# Springhead Elementary School

**2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan**

## Table of Contents

# Springhead Elementary School

3208 NESMITH RD, Plant City, FL 33566

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

## Principal: Michelle Mcclellan

Start Date for this Principal: 11/5/2018

| 2019-20 Status<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
|---|---|
| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2021-22 Title I School | Yes |
| 2021-22 Economically<br>Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: C (52%)<br>2018-19: B (55%)<br>2017-18: C (43%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | ATSI |
| * 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.](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

## Springhead Elementary School

### 3208 NESMITH RD, Plant City, FL 33566

### [ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

| **School Type and Grades Served** (per MSID File) | **2021-22 Title I School** | **2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary School PK-5 | Yes | 100% |

| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 69% |

## School Grades History

| Year | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | C | | B | B |

## 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.**

Leading to succeed.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Preparing students for life.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| McClellan, Michelle | Principal | Administrator - Oversees School Improvement Processes, Supports School Improvement Team decisions and implementation |
| Magann, Jennifer | Assistant Principal | Administrator - Supports School Improvement Processes |
| Broussard, Kim | SAC Member | SAC Chair, Initiates and coordinates SAC Meetings |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Monday 11/5/2018, Michelle Mcclellan

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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.*
11

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**
36

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**
740

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

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.**
10

**Demographic Data**

**Early Warning Systems**

**Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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 | 64 | 113 | 123 | 116 | 110 | 122 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 648 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 35 | 29 | 29 | 36 | 25 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 175 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| 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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 40 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 102 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 25 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 40 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 102 |

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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 | 1 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |

**Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 10 | 12 | 15 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**
Wednesday 7/6/2022

**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 | 110 | 120 | 108 | 116 | 124 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 685 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 20 | 21 | 30 | 36 | 22 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 151 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| 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 | 47 | 48 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 35 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 48 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 |

**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 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

**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 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**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 | 110 | 120 | 108 | 116 | 124 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 685 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 20 | 21 | 30 | 36 | 22 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 151 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| 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 | 47 | 48 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 35 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 48 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 |

**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 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

**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 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| 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 | 2022 | | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 41% | 53% | 56% | | | | 49% | 52% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 56% | | | | | | 52% | 55% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 48% | | | | | | 56% | 50% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 61% | 50% | 50% | | | | 63% | 54% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 62% | | | | | | 69% | 57% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 54% | | | | | | 60% | 46% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 42% | 59% | 59% | | | | 37% | 50% | 53% |

**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 |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 50% | 52% | -2% | 58% | -8% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 51% | 55% | -4% | 58% | -7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -50% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 42% | 54% | -12% | 56% | -14% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -51% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 64% | 54% | 10% | 62% | 2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 66% | 57% | 9% | 64% | 2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -64% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 54% | 54% | 0% | 60% | -6% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -66% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 38% | 51% | -13% | 53% | -15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

## Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 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 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| SWD | 18 | 46 | 47 | 41 | 52 | 43 | 21 | | | | |
| ELL | 34 | 59 | 52 | 54 | 60 | 60 | 29 | | | | |
| BLK | 18 | | | 45 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 39 | 61 | 56 | 60 | 62 | 56 | 39 | | | | |
| MUL | 67 | | | 75 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 43 | 49 | 35 | 63 | 65 | 57 | 50 | | | | |
| FRL | 37 | 54 | 43 | 58 | 59 | 53 | 43 | | | | |

| **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 | 11 | 22 | 31 | 41 | 37 | 46 | 20 | | | | |
| ELL | 31 | 39 | 33 | 50 | 43 | 40 | 17 | | | | |
| BLK | 14 | | | 36 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 38 | 45 | 39 | 54 | 45 | 44 | 21 | | | | |
| MUL | 62 | | | 69 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 47 | 34 | | 61 | 42 | 50 | 51 | | | | |
| FRL | 37 | 39 | 48 | 54 | 40 | 41 | 25 | | | | |
| **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 | 22 | 45 | 55 | 42 | 58 | 69 | 13 | | | | |
| ELL | 36 | 47 | 56 | 53 | 69 | 63 | 25 | | | | |
| BLK | 42 | 77 | | 53 | 77 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 43 | 47 | 53 | 60 | 70 | 65 | 35 | | | | |
| WHT | 57 | 56 | 56 | 69 | 67 | 43 | 45 | | | | |
| FRL | 45 | 50 | 57 | 60 | 69 | 61 | 33 | | | | |

## ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| **ESSA Federal Index** | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 53 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 58 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 422 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| **Subgroup Data** | |
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 38 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **English Language Learners** | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 51 |

| English Language Learners | |
|---|---|
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Native American Students** | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Asian Students** | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Black/African American Students** | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 32 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Hispanic Students** | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 54 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Multiracial Students** | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 71 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Pacific Islander Students** | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **White Students** | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 52 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| --- | --- |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 51 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**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?**

Though we made consistent learning gains from 2021 to 2022 on the FSA Reading and Math, we continue to struggle with making learning gains with students in the lowest 25%, as well as ESE and ELL subgroups.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?**

Though a gain was made on the 2022 SSA from 2021, there has been a consistent trend of low performance on the science state assessment in 5th grade compared to the district average. Students demonstrate a weakness on standards taught prior to 5th grade. Data from 21-22 shows continuous growth toward these standards.

**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 focus of science has been primarily in only 4th and 5th grade. We have focused our efforts in reading and math over science to make improvements in these areas. Teachers are more comfortable with reading and math. Teachers have more training and expertise in math and reading. Many teachers do not have rigorous teaching strategies for Science core instruction. We have full-time reading and math resource teachers to build capacity with teachers and in 21-22 we were able to hire a part-time science resource teacher. In order to increase the capacity of teachers in the content area of science at a rapid rate, we will employ a full-time Science resource teacher.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

Reading and Math learning gains showed the most improvement.

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

Consistent data driven meetings and focused planning sessions supported an ongoing high level of differentiated support for students. The high level of structure and consistency with planning sessions and job-embedded professional development were key actions taken.

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

Our highest priorities for 22-23 are Science and maintaining learning gains in Reading and Math. Strategies will be implemented to increase planning and professional development for teachers that will transfer to high levels of engagement in the classroom.

**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.**

The 22-23 professional development plan will be centered around building resilient teachers. Based on teacher observations and student data, the continuous improvement model will be used to support teachers with planning and job-embedded professional development on a weekly basis through conferencing, demonstration classrooms, coaching cycles, and lesson studies.

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

As we build the capacity of teachers, we create a strong group of instructional leaders who are able to mentor and support one another.

**Areas of Focus**
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

**:**

| #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning ||
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. | We will hire a full-time science resource teacher to focus on modeling in the classroom, lesson planning, data reviews with teachers in grades 3-5, and small group instruction with 4th-5th grade students. Lesson planning, modeling and small groups will occur weekly. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. | Through the implementation of a full-time science resource teacher, we will increase science proficiency from 42% to 46% as measured by the 2023 State Science Assessment. |
| **Monitoring:** Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. | Data reviews will occur monthly under the supervision of the principal. The science resource teacher will meet quarterly with the principal to progress monitor implementation of job-embedded professional development. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Michelle McClellan (michelle.mcclellan@hcps.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. | We will use job-embedded professional development to support increased instructional strategies for teachers. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy. | In the journal article, "Job-embedded Professional Learning Essential to Improving Teaching and Learning in Early Education" by Debra Pacchiano, Ph.D., Rebecca Klein, M.S., and Marsha Shigeyo Hawley, evidence-based research supports peer learning groups, coaching cycles, and lesson studies because of their ability to increase knowledge development, collaboration routines and transfer to practice supports, which will in turn, equip all classrooms with highly effective teachers |

**Action Steps to Implement**
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

A science resource teacher will focus on modeling in the classroom, lesson planning, data reviews with teachers, school-wide communication of science events, and small group with 5th grade students.

**Person Responsible**   Michelle McClellan (michelle.mcclellan@hcps.net)

Hands-on science materials will be used to increase science engagement in grades K-5

**Person Responsible**   Jennifer Magann (jennifer.magann@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

| #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation | |
| --- | --- |
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**<br>**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | Though we made an increase in learning gains from 2021 to 2022 on the FSA in Reading and Math, there is still a need for maintaining a consistent level of learning gains among students scoring in the lowest 25% for reading and/or math, especially among ESE and ELL subgroups. |
| **Measurable Outcome:**<br>**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | Given student need across grade levels, our staff will continue to implement differentiated instruction by using supplemental units and technology to maintain the gains made in reading (56%) and/or math (62%) and increase those by the lowest 25% in reading (48%) and math (54%) based on 2023 state assessment results. |
| **Monitoring:**<br>**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | Monthly progress monitoring data received through school-wide and district assessments will be reviewed. In addition, daily walk-through feedback will be received and reviewed for trends weekly through a data collection structure. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Michelle McClellan (michelle.mcclellan@hcps.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:**<br>**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** | Springhead students lack foundational skills in both reading and math including cross-curricular vocabulary. Student performance varies among sub-groups, which poses a need for strong core instruction as well as differentiation. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**<br>**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.** | In the journal article, "Differentiated Instruction: A Research Basis", current evidence supports addressing student differences through meeting a variety of learning styles and multiple intelligences. To provide these varied modalities, we need access to personnel, technology, and instructional materials. Implementing differentiated instruction will raise students confidence and motivation levels by providing curriculum rich with embedded growth mindset. Our area of focus levels the playing field for our lowest 25% through a variety of modalities/learning styles, remediation, and enrichment opportunities. |

**Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

**Action Steps to Implement**
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

A reading coach will lead collaborative planning and data reviews in PLCs with all K-5th grade teachers, facilitate small group lessons with 3rd -5th grade students, and coach teachers on a tiered system of support.

| **Person Responsible** | Michelle McClellan (michelle.mcclellan@hcps.net) |
|---|---|

A reading resource teacher will facilitate small group lessons with K-2nd grade students and support data discussions and collaborative planning with K-2nd grade teachers in PLCs.

| **Person Responsible** | Michelle McClellan (michelle.mcclellan@hcps.net) |
|---|---|

A math resource teacher will lead collaborative planning and data reviews in PLCs with all K-5th grade teachers, facilitate small group lessons with 4rd -5th grade students, and coach teachers on a tiered system of support.

| **Person Responsible** | Michelle McClellan (michelle.mcclellan@hcps.net) |
|---|---|

Technology and equipment to enhance and engage students in daily instruction, ongoing progress monitoring, media production and school-wide communication.

| **Person Responsible** | Michelle McClellan (michelle.mcclellan@hcps.net) |
|---|---|

Online Subscription - BrainPop

| **Person Responsible** | Michelle McClellan (michelle.mcclellan@hcps.net) |
|---|---|

Literature for classrooms and the media center to increase cultural and curriculum relevant lessons and experiences.

| **Person Responsible** | Michelle McClellan (michelle.mcclellan@hcps.net) |
|---|---|

Instructional and Professional Development Materials

| **Person Responsible** | Michelle McClellan (michelle.mcclellan@hcps.net) |
|---|---|

## RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

**Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**

Based on Spring 2022 I-Ready Reading scores, 44% of students in Kindergarten, 38% of students in 1st grade and 34% of students in 2nd grade score at proficiency for the end of the year grade level benchmarks. These percentages are indicators of the percentage of students on-track for scoring a level 3 or above on statewide, standardized assessments.

**Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**

Based on the 2022 ELA FSA scores, 41% in grades 3-5 scored at proficiency, which is level 3 or higher. This score was due to students entering a grade already below level which impacted their on grade-level performance and showed a need for acceleration to close the existing achievement gap.

**Measurable Outcomes:**
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

**Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)**

The percent of grades K-2 students scoring proficient, will increase to 50% or higher as measured by the Spring 2023 ELA assessment.

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

The percent of grades 3-5 students scoring proficient, which is a level 3 or higher will increase to 50% or higher as measured by the 2023 ELA state assessment.

**Monitoring:**
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Students progress in ELA will be progress monitored through monthly and quarterly assessments. This data will be used to set individualized goals, plan for instruction, and monitor students progress toward proficiency.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

McClellan, Michelle, michelle.mcclellan@hcps.net

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

We will 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 backward planning. Within these planning structures, we will
incorporate structures and strategies that encourage student discussion, students taking ownership of their work, and active engagement during the ELA block.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

In 2022, the data showed the same percentage (41%) of 3-5 students making proficiency on the FSA ELA assessment. The improvement strategy of providing standard-based planning structures focuses core instruction on developing rigorous and meaningful ELA lessons that are purposeful and engage students in critical thinking and reading strategies that will increase reading proficiency.

**Action Steps to Implement:**
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

| Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|
| Provide a school wide professional development that teaches teachers how to use vocabulary strategies from the Jennifer Servillo book that will be expected to be embedded in planning and instruction. Administration will set the expectation that academic vocabulary will be identified, taught, posted, and utilized in every classroom. The professional development will start whole group so that administration can set expectations. Then teachers will split into differentiated groups based on need and teacher leaders will present the Jennifer Servallo strategies. | McClellan, Michelle, michelle.mcclellan@hcps.net |
| The reading coach will facilitate planning sessions while incorporating prompting questions that illicit teacher discussion and plans that meet consistent expectations of high quality vocabulary instruction. | McClellan, Michelle, michelle.mcclellan@hcps.net |
| Conduct walkthrough to collect evidence for look fors and vocabulary implementation. Provide feedback to teachers based on observations. | McClellan, Michelle, michelle.mcclellan@hcps.net |
| 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. · Literacy Coach will communicate prior to planning what texts/task teachers will be planning with during the session. · 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. · Based on the internalizing work, teachers will then construct daily learning targets that will contain both the skill and strategy needed for the day. · Literacy Coach will guide teachers in creating anchor charts they can use and refer to throughout the week to support instruction and student understanding. · Construct rigorous student tasks aligned to this guiding question and learning target. | McClellan, Michelle, michelle.mcclellan@hcps.net |

## 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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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

Springhead's culture operates best when teachers, students, parents, and volunteers have a clear vision and mission. Our teachers are committed to meeting and contributing to professional learning communities to better understand and teach the Florida Standards. They are given the autonomy to teach the standards, but use their own expertise to meet student needs. They value the "whole child" and the uniqueness of the individual student, recognizing that not everyone learns the same way, but that we all have gifts and talents that can be recognized. They focus on student strengths to increase academic achievement.

Open-ended communication is vital to the success of any organization. At Springhead, it comes in a variety of forms – parent conferences, "Remind" messages, school-wide weekly calls, individual classroom and school-wide newsletters, school-wide texts and school events/programs designed to not only showcase students but to enlighten stakeholders regarding issues that are crucial to their child's success (technology nights, reading and math nights, PTA meetings, etc.).

We take proactive measures to make sure that as many parent voices are heard when surveying for needs and feedback. This includes opening up the media center on conference night so that as many parents as possible have access to computers with working internet connections. Other incentives such as gift cards have also encouraged parents and families to participate in the survey.

Teachers have made an extra effort in giving students a voice in their own learning. This is evident in student-created rubrics as well as projects and assignments that are geared towards students' interests and relevant current events. This continual collaboration not only helps to keep all stakeholders informed, it unites the effort to ensure that every child has the opportunity to reach their personal best. The result is a positive culture and environment that is built and maintained through building relationships with parents and other community
stakeholders.

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

Business partners are valued at Springhead as they take an active role on the School Advisory Council. The group meets monthly to discuss data trends on school-wide assessments, attendance concerns, and upcoming community events. Volunteers and business partners provide us with a strong community bond that helps teach our students the power of giving through service projects on and off campus. They are an integral part of helping our school to function effectively and efficiently.

Culture involves many facets, but it is the relationships between teachers and students AND teachers and stakeholders that has to happen first. Relationships build trust. Parents are made to feel welcome and their input is not only valuable; it is crucial. We do this by not just continually seeking their input but by acting on

it. When stakeholders begin to view themselves as an actual partner in their child's education, and can see when their ideas are implemented and their concerns are addressed, they become more invested, which, in turn,

supports a positive school culture, where students not only learn, but thrive.