

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Seffner Elementary School



2021-22 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	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

Seffner Elementary School

109 CACTUS RD, Seffner, FL 33584

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Renel Mathurin

Start Date for this Principal: 1/4/2016

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
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 (41%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (42%)
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 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	21

Seffner Elementary School

109 CACTUS RD, Seffner, FL 33584

[no web address on file]

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	74%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	60%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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.

We will equip, empower and enrich our future leaders - E3

Provide the school's vision statement.

Seffner Elementary will become the district's front-runner in developing problem solvers ready for tomorrow's challenges.

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
Hermann, Shelly	Principal	Principal of the School
Mounce, Sara	Instructional Media	Teacher Leader
Pendergrast, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Teacher Leader
Whitehead, Amy	Teacher, K-12	Teacher Leader
Atherton, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	Teacher Leader
Brown, Aimee	Teacher, ESE	ESE Specialist of the School
Claffie, Kristine	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of the School

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 1/4/2016, Renel Mathurin

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.*

0

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

20

Total number of students enrolled at the school

389

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

2

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

6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	61	68	52	62	67	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	384
Attendance below 90 percent	21	19	22	21	18	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	10	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	13	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	11	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	30	21	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/9/2021

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	58	65	55	68	62	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	381
Attendance below 90 percent	10	9	10	12	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
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	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	58	65	55	68	62	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	381
Attendance below 90 percent	10	9	10	12	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
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	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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				45%	52%	57%	47%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				47%	55%	58%	42%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	50%	53%	29%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				43%	54%	63%	52%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				43%	57%	62%	51%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				18%	46%	51%	34%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				46%	50%	53%	38%	51%	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	41%	52%	-11%	58%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	46%	55%	-9%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
05	2021					
	2019	45%	54%	-9%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	34%	54%	-20%	62%	-28%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	45%	57%	-12%	64%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	60%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	47%	51%	-4%	53%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tool we used to compile the data was I-Ready.

Grade 1					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		19%	59%	84%
	Economically Disadvantaged		16%	42%	51%
	Students With Disabilities		0	0	0
	English Language Learners		0	0	0
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		29%	59%	74%
	Economically Disadvantaged		10%	33%	43%
	Students With Disabilities		0	0	0
	English Language Learners		0	0	0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	14%	14%	44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	4%	4%
	Students With Disabilities	63%	83%	83%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	41%	87%	104%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19%	48%	58%
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	83%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	40%	59%	61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	52%	59%	57%
	Students With Disabilities	94%	103%	103%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	10%	30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8%	27%	39%
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	49%	73%	52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	38%	38%	21%
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	37%	37%	52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14%	24%	26%
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30%	50%	60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13%	21%	25%
	Students With Disabilities	100%	0%	100%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	30%	50%	40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4%	13%	25%
	Students With Disabilities	0	97%	97%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	60%	48%	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	36%	36%	0
	Students With Disabilities	60%	60%	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

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	37	54		23	77						
ELL	29			29							
BLK	27	30		28	50						
HSP	27	27		17	27	33	21				
MUL	47			33							
WHT	50	67		34	46		44				
FRL	35	34	40	25	37	44	27				
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	24	39	33	27	33	19	26				
ELL	29	36		24	57	45					
BLK	31	33		33	38		43				
HSP	40	47	47	33	43	32	35				
MUL	31			31							
WHT	55	53	50	55	45		59				
FRL	36	46	46	35	35	23	40				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	26	33	22	37	49	29	23				
ELL	22	17		26	36						
BLK	35	31		36	39	30	20				
HSP	44	43	30	51	52	33	28				
MUL	53			53							
WHT	52	42	29	55	57	44	45				
FRL	43	42	29	46	50	38	34				

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	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	78
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	330

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	34
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	33
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	40
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

Multiracial Students	
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	48
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	40
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?

Looking at the progress monitoring assessments, the economically disadvantaged students in grades 1-3 and 5th grade increased in percentage of I-Ready from the Fall to the Spring in both Reading and Math. In the subgroup "all students", grades 1-5 went up in percentage for I-Ready in both areas of Reading and Math from the Fall to the Spring.

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

Looking at the I-Ready progress monitoring assessments, the data shows that of the areas for improvement is needed in the area of Math. Looking at the achievement percentile in Math on the FSA, the score dropped from a 67% in 2018-2019 to a 60% in 2020-2021. Looking at the learning gains percentile in Math on the FSA, the score dropped from a 64% in 2018-2019 to a 51% in 2020-2021.

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

The data showed that in the area of Math on I-Ready and on the FSA, the percentile decreased from the year before. We would be utilizing district coaches to help in the area of planning. District coaches would also come out and model lessons and have teachers participate in a Fishbowl model. Teachers would participate in virtual monthly PD's for math online and give the Math monthly's to their students.

Data would be discussed at ILT meetings and during PLC's. Teacher Leaders and the Instructional Leadership team would work together to come up with strategies and techniques that teachers can incorporate into their daily instruction. If necessary, the faculty can participate in professional developments in person with a district coach or resource person.

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

Looking at the progress monitoring data for I-Ready, students made the most gains in percentage from Fall to Spring in the area of Reading.. Looking at FSA in the area of achievement, the percentage was higher for all grades in Reading compared to Math. Reading had 75% for grade 3, 74% for grade 4, and 75% for grade 5. Math had for grade 3 70%, 60% for grade 4, and 72% for grade 5.

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

Our focus was centered around planning and looking more in depth at the data based off the common grade level assessments. We used the backward design model to help drive our instruction. We discussed in PLC's what we were going to do for students who did not master the standards and what we were going to do for those students who did master the standards. We differentiated the tasks and assignments we gave the students based on their needs.

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

We will utilize and implement the strategies that are in the Reading Strategies Book by Jennifer Serravallo within our acceleration small groups for ELA. We will use the strategies and resources within Canvas to help drive acceleration instruction. Also, we will use the lessons from I-Ready.

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.

We will have I-Ready professional developments throughout the year with a district I-Ready resource person. Faculty members can take professional developments virtually or in person that are focused on acceleration. Also, faculty members can work with the reading resource teacher on ways to accelerate in small group instruction for reading and engage in coaching cycles.

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

Connect PLC work to planning session by highlighting the standards/strategy/literacy needs that arise from student data analysis, to include actual student work. Implement a planning structure with ELA grade level teams in grades 3-5 that will allow them to internalize the Guiding Question and use it as a basis for backwards planning. Develop a framework for team planning around the student end task aligned to the Guiding Unit question and focus standards.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The data shows that compared to other elementary schools in the state; we are in the yellow for out of school suspensions but green for incident rates.

Measurable Outcome: Number of students with out of school suspension will decrease by 10%

Monitoring: Leadership team will review discipline data monthly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Shelly Hermann (shelly.hermann@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: PBIS training
De-escalation strategies
Resources or a coach to consult with teachers who have high incident rates
Think Tank Club

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Classroom management and environments that lead to high incident rates

Action Steps to Implement

Our first step is to have Katrina Hudson come out and do an overview training on PBIS with our faculty so everyone understands how PBIS should look in the classroom. About once or twice a monthly if needed Amy Whitehead (3rd grade teacher) and Jessica Atherton (5th grade teacher) will lead the Think Tank Club on Fridays. During the club, teachers can come to us with the assistance of other expert teachers and ask for advice on management strategies and resources to implement in their classroom for challenging students. Also, we can provide some de-escalation strategies to help the teachers in their rooms. We can also share some de-escalation strategies at faculty meetings. If these strategies still do not seem to help, we can provide some outside resources or a coach from district to help the teachers decrease their incident rates.

Person Responsible Shelly Hermann (shelly.hermann@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math scores were significantly lower than ELA scores.
Measurable Outcome:	50% of students will score proficient on iReady diagnostoc math tests throughout the year
Monitoring:	Data meetings with Leadership team quarterly
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Shelly Hermann (shelly.hermann@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional developments offered online by the district Professional learning communities offered monthly to go over the district math monthly assessments Book study or professional development for math engagement Professional development on math manipulatives
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students who have lost instruction

Action Steps to Implement

First, all math teachers can attend the bi-monthly math professional developments offered through teams. All math teachers can also go over math data, formal assessments, and informal assessments during their professional learning communities at least twice a month. The district math coach can come into the classrooms, observe, model, and provide feedback to administration, as well as teachers. If further action is needed, Shelly Hermann the principal can have book study or professional development on math engagement and manipulatives. School wide data tracker sheet will include the following subgroups: SWD, ELL, Asian, Black/African American, Hispanic, Multiracial, and Economically Disadvantaged. We will monitor the data in the data tracker monthly.

Person Responsible Shelly Hermann (shelly.hermann@hcps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2021 ELA FSA scores, 35 % in grade 3, 33 % in grade 4, and 44 % in grade 5 scored at proficiency. These scores were due to backward design lesson planning focusing on remediation.. This had a negative effect. By focusing on ELA proficiency this year, the instructional improvements will include small group rotations focusing on acceleration, backward design planning with acceleration, and school wide common planning time, resulting in an improvement in student proficiency.

Measurable Outcome: ELA FSA proficiency for 3-5 will be 50% or above.

Monitoring: I-Ready Diagnostic and weekly I-Ready usage and proficiency will be monitored as well as PMA assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Shelly Hermann (shelly.hermann@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Common planning with a focus on backward planning with acceleration.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Backward planning ensures standards are addressed and daily learning targets are developed. District resource teacher will support planning weekly with site-based coach.

Action Steps to Implement

Develop a framework for team planning around the student end task aligned to the Guiding Unit question and focus standards. The framework will include the following steps:

Teachers pre-read all texts and tasks provided within the instructional guide.

District Resource Teacher will support planning by planning for planning with the site based coach.

Literacy Coach will communicate via email one week prior to planning with teachers: possible text and standard lay out, 1-2 strategy suggestions, reminder of teacher prework needed, planning agenda that communicates what happens before planning, during planning, and what they are planning for.

Teachers internalize the task by “doing the work” and discussing at planning what knowledge and skills the students will need to have to complete it successfully.

Teachers will work through a strategy with the text in order to build clarity around what parts of the text students need to see and hear modeled and what parts students can practice and apply on their own.

Based on the internalizing work, teachers will then construct daily learning targets that will contain both the skill and strategy needed for the day.

Person Responsible Shelly Hermann (shelly.hermann@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

Monitor out of school suspensions

Seffner Elementary is ranked #347 out of 1,395 other elementary schools statewide. The violent incidents are low. The property and drug/public order incidents are very low. Seffner is ranked in the middle for the state with out of school suspensions.

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.

The school will address building a positive school culture and environment by implementing the following: professional learning communities, an instructional leadership team, teacher leaders, a SAC committee, and professional developments.

All grade level faculty will participate in professional learning communities

Jessica Atherton, Sara Mounce, Jennifer Skywalker, and Amy Whitehead will serve as the teacher leaders
The SAC committee will consist of 5 parents, Shelly Hermann the principal, Amy Whitehead the SAC chair/
3rd grade teacher Nancy Cobb a first grade teacher and part of the HTU, and Jennifer Skywalker the SAC co chair/3rd grade teacher.

The instructional leadership team consists of Shelly Hermann, Kristine Claffie, Danielle Larson, Jessica Atherton, Cheryl Silva, Sherry Terle, Ms. St Germain

All faculty will be involved throughout the year in professional developments.

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

We partner with Chick Fil a and Twistte Treat for our Spirit Nights monthly.

We partner with Taco Bell, McDonalds, Revolution Ice Cream, Beef O Brady's, Dominos, and Chick fli a to recognize our students for their grades, attendance, and behavior quarterly.

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: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00