

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Summerfield 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	18
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Summerfield Elementary School

11990 BIG BEND RD, Riverview, FL 33579

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Andrea Bryner

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2021

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 (49%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (53%)
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	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Summerfield Elementary School

11990 BIG BEND RD, Riverview, FL 33579

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>68%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>68%</p>

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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Alfano, Carmine	Principal	Maintain school safety; instructional leader; implement and maintain high quality instruction using district adopted curriculums; communicate school-wide data to PSLT and PLC's; progress monitor academic success, attendance, and discipline. Hire personnel to meet the multi-cultural needs of the school and establish a collaborative culture utilizing SEL and Restorative Practices to include all stakeholder.
BonannoAkel, Judith	SAC Member	Organize and facilitate SAC committee meetings. Classroom teacher in grade 5 with strong ELA strengths to facilitate instruction at that grade level.
Simpson, Karen	Reading Coach	Create high quality coaching sessions for all teachers in grades K-5 and ESE. Progress monitor all ELA and writing data that is intertwined within the curriculum instructional frameworks. Provide trends of reading success and deficits to the PSLT on a regular basis. Implement and lead professional development that increases instructional capacity for all ELA teachers. The Literacy Champion of the school who monitors resources and trends within the literacy program to improve the love for reading and writing.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/29/2021, Andrea Bryner

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

2

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

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

51

Total number of students enrolled at the school

716

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

3

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

3

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	91	111	117	96	103	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	639
Attendance below 90 percent	1	29	24	20	18	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	34	33	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	46	33	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	22	19	16	6	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	2	5	7	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	126	103	138	133	147	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	775
Attendance below 90 percent	19	17	10	11	19	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	26	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	43	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	126	103	138	133	147	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	775
Attendance below 90 percent	19	17	10	11	19	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	26	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	43	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				48%	52%	57%	47%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				48%	55%	58%	38%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	50%	53%	34%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				51%	54%	63%	55%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				50%	57%	62%	44%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	46%	51%	34%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				50%	50%	53%	41%	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	49%	52%	-3%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	47%	55%	-8%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2021					
	2019	40%	54%	-14%	56%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	62%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	49%	57%	-8%	64%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	54%	-6%	60%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	49%	51%	-2%	53%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

I-Ready diagnostic AP 1,2,3 (Fall, Winter, Spring). Achieve 3000 (Grades 3-5) Baseline and Midyear Science FSA Science

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	44	66	79
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	47	66
	Students With Disabilities	24	29	31
	English Language Learners	49	74	89
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	40	56	77
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	32	58
	Students With Disabilities	15	16	4
	English Language Learners	40	56	77

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	52	63	74
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	45	60
	Students With Disabilities	19	44	34
	English Language Learners	19	19	60
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	18	51	84
	Economically Disadvantaged	12	25	46
	Students With Disabilities	0	31	50
	English Language Learners	7	26	35

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	25	44	60
	Economically Disadvantaged	66	71	86
	Students With Disabilities	60	64	86
	English Language Learners	60	79	88
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	25	44	60
	Economically Disadvantaged	12	26	45
	Students With Disabilities	29	37	49
	English Language Learners	25	45	59

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	72	76	78
	Economically Disadvantaged	53	61	64
	Students With Disabilities	43	47	60
	English Language Learners	31	46	45
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	32	47	69
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	23	43
	Students With Disabilities	37	47	65
	English Language Learners	17	24	37

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	59	63	67
	Economically Disadvantaged	57	61	65
	Students With Disabilities	59	65	68
	English Language Learners	34	38	42
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	20	33	56
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	32	51
	Students With Disabilities	23	32	63
	English Language Learners	3	1	13
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	54	59	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	62	47	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	64	71	NA
	English Language Learners	32	42	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

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	33	32	36	29	32	33	37				
ELL	16	38	70	28	40	38	14				
ASN				90							
BLK	41	33		27	50		31				
HSP	32	36	54	29	42	44	21				
MUL	59			41							
WHT	72	65		57	52		69				
FRL	42	40	50	33	43	45	34				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	31	41	35	27	36	40	14				
ELL	23	42	69	37	42	33	32				

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
BLK	40	46	38	34	46	50	39				
HSP	42	44	53	46	38	38	43				
MUL	55	68		58	62						
WHT	56	47	50	59	61	40	63				
FRL	40	47	56	44	42	44	41				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	20	31	28	26	33	25	8				
ELL	31	29	39	45	37	38	18				
BLK	41	35	20	48	44	42	46				
HSP	43	40	37	51	40	30	34				
MUL	41	33		44	27						
WHT	57	38	33	65	49	31	46				
FRL	41	35	32	48	39	36	39				

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	43
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	34
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	346
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	82%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	35
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
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	90
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	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	37
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	50
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	63
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	41
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?

Students with disabilities score considerably lower in ELA, Math and Science. Math across three grade levels (2nd, 3rd and 5th) have shown regression from Fall to Mid-year Diagnostic Assessments (I-Ready). ELA vocabulary and Informational Text is a schoolwide focus, but a huge challenge for our ESE students. Phonics development in grades 1st and 2nd is below the district average for our ESE students and our ELL students. Science vocabulary hinders our ESE students in grades 4 and 5 to perform with their peers at the school and district level.

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

Math proficiency in all subgroups is declining. Fall % on and above level compared to Fall % Mid Late and Above levels in math. Our grade 5 ESE students comparison to schoolwide date in Math and ELA. Our end of the year ELA and Math areas are of need. ELA areas of vocabulary, informational text and phonics development in the Primary grades. Grades 3 and 4 struggle in Numbers and Operations and grade 5 also struggles in Number Operations and Algebraic Equations.

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

Core instruction is our number one focus. Acceleration of the core content is critical to improve the core content. Scaffolding of below level gap instruction based on schoolwide data and small group instruction is paramount to increasing proficiency schoolwide. Attendance was also a contributing factor for our subgroups because of the increase in students with Key Performance Indicators and the relationship to their academic success. The key action step to improve academic performance would be our focus on PLC planning using data driven instruction to target timely deficits in benchmark standards across all grade levels.

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

Our BQ gains in ELA have made some gains this past year. Also our teacher retention and school culture is strong. We only lost three teachers (mostly to mobility or retirement). The use of I-ready LAFS and Achieve 3000 has increased our levels of proficiency using informational text and other genres that have been a stumbling block for our site the past two years. Lastly, our attention to detail using scaffolding techniques to increase vocabulary development across all subjects and grade levels is critical. Our ELA proficiency in grade three maintained the same in 2021, however we declined in these areas in other FSA grades because of our challenges with vocabulary and informational text proficiency.

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

Our contributing factors to maintaining our proficiency levels in grade three ELA is directly related to mini-lesson PD we used from the Reading coach to maximize the work of Jennifer Serravallo's book of mini-lessons that are standards based and targeted to benchmark needs based on data analysis.

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

Strong attention to small group instruction that has rigor and is grade level exposure for all learners. Scaffolding those students who lack prior year knowledge must be on the forefront of this approach in order for those students to be able to access and accelerate the current grade level content they will be assessed on. Also the data analysis PD focus of using timely formative and district test data to item analyze specific standards and apply remediation with reteaching and scaffolded resources to close those achievement gaps.

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.

PD- Book study using Driven by Data (A practical guide to improve instruction) 2.0 by Paul Bambrick-Santoyo in which all grade levels will present a chapter chunked into our PD Mondays to elevate the understanding of using live data in a timely manner. This growth will elevate the PLC's at each grade level and provide rich conversations at vertical PLC sessions. Also the focus on the 4 Principles of Excellent Instruction is the schoolwide expectation for all classrooms. Culture of Learning; Rigorous content; Academic ownership by the students; and the Demonstration of Learning by the students to achieve proficiency and mastery of key concepts and benchmarks. Walk through feedback will be based on these four key concepts of excellent instruction. We also have used subs to cover classes in order to do grade-level data dives strategically throughout the school year. I-Ready trainings using the district trainers to facilitate smart planning of small groups based on Diagnostic data has been implemented at least three times for this upcoming school year.

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

Our school wide behavior PEACE Plan will provide classroom support and stability to student needs through administration and student services. Focused attention to attendance and trends as well as staffing priorities will dominate our PSLT teams focus this year. Academic school wide trends that arise after district and formative assessments per each grade level will be the center of attention at I.L.T. and PSLT meetings. By focusing on these trends, we can progress monitor each student who is struggling and provide accelerated supports with needed remediation based on sound scaffolding techniques to support each learner.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Purchased a Reading Coach out of Title I funds to focus on coaching, modeling, scaffold and support lesson planning in grades K-5. The key focus of the reading coach is to develop vocabulary and comprehension skill development throughout her coaching and modeling using a strong emphasis on Informational Text. The focus of phonics instruction at the Primary grades will elevate the need for this desired deficit across grades K-2. Implementation of the Wonders program will also lend well to the new BEST standards being implemented. In addition, teachers will plan for differentiation and scaffolding to support their diverse learners with grade-level content and acceleration of unfinished learning driven from the instructional frameworks.

Measurable Outcome: We expect to achieve a 5% increase in ELA proficiency across all grade-levels, especially in grades 3-5. Equitable coaching cycles that cross all grades with follow-up data sessions to highlight the needs and strengths of each session with logged data to support the session.

Monitoring: Based on teacher data of formative and district assessments, the focus will start with those teachers who have the greatest need or those who are new to our district and site. We only have three new teachers and two fall into the core K-5 general education setting. Making data driven decisions based on diagnostic data from three assessed times of the year will allow growth monitoring data that will show improvement with benchmarks that need immediate attention.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Karen Simpson (karenm.simpson@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Hattie's work on scaffolding shows a .82 influence on improved achievement using strong support with this teaching technique.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Proper modeling and implementation of scaffolded resources and skill development amongst teachers has a sizeable influence in Hattie's work.

Action Steps to Implement

Adapt current PLC planning sessions for teachers and leadership team to review student created work as a criteria to determine content and benchmark understanding of required standards.

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

Utilize the demonstration of learning tasks in grades K-2 and additional performance tasks embedded in the instructional guides as the foundation for check points of understanding in grades 3-5.

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

Teachers will utilize and attend common planning sessions by grade level and/or content area every week. Planning will be data driven using common assessments, baseline/mid-year assessments, and other progress monitoring data including student work samples.

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

Reading Coach and ESOL Resource teacher will identify at least one scaffolding strategy for the ELL learners to embed in their daily instructional practice. This will also be enhanced by ELlevation strategies, sentence stems for speaking and writing, anchor charts with visuals, and vocabulary development strategies like glossaries and word maps.

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

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: SWD students have struggled in two main areas, ELA (vocabulary development) and Math applications. Both areas require differentiated response to intervention that is solely based on increased levels of planning between the VE teachers and the homeroom teachers.

Measurable Outcome: Through the use of strategic planning sessions weekly that align to grade-level data needs within the ESE sub-group. Teachers will use data driven methods of fresh data after formative and district assessments to provide scaffolded opportunities within the general education classroom to accelerate the learning of those SWD's who need immediate support to access grade level standards and benchmarks.

Monitoring: PLC weekly planning logs and classroom walk throughs aligned with the four principles of Excellent Instruction and timely feedback by the administrators. The focus on the rationale of the scaffolded implementation and the classroom look-for's will drive this desired outcome.

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

Evidence-based Strategy: Hattie's Response to intervention 1.29 impact and Scaffolding techniques 0.82 impact on student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The impact of Response to Intervention using data driven information to create new learning supports for the SWD and for that matter, ELL students shows a high correlation in Hattie's work regarding impact on learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Increase awareness of classroom and VE teachers to the best practices of data driven instruction using student work samples from ESE students to clarify any misunderstandings or scaffolding needs aligned with the grade level content being delivered.

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

Monitor differentiated instruction through classroom walk throughs and observation data that ensures acceleration practices and remediation practices are distinctly different. Acceleration practices support intervention by attacking unfinished learning that is targeted and aggressive. Remediation scaffolds practices necessary to access the current grade level curriculum.

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

SWD subgroup is addressed at quarterly data chats and focused on in PSLT school wide data beginning from FSA and FSAA data from the prior year to yearly mandatory assessments used for progress monitoring.

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

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Specifically posted and introduced learning objectives and targets that are posted and articulated by the students to the teacher after direct instruction has occurred. The What, How and most importantly the Why of each learning target is expected to be the center of each learning episode for all students in all grade levels.

Measurable Outcome: Increased rigor, academic ownership by the students, self-monitoring by the students and rigorous content that is demonstrated by the student ownership of learning.

Monitoring: Walk through data, feedback and alignment with school wide look for's established by the Instructional Leadership Team. In addition the instructional practice will also align with the personal goal that each teacher has established before the school year began that will improve their practice regarding increased student achievement.

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

Evidence-based Strategy: Learning goals have a 0.68 influence rating when done successfully based on Hattie's work on factors that improve achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The rationale is simple. Teachers have a personal goal they want to improve on based on evaluation reviews from the prior year. In addition, the laser focus of a learning target that is student driven, student owned and shows clarity in alignment with the benchmarks specific to grade level standards supports rigor at the highest level when the What, How, and Why is clear and communicated to all learners.

Action Steps to Implement

Teacher driven student conferencing on each learners progress towards benchmarks being taught across all subject areas. Data samples like student work, I-reading Typical and Stretch growth monitoring graphs, and progress monitoring district assessments and teacher created common assessments used amongst the grade level or content area.

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

Administrative feedback focusing of "Look-For's" designed to target instructional time is maximized with strong procedures and efficient pacing. Standards being taught are grade level appropriate with adjoining use of vocabulary by the teacher and student to support that grade level content. And ultimately, students are interacting with rigorous content and they are demonstrating their understanding of their own learning. This would be highlighted with student talk vs. teacher talk.

Person Responsible Carmine Alfano (carmine.alfano@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.

By establishing discipline tier of response and support during daily instruction, we have created a school wide PEACE Plan that has specific steps and interventions that support all types of classroom behavioral and social emotional needs across all grade-levels. Our discipline data from last year only had two Out of School Suspensions. Our data tracker did have many classroom behaviors that needed support and could be addressed by teacher driven interventions and strategies internally. The implementation of the PEACE Plan the first two weeks of school align strategies and supports that support the culture and climate of the classroom. By following the supports in the plan, a child who needs immediate attention for behavior or social emotional growth can eventually transfer to the PSLT agenda when the teacher has exhausted all schoolwide resources, personnel and supports described and modeled within the schoolwide PEACE Plan system.

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 work of our Parent and Family Engagement Liaison (Mrs. Thompson) and her committee utilized survey data that impacts our stakeholders to drive the yearly calendar of events to increase family and community involvement to support our students and staff. Through the use of our Annual Title I meeting and our Mental Health and ELL presentation Shark Night, we have created wrap-around supports and avenues for all families to be successful and supported. We also utilize a strong classroom culture and schoolwide monthly celebration to honor those who have a birthday or award each month at a quick schoolwide celebration. Hopefully with the pandemic we will be able to elevate some of these events which have more impact when they are not virtual, but in person by the participants. Each classroom establishes a "safe place" and a family meeting is encouraged for those classes who struggle with cohesive continuity or struggles within the framework of each homeroom.

The utilization of social media, parent links and weekly flyers keeps the communication lines active and positive and creates true transparency between the school staff and all our families. We also invite many business partners to set up tables at family events if they have resources and programs that may support any sub-group of our population that may be interested in their services.

Our attention to most needed demands centers around our Student Services team that provided meals,

backpacks and school supplies to any family that needs support. Our family resource program has improved each year and the wrap-around supports we can direct our families to are very helpful and supportive.

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

Administration: Social media, parent links, wrap-around services and community involvement.

Student Services: SEL supports, wrap-around community supports, meals, backpacks.

Parent and Family Engagement Committee: Establishes schoolwide events and outreach that is solely driven by our Impact Survey in Title I so that we can meet the needs of our families and be equitable to all groups.

SAC Committee: Reviews, discusses and creates guidance to schoolwide decisions regarding budget, instructional and non-instructional practices, and schoolwide challenges that require a cross section of ideas and input.

PTA: Mainly a staff driven group that raises money and provides rich and exciting opportunities and Spirit Nights for all our students to access and enjoy.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00