curriculum platforms we utilize. In my case it will be I-ready face to face data talks.</i> | | | |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | | | | \$18,000.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 5100 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 4211 - Summerfield Elementary School | Title, I Part A | 0.0 | \$15,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: 4 ELP tutors used to do gap instruction (standards based) with small groups in grades 3-5 based on Interim assessments that are aligned with FSA proficiency specifically in Math.</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 4211 - Summerfield Elementary School | Title, I Part A | 0.0 | \$3,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: 4 ELP tutors used to do gap instruction (standards based) with small groups in grade 5 based on Interim assessments that are aligned with Sunshine State Science Standards proficiency specifically 6 weeks prior to grade 5 state testing for Science.</i> | | | |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement | | | | \$9,560.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 6150 | 510-Supplies | 4211 - Summerfield Elementary School | Title, I Part A | 0.0 | \$3,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Student communication folders used daily K-5. Printed information driven by the school and all the stakeholders will be distributed home for each child. These folders will be monitored by each Homeroom teacher assigned to their caseload.</i> | | | |
| | 6150 | 510-Supplies | 4211 - Summerfield Elementary School | Title, I Part A | 0.0 | \$6,560.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Program flyers and brochures that support All Pro Dads and IMOM breakfast events, academic nights, PTA events, school social events, Conference and open house programs and the Annual Title I meeting presentation.</i> | | | |
| | | | | | Total: | \$172,905.90 |