Suncoast Elementary School

2021-22 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: 6/17/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	42%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	D

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Piesik, Scott	Principal	Instructional Leader
Hughes, Dacey	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader
Liebler, Shannon	Teacher, K-12	Reading Resource
Sullivan, Diana	Teacher, PreK	ESE - SBLT
Leon, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	1st Grade - SBLT
Staton, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	2nd Grade - SBLT
Howard, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	4th Grade - SBLT
Williams, Allison	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade - SBLT
Baker, Kelly	School Counselor	Specials - SBLT
Bennett, Philip	Dean	Attendance, behavior, and PBS
Cameron, Kristen	Teacher, K-12	MTSS

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 6/17/2021, 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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
46

Total number of students enrolled at the school
805

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
1

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
2

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/17/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	

2020-21 - 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	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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				52%	54%	57%	45%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	53%	58%	33%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	52%	53%	34%	51%	48%
Math Achievement				54%	58%	63%	55%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				57%	57%	62%	40%	53%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	48%	51%	32%	43%	47%
Science Achievement				49%	54%	53%	40%	58%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	49%	57%	-8%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	59%	-8%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2021					
	2019	51%	52%	-1%	56%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	49%	62%	-13%	62%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	58%	62%	-4%	64%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2021					
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	60%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	50%	55%	-5%	53%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	27	28		28	16		24				
ELL	50			43	60						
ASN	70			90							
BLK	27			32							
HSP	46	32	36	47	41	20	27				
MUL	48			39							
WHT	55	26	7	58	48	33	38				
FRL	45	25	11	49	34	22	24				
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				

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
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	312
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	53
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	80
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	30
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	44
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	38
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	32
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on our student engagement survey, 71% of students feel supported by their peers and 64% of students work in class with students other than their friends. By increasing these percentages we will improve our school culture and create an environment that allows students to feel they can take risks and actively participate in their education.
Measurable Outcome:	We want to increase the percentage of students who feel supported by their peers to 80% and the percentage of students who work with students other than their friends to 75%.
Monitoring:	- sign-in sheets and agendas for Sanford Harmony PD - Meet Up Planner posted in classrooms - Suncoast Executive Team participation tracking form
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Sanford Harmony SEL
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Sanford Harmony SEL is a free, easy to use program that is being implemented as a district initiative. When used with fidelity this program will help foster and support student connections, collaborations, and learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Select teachers were chosen to be the Sanford Harmony representative for their grade level and will attend the Train the Trainer PD.
K - Adina Eaton, 1st - Maria Krieg, 2nd - Heather Zielinski, 3rd - Amy Hynes, 4th - Erica Enriquez, 5th - Kaitlyn Brunner, Administration - Dacey Hughes

Person Responsible	Dacey Hughes (hughes_d1@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

The master schedule will include a time for the classroom Meet Up.

Person Responsible	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Materials will be prepared and provided to teachers.

Person Responsible	Dacey Hughes (hughes_d1@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Grade level representatives will provide training during pre-school week.

Person Responsible	Dacey Hughes (hughes_d1@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Teachers and students will participate in Meet Up each morning and Buddy Up throughout the week.

Person Responsible	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will post Meet Up Planner in their rooms as part of their board configuration.

Person Responsible	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Members of the Suncoast Executive Team will participate with a different class each morning.

Person Responsible   Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Mr. Piesik will begin each staff meeting with Meet Up/Buddy Up.

Person Responsible   Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

#2. Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on our 2020-2021 District Walkthrough data 27.3% of our students were fully engaged in the work of the lesson and 27.3% of students were responsible for doing the thinking in the classroom. The 2020-2021 Administrative Walkthrough heat maps show that in Domain 3c: Engaging Students in Learning, 4% of walkthroughs fell in the Needs Improvement category, 77% fell in the Effective category, and 18% fell in the Highly Effective category.
Measurable Outcome:	On our 2021-2022 District Walkthrough, we want to increase the percentage of students engaged in the work on the lesson and the percentage of students responsible for doing the thinking in the classroom to 40%. On Administrative Walkthroughs we want to increase the percentage of Domain 3C walkthroughs in the Highly Effective category to 30%.
Monitoring:	- SBLT PLC sign in sheets and agendas - Learning Walk Reflections - Administrative Walkthrough Data - District Walkthrough Data
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Through quarterly SBLT PLCs, we will analyze data, conduct learning walks, and plan vertically to brainstorm ways to increase students engagement in and student ownership of standards based learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The Professional Learning Community format is a process that focuses on learning, collaboration, and results. PLCs are a common and proven practice to promote teacher collaboration that increases student achievement. This strategy will result in developing teacher leaders at the school.

Action Steps to Implement

Establish SBLT members.
Administration, Grade Level Representatives, MTSS Coordinator, Guidance Counselor, and Dean.

Person Responsible	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Establish SBLT PLC dates.

Person Responsible	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Develop agendas for each SBLT PLC.

Person Responsible	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Hold SBLT PLCs.

Person Responsible	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on our 2020-2021 i-Ready Reading Diagnostic Growth Report, 56% of students met their Typical Growth and 32% of students met their Stretch Growth. Based on our 2020-2021 i-Ready Math Diagnostic Growth Report, 55% of students met their Typical Growth and 29% of students met their Stretch Growth.
Measurable Outcome:	We want to increase the percentage of students who meet Typical Growth on the Reading and Math Diagnostic to 65% and the percentage of students who meet Stretch Growth on the Reading and Math Diagnostic to 40%.
Monitoring:	- PLC/Facilitated Planning Minutes - Differentiated Instruction Look fors Checklist - i-Ready Diagnostic Growth Reports
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dacey Hughes (hughes_d1@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Through weekly grade level PLCs, we will use data to plan standards-based instruction to meet the needs of our students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The Professional Learning Community format is a process that focuses on learning, collaboration, and results. PLCs are a common and proven practice to promote teacher collaboration that increases student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement	
Establish PLC dates.	
Person Responsible	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Develop agendas for each PLC.	
Person Responsible	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Hold PLCs.	
Person Responsible	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Send out PLC minutes.	
Person Responsible	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Administrative walkthroughs to ensure teachers are following the plan that was developed during the PLC.	
Person Responsible	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Review data after each i-Ready Diagnostic assessment period.	
Person Responsible	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Conduct fidelity checks using Differentiated Instruction Look fors Checklist.	

Person Responsible	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on out 2020-2021 i-Ready Diagnostic AP 3 data, 38% of Black/African American students were on or above grade level in Reading and 41% of Black/African American students were on or above level in Math.
Measurable Outcome:	We want to increase the percentage of Black/African American students who are on or above level on their i-Ready AP 3 in Reading and Math to 45%.
Monitoring:	- PLC/Facilitated Planning Minutes - Differentiated Instruction Look fors Checklist - i-Ready Diagnostic Growth Reports
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Through weekly grade level PLCs, we will use data to plan standards-based instruction to meet the needs of our students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The Professional Learning Community format is a process that focuses on learning, collaboration, and results. PLCs are a common and proven practice to promote teacher collaboration that increase student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Establish PLC dates.

Person Responsible	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Develop agendas for each PLC.

Person Responsible	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Hold PLCs.

Person Responsible	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Send out PLC minutes.

Person Responsible	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Administrative walkthroughs to ensure teachers are following the plan that was developed during PLC.

Person Responsible	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Review data after each i-Ready Diagnostic assessment period.

Person Responsible	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Conduct fidelity checks using Differentiated Instruction Look fors Checklist.

Person Responsible	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on our 2020-2021 i-Ready Diagnostic AP 3 data, 23% of Students with Disabilities were on or above grade level in Reading and 25% of Students with Disabilities were on or above level in Math.
Measurable Outcome:	We want to increase the percentage of Students with Disabilities who are on or above level on their i-Ready Diagnostic AP 3 in Reading and Math to 35%.
Monitoring:	- PLC/Facilitated Planning Minutes - Differentiated Instruction Look fors Checklist - i-Ready Diagnostic Growth Reports
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dacey Hughes (hughes_d1@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Through weekly grade level PLCs, we will use data to plan standards-based instruction to meet the needs of our students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The Professional Learning Community format is a process that focuses on learning, collaboration, and results. PLCs are a common and proven practice to promote teacher collaboration that increases student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Establish PLC dates.

Person Responsible	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Develop agendas for each PLC.

Person Responsible	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Hold PLCs.

Person Responsible	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Send out PLC minutes.

Person Responsible	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Administrative walkthroughs to ensure teachers are following the plan that was developed during the PLC.

Person Responsible	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Review data after each i-Ready Diagnostic assessment period.

Person Responsible	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Conduct fidelity checks using Differentiated Instruction Look fors Checklist.

Person Responsible	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on our 2021 ELA FSA, 38% of 5th Grade students were proficient (level 3 or higher). Based on our 2020-2021 i-Ready Reading Final Diagnostic, 35% of 2nd Grade students were mid grade level, on grade level, or above grade level.
Measurable Outcome:	We want to increase the percent of 5th Grade students who are proficient on the 2022 ELA FSA to 50%. We also want to increase the percent of 2nd Grade students who are mid grade level, on grade level, or above grade level on the final 2021-2022 i-Ready Reading Diagnostic to 50%.
Monitoring:	- PLC/Planning Sign In Sheets - PLC/Planning Minutes/Notes/Plans - Admin Walkthroughs - i-Ready Diagnostic Data
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will plan higher-order, standards-based questions to use during instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to John Hattie's research, Questioning has an effect size of 0.48, which falls in the zone of desired effects.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will preread texts and come with questions to planning/PLC.

Person Responsible	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Teachers, admin, and coach will collaborate during planning/PLC to determine standards-based, higher-order questions to use during instruction.

Person Responsible	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will use questions decided upon during planning/PLC in their instruction.

Person Responsible	Scott Piesik (piesik_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Suncoast Elementary School ranked #147 out of 1,395 elementary schools in the State of Florida. There were 0.1 incidents reported per 100 students. Compared to all elementary schools statewide, SES falls into the very low category. SES's statewide rank for total reported suspensions was #816 our of 1,395. Our primary focus for the upcoming school year will be to improve our statewide rank for total number of suspensions. The School Based Leadership Team and Positive Behavior Support Team will monitor discipline data monthly. Discipline data will be pulled from RtIB for monitoring.

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.

Suncoast Elementary plans on strengthening the positive culture & environment by implementing Sanford Harmony SEL. Harmony fosters knowledge, skills, and attitudes that students need to develop healthy identities, create meaningful relationships, and engage productively by providing SEL learning resources, tools, and strategies. Teachers will lead a Sanford Harmony Meet-Up everyday for their class and utilize Buddy-Up throughout the week. Studies have shown that students that participate in Harmony have more peer relationships and were more likely engage with a wider array of peers.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Teachers - teachers will implement the Sanford Harmony program in their classrooms daily.
Parents - parents are invited to be involved in their child's education through school events and committee (PTA/SAC/Title I) participation.
Business/Community Partners - business/community partners are invited to participate in committees. We also collaborate with them to provide resources for students, parents, and staff throughout the year.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Leadership Development	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00