Hillsborough County Public Schools

Summerfield Crossings Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Summerfield Crossings Elementary School

11050 FAIRWAY MEADOW DR, Riverview, FL 33579

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Brian Harvey
Start Date for this Principal: 2/3/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	97%
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: B (56%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: 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	
* 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

Summerfield Crossings Elementary School

11050 FAIRWAY MEADOW DR, Riverview, FL 33579

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	64%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	75%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

Together we will do "Whatever It Takes"!

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Harvey, Brian	Principal	Instructional leadership, leadership development and student safety.
Bryner, Andrea	Assistant Principal	Instructional leadership, leadership development and student safety.
Brush, Kara	Math Coach	Coaching cycles, side-by-side teaching, data analysis and PLC support.
Schulte, Laura	Reading Coach	Coaching cycles, side-by-side teaching, data analysis and PLC support.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 2/3/2014, Brian Harvey

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
3

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
44

Total number of students enrolled at the school
903

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
5

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	129	117	145	167	134	184	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	876
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	28	29	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	40	35	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
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	3	0	1	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

Date this data was collected or last updated
Sunday 8/29/2021

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	107	136	125	140	164	125	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	797
Attendance below 90 percent	15	25	16	24	21	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	107	136	125	140	164	125	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	797
Attendance below 90 percent	15	25	16	24	21	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	9	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	3	0	1	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
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				53%	52%	57%	52%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				58%	55%	58%	42%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	50%	53%	26%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				53%	54%	63%	49%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				67%	57%	62%	46%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	46%	51%	31%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				57%	50%	53%	36%	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	46%	52%	-6%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	60%	55%	5%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
05	2021					
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	44%	54%	-10%	62%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	53%	57%	-4%	64%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2021					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	60%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	51%	51%	0%	53%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Kindergarten through 5th grade ELA and MATH data represent the three I-Ready testing windows. 5th grade Science Fall data was our baseline, the Winter data was our midyear assessment and the Spring data represents our state testing results.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23%	45	64
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	39	57
	Students With Disabilities	36	21	50
	English Language Learners	11	22	33
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13	32	49
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	25	39
	Students With Disabilities	7	14	43
	English Language Learners	11	11	33

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30	50	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	25	49
	Students With Disabilities	28	48	53
	English Language Learners	10	20	33
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16	29	54
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	24	48
	Students With Disabilities	24	39	50
	English Language Learners	10	0	22

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	45	56	59
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	49	49
	Students With Disabilities	34	47	48
	English Language Learners	30	44	33
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12	29	53
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	23	40
	Students With Disabilities	19	39	36
	English Language Learners	10	25	44

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	31	37	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	27	32	44
	Students With Disabilities	13	13	17
	English Language Learners	7	7	14
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	12	33	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	28	36
	Students With Disabilities	10	30	24
	English Language Learners	6	19	0

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	27	40	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	28	38	46
	Students With Disabilities	23	27	40
	English Language Learners	0	25	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	16	33	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	36	39
	Students With Disabilities	20	32	32
	English Language Learners	0	0	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	41	40	34
	Economically Disadvantaged	36	31	27
	Students With Disabilities	32	35	11
	English Language Learners	17	28	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	7	29	33	18	36	38	14				
ELL	30	50		28	25		20				
BLK	34	42	42	32	30	50	19				
HSP	44	57		44	40		38				
MUL	52			60							
WHT	57	53		57	50		44				
FRL	37	48	43	37	37	55	30				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	16	46	41	21	51	42	32				
ELL	30	35	32	40	63	50	41				
BLK	42	49	36	44	62	50	42				
HSP	48	54	40	49	67	61	50				
MUL	70	74		65	74		91				
WHT	64	68	79	65	71	53	69				
FRL	44	50	41	46	61	51	49				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	21	30	31	23	33	33	17				
ELL	32	35	47	36	55	46	9				
BLK	46	32	25	37	35	16	19				
HSP	46	39	29	47	47	39	38				
MUL	59	45		69	55		18				
WHT	64	55		53	48	23	48				
FRL	43	37	29	41	43	33	31				

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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	375

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	95%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	36
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	47
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	56
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

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	52
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	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

In our 2020-2021 FSA Data the biggest trend was our decrease in Science scores.

Referencing our 2019 FSA data - Summerfield Crossings Elementary displayed growth in every FSA data component. We will need to ensure that our ELA and Math learning gains continue to increase. We are also prioritizing our SWD subgroup and their achievement and learning gains.

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

The greatest decline in 2019 data was within our SWD subgroup achievement level. We saw ELA achievement drop 5% and Math achievement drop 2%. We focused on differentiated instruction and it showed in our increase within the SWD subgroup learning gains. The drop in overall achievement within our SWD subgroup is our greatest need for improvement looking at 2019 data.

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

Implementing appropriately differentiated, small group instruction and providing enough collaborative common planning with our ESE teachers and our classroom teachers created the change needed. We need to refine these two areas and increase the amount of PLC support at each grade level. Our

Reading and Math Coaches, along with ESE teachers at each PLC, will help us accelerate and show gains.

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

2019 FSA data highlights Science achievement increasing by 21 percentage points. Our ELA Bottom Quartile Learning Gains also increased 21 percentage points, while our Math Bottom Quartile Learning Gains increased 23 percentage points. Within our ESSA subgroup focus, the data component that showed the most improvement was our SWD learning gains. Our ELA LG increased 16%, ELA LG BQ increased 10%, Math LG increased 18% and Math LG BQ increased 9%.

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

Increased common planning time, a science specific PLC that was headed by a science liaison, and increased professional development that focused on small group instruction all contributed to our increased scores.

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

We will need to continue to implement standards specific, small group instruction that addresses specific student needs. We will also need to continue to ensure our PLC's are integrating ESE teachers and create action plans based on current and relevant data.

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.

Professional development will focus on disaggregating and understanding current/timely I-Ready data, strategies to implement small group instruction with fidelity and also how to increase engagement in science across all grade levels.

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

We will use our Reading and Math Coach to facilitate coaching cycles, side-by-side teaching and also partner in PLC's to help data disaggregation. There will be small group instruction PD opportunities, Cognitively Guided Math Instruction PD and we will host 3-4 STEM Saturdays.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	After using the 5 Why's protocol and analyzing how we can sustain reading and math learning gains, it was determined that standards based, student specific, small group instruction would be the most valuable strategy to meet our goal.
Measurable Outcome:	Based on FSA Data from 2019: -Our SWD ESSA subgroup will increase proficiency from 36% to 42% and show a 6% gain. -Our SWD subgroup will increase ELA achievement from 16% to 20%. -Our SWD subgroup will increase Math achievement form 21% to 24% -Our ELA bottom quartile learning gains will increase from 47% to 54% and show a 7% gain. -Our ELA learning gains will increase from 58% to 62% and show a 4% gain. -Our Math bottom quartile learning gains will increase from 54% to 59% and show a 5% gain. -Our Math learning gains will increase from 67% to 70% and show a 3% gain
Monitoring:	Administration in collaboration with the Reading and math Coach will meet weekly to disaggregate timely data. Action plans from current data will be created and results will be monitored.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brian Harvey (brian.harvey@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategies focused on are proven strategies that show positive effects on student engagement/learning per John Hattie's work in "Visible Learning". His hinge point for the average effect size for an intervention is .4. When above .40, data suggest learning extends beyond what is expected from attending school for a year. The strategies we are using are all above the hinge point of .4. Differentiation (Scaffolding) .42, Small Group Learning .47, Standards Aligned Instruction (Teacher Clarity) .75. Learning targets will be visible to students, preparing students for instructional content delivery and assessment methods. Introducing learning targets that detail the specific standard(s) our students are learning and how the teacher will assess learning will provide vital information that increases student engagement and learning. Learning Targets will be coupled with differentiated, standards based, small group instruction. Skillful understanding of student strengths and weakness across all standards will drive small group instruction decisions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	To ensure all students continue to grow academically and show learning gains, differentiated small group instruction in imperative. A 2009 academic presentation "Using Data to Differentiate Instruction" (https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/ wwc_rrti_pg_rec02.pdf) stated " Differentiated reading instruction based on assessment data is essential for all students, not just those receiving interventions". The presentation also stated that "this is accomplished by varying the content focus, the amount of time spent in instruction, and the degree of teacher support and scaffolding provided to students based on their reading proficiency levels." It's extremely important we focus on our SWD, at the same time addressing all learning needs. Supporting differentiated groups during a lesson is not easy. As the Using Data to

Differentiate Instruction presentation said, "for many classroom teachers, managing independent and small-group work can be challenging..." We will ensure that training for all teachers is available by using model classroom teachers as our professional development facilitators

Action Steps to Implement

PD – Designing and implementing standards based, small group instruction in Reading. This will be facilitated by our Reading Coach during the first quarter of the school year. We will use 1-2 PLC's and a Monday to complete the training. Administration will progress monitor through formal/informal observations and through focused walk throughs that include immediate teacher feedback.

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

PD – Designing and implementing standards based, small group instruction in mathematics. This will be facilitated by our Math Coach during the first quarter of the school year. We will use 1-2 PLC's and a Monday to complete the training. Administration will progress monitor through formal/informal observations and through focused walk throughs that include immediate teacher feedback.

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

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	After using the 5 Why's protocol and analyzing how we can increase scores within our SWD subgroup, it was determined that strengthening our Professional learning Communities and better integrating ESE teachers in those PLC's would be the most valuable strategy to meet our goal.
Measurable Outcome:	Based on 2019 FSA Data: -Our SWD ESSA subgroup will increase proficiency from 36% to 42% and show a 6% gain. -Our SWD subgroup will increase ELA achievement from 16% to 20%. -Our SWD subgroup will increase Math achievement form 21% to 24% -Our ELA bottom quartile learning gains will increase from 47% to 54% and show a 7% gain. -Our ELA learning gains will increase from 58% to 62% and show a 4% gain. -Our Math bottom quartile learning gains will increase from 54% to 59% and show a 5% gain. -Our Math learning gains will increase from 67% to 70% and show a 3% gain.
Monitoring:	Administration will participate in weekly PLC's to ensure that our ESE teachers are represented and participating. When our Reading and Math Coached disaggregate data with Administration, the SWD subgroup data will be isolated and that data will be provided for all classroom teachers to discuss and analyze at a grade level PLC.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Andrea Bryner (andrea.bryner@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Developing PLC's that embrace common planning time and include a focus on ESE student data and collaborate with ESE teachers is invaluable. As our ESE teachers participate consistently and share interventions they use for students with learning needs, Hattie suggests that if these strategies are used with fidelity, the the influence rate is .77. Planning and prediction, the essence of common planning for all students, has a .76 affect size and when grade level PLC's discuss their standards focus and learning goals that will be shared with students, Hattie indicates that the effect size is .68. Common planning is also a time for teachers to discuss implementation of small group instruction. Coaches will be at all grade level PLC's to support and build teacher skill around creating and implementing small group instruction. We have documented success when small group instruction is successfully implemented in the classroom (Hattie effect size .47).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rich discussions around student growth, lack of student growth, grade level specific standards, small group implementation and data analysis are invaluable at a PLC. In an article posted in Learning Forward (https://learningforward.org/standards/learning-communities/) that focused specifically on learning communities it stated "Professional learning that increases educator effectiveness and results for all students occurs within learning communities committed to continuous improvement, collective responsibility, and goal alignment. Professional learning within communities requires continuous improvement, promotes collective responsibility, and supports alignment of individual, team, school, and school system goals. " Our Reading/Math Coaches and Administration will be able to support and progress monitor PLC's to ensure they are common planning and integrating SWD data into conversation and discussing strategies that work best for students with learning needs.

Action Steps to Implement

Create a Master Schedule for Common Planning (PLC's). Administration will publish a common planning schedule during preplanning that will dictate when other meetings are scheduled. This schedule will begin in August and end in May. PLC's will meet weekly and one predetermined Monday a month. Administration and Coaches will attend PLC's regularly. Reading and Math Coach will attend all K-5 PLC's and Administration will attend multiple PLC's weekly. Walkthroughs will allow Administration to see evidence of common planning and small group instruction.

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

Quarterly ESE Common Planning Review Meetings. Each quarter, Administration will meet with all ESE teachers to review success and struggles in their PLC's. The progress of successfully integrating ESE into PLC's will be monitored quarterly. Administration will make adjustments quarterly as barriers are defined.

Person Responsible Andrea Bryner (andrea.bryner@hcps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA proficiency was identified as a critical need area after reviewing 2020-2021 FSA data. ELA proficiency fell to 45% when we historically are above the 50% threshhold.
Measurable Outcome:	Our ELA proficiency will increase from the 2020-2021 score of 45% to 53% after the 2021-2022 FSA.
Monitoring:	Administration and the Reading/Math Coaches will participate in weekly PLC's to ensure fidelity of planning. Administration will also look for evidence of common planning through weekly walkthroughs and observations.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brian Harvey (brian.harvey@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement a planning structure (weekly common planning) with ELA grade level teams in grades 3-5 that will allow the team to internalize the Guiding Question and use it as a basis for backwards planning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Discussions around student growth, lack of student growth, grade level specific standards, small group implementation, data analysis and the Guiding Questions that are needed for backwards planning are invaluable at a PLC. In an article posted in Learning Forward (https://learningforward.org/standards/learning-communities/) that focused specifically on learning communities, it stated "Professional learning that increases educator effectiveness and results for all students occurs within learning communities committed to continuous improvement, collective responsibility, and goal alignment. Professional learning within communities requires continuous improvement, promotes collective responsibility, and supports alignment of individual, team, school, and school system goals. " Our Reading/Math Coaches and Administration will support PLC's to make sure that the Guiding Questions are uses as a basis for backwards planning. Addressing specific student needs will be crucial to increasing academic gains.

Action Steps to Implement

Develop a framework for team planning around the student end task aligned to the Guiding Unit question and focus standards.

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

Conduct focused walk throughs in grades 3-5, providing feedback to teachers on the learning target/task/ guiding questions alignment.

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

Implement coaching cycles around teacher clarity of the guiding question and its relation to the daily learning targets. An emphasis on this work will be on the teacher understanding of the guiding question and connecting it for the students to the daily learning target.

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

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.

Summerfield Crossings Elementary reported 0.1 incidents per 100 students. This rate is less than the Statewide elementary school rate of 1.0 incidents per 100 students.

Disciple Data - will be reviewed alongside our behavioral tracking data to make sure we are finding ways to support and celebrate every student.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

At Summerfield Crossings Elementary, we will develop positive environments throughout our school that will minimize negative and distracting student behavior. We will teach our students school-wide behavioral expectations, they will learn what is appropriate and then grow into socially responsible and emotionally balanced students.

By being preventative and focusing on behavioral/procedural expectations and infusing a school/class/student-wide character recognition program, we are anticipating students that will be highly engaged and ready to learn.

Celebrations will occur on our Morning Show and our Afternoon Dismissal Show.

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

Dee Ramsey and Patricia Mendez, our School Counselors, are the key personnel that will ensure the program is running smoothly. They celebrate on the morning show, conduct 7-Habits lessons in the classroom and make sure all students are incorporated in celebrations. The belief at Summerfield Crossings is that every student brings something positive and valuable to school every day. We need to celebrate it!

Classroom Teachers - our classroom teachers monitor class-wide compliments. When classes reach a particular quantity of compliments (approximately 20) the classrooms celebrate. It is a huge motivator and allows ALL STAFF a chance to compliment any class at any time.

Administration - complimenting classrooms and students.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**