Seffner Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Seffner Elementary School

109 CACTUS RD, Seffner, FL 33584

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Renel Mathurin

Start Date for this Principal: 8/2/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (46%) 2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: C (42%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	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.

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

Seffner Elementary School

109 CACTUS RD, Seffner, FL 33584

[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	67%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership
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
Mathurin, Renel	Principal	The Principal directs and coordinates educational, administrative, and counseling activities of an elementary school. The Principal demonstrates the Florida Principal Standards, serves as the instructional leader, and develops and evaluates educational programs to ensure overall student achievement.
Claffie, Kristine	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal will assist with instructional, administrative, and overall operational leadership of the school.
Mounce, Sara	Teacher, K-12	
Whitehead, Amy	Teacher, K-12	
Atherton, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 8/2/2022, Renel Mathurin

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.*

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

22

Total number of students enrolled at the school

376

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.

3

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	46	56	40	64	55	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	319
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/4/2022

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	61	68	52	62	67	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	384
Attendance below 90 percent	21	19	22	21	18	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	10	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	13	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	11	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	30	21	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	61	68	52	62	67	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	384
Attendance below 90 percent	21	19	22	21	18	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	10	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	13	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	11	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	30	21	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	43%	53%	56%				45%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	59%						47%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%						44%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	45%	50%	50%				43%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	58%						43%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	31%						18%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	30%	59%	59%				46%	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	41%	52%	-11%	58%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	46%	55%	-9%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
05	2022					
	2019	45%	54%	-9%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

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	34%	54%	-20%	62%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	45%	57%	-12%	64%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				
05	2022					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	60%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					
	2019	47%	51%	-4%	53%	-6%
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	31	46		34	54		32				
ELL	12	58		35	69						
BLK	20	37		23	32		14				
HSP	36	61	73	36	59	38	18				
WHT	55	63	40	59	64		44				
FRL	38	59	54	41	55	31	23				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	37	54		23	77						
ELL	29			29							
BLK	27	30		28	50						
HSP	27	27		17	27	33	21				
MUL	47			33							
WHT	50	67		34	46		44				
FRL	35	34	40	25	37	44	27				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	24	39	33	27	33	19	26				
ELL	29	36		24	57	45					
BLK	31	33		33	38		43				
HSP	40	47	47	33	43	32	35				
MUL	31			31							
WHT	55	53	50	55	45		59				
FRL	36	46	46	35	35	23	40				

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	46
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	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	370
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	45
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	25
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	54
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	44
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?

Overall, the percentage of students who scored proficient increased 3% in ELA and 17% in Math and stayed the same in Science (30%). Students also made improvement in the learning gains for ELA and Math. Increased 18% in ELA Learning Gains and 20% in Math Learning Gains. 54% of Student ELA Bottom Quartile made gains and 31% of student in Math Bottom Quartile made learning gains.

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

Based on the 2022 Florida Standard Assessment, Math learning gains and 5th grade science demonstrate the greatest need for improvement.

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

Students in the bottom quartile had gaps in their learning with foundational skills that impacted them meeting the grade level standards. Additional resources and strategies could be utilized to address the foundational needs of the students, beginning in Kindergarten. Utilizing DDI in K-5, would allow grade levels to analyze data and make instructional decisions to meet the needs of the students.

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

Math proficiency and math learning gains showed the greatest improvement based on the 2022 state assessment.

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

Actions that contributed to the improve: data analysis from monthly assessment and electronic data wall to identifying successes and area of development for individual students and classroom wide. Teacher using small groups to support students in their area of development based. ILT analyzed the data to identify instructional trends.

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

We will continue to utilize data to determine the needs of the students, and respond to the data using evidence based strategies. Utilizing vertical PLCs to ensure grade levels are aware of the prerequisite skills from the previous year and the skills needed to be successful in the future.

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/learning will be provided for the faculty in the following areas:
K-5 support with understanding and implementing the new Math BEST Standards.
K-3 support with understanding and implementing the new ELA BEST Standards, and K-2 supports with year 2 of implementation with ELA BEST Standards.
The use of data analysis protocol.
Support with student goal setting and data tracking folder.

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

We hire a reading resource teacher to help coach the teachers and pull small groups.

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 B.E.S.T. Standards	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Description: During common planning time, teachers will plan instruction that demonstrate clarity around the BEST standards. Teacher will aggressive monitor student's progress towards grade level standard mastery and provide timely feedback. Rationale: We want to ensure teachers have deep understanding of the new BEST Standards and use that knowledge to plan effective lesson that area aligned to the standards.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	By December of 2022, 100% of teachers will plan effective instruction that demonstrate clarity around the BEST Standards. As a result, student data will show: At least 50% of students in grades 3-5 will scored in the on level or above level category on the Spring PMA 2023.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	The area of focus will be monitored through monthly common assessments, exit tickets, lesson plans and classroom walkthrough visits. Implementation of teachers providing targeted concise feedback through aggressive monitoring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Renel Mathurin (renel.mathurin@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Teacher will aggressive monitor student's progress towards grade level standard mastery and provide timely feedback.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	The data suggests there is tremendous need for intentional checks for understanding using "Aggressive Monitoring" techniques, frequent monitoring of students' abilities through interim assessments, and creating action plans to reteach and plan for acceleration. Aggressive Monitoring and Four Principles of DDI based upon Paul Bambrick-Santoyo research, have a high correlation to positive student achievement and improving instruction.

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.

1. Provide staff professional development on: Paul Bambrick Santoyo's Aggressive Monitoring Techniques, how to plan for these opportunities during planning, and how to use data to plan for core and small group instruction.
2. Create Look Fors Around Aggressive Monitoring and Coding System and communicate with staff. Monitoring: Leadership Team
3. Create Planning Protocols to embed DDI, Aggressive Monitoring, and standards-based instruction practices. Protocols are used during Grade Level Collaborative Planning PLCs.
4. Staff will be provided with safe practice opportunities and baseline data will be collected
5. Staff will have a specific monitoring and plans for Black and SWD ESSA subgroups below 41%.
6. ILT will review and share walkthrough data trend with the staff and make adjustments based on the data

Person Responsible	Renel Mathurin (renel.mathurin@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Based on FSA data in Reading and Math, our Students with Disabilities and Black/African American subgroups did not make adequate progress and learning gains.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By December of 2022, 100% of teachers will implement small group instruction based on individual student needs with fidelity. As a result, student data will show: At least 50% of students in grades 3-5 will scored in the on level or above level category on the Spring PMA 2023.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The area of focus will be monitored through monthly common assessments, exit tickets, lesson plans and classroom walkthrough visits.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Renel Mathurin (renel.mathurin@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teacher will aggressive monitor student's progress towards grade level standard mastery and provide timely feedback.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	The data suggests there is tremendous need for intentional checks for understanding using "Aggressive Monitoring" techniques, frequent monitoring of students' abilities through interim assessments, and creating action plans to reteach and plan for acceleration. Aggressive Monitoring and Four Principles of DDI based upon Paul Bambrick-Santoyo research, have a high correlation to positive student achievement and improving instruction.

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.

1. Provide staff professional development on: Paul Bambrick Santoyo's Aggressive Monitoring Techniques, how to plan for these opportunities during planning, and how to use data to plan for core and small group instruction.
2. Create Look Fors Around Aggressive Monitoring and Coding System and communicate with staff. Monitoring: Leadership Team
3. Create Planning Protocols to embed DDI, Aggressive Monitoring, and standards-based instruction practices. Protocols are used during Grade Level Collaborative Planning PLCs.
4. Staff will be provided with safe practice opportunities and baseline data will be collected
5. Staff will have a specific monitoring and plans for Black and SWD ESSA subgroups below 41%.
6. ILT will review and share walkthrough data trend with the staff and make adjustments based on the data

Person Responsible   Renel Mathurin (renel.mathurin@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 the Spring Iready Diagnostic Assessment:
K- 16% of students scored BL
1- 44% of students scored BL
2- 36% of students scored BL

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

43% of students scored at a level 3 or above in ELA
59% of students made leaning gains in ELA
54% of student in the bottom quartile made gains in ELA

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)

Students in grades K-2 will work toward reading mastery through implementation of benchmark based planning, effective, effective implementation of lessons planned, aggressive progress monitoring, differentiated small groups to address the learning gaps based on the data. As a result, 100% of students will make learning gains and student reaching grade level mastery will increase to 50%.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Students in grades 3-5 will work toward reading mastery through implementation of benchmark based planning, effective, effective implementation of lessons planned, aggressive progress monitoring, differentiated small groups to address the learning gaps based on the data. As a result, 100% of students will make learning gains and student reaching grade level mastery will increase to 50%.

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 will take the Iready Reading Diagnostic three times with the school year to monitor progress. Assessment within the Wonders instructional materials will used to assess student performance of standards based items. We will also utilized exit tickets and district formative assessments.

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

Mathurin, Renel, renel.mathurin@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?

Iready, SIPPS, ACHIEVE 3000 and Differentiated Guided Reading Small Groups

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?

Iready, SIPPS, ACHIEVE 3000, and Differentiated Guided Reading Small Groups are research based that differentiate instruction based on the student's needs to address the academic reading deficits.

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
Literacy Coaching Teachers will take part in a weekly collaborative planning session with district literacy coach and school reading resource teacher; instruction will be monitored and student progress will be aggressively monitored.	Mathurin, Renel, renel.mathurin@hcps.net
Literacy Leadership Identity students who are not meeting proficiency based on assessment and support teacher in developing a schedule intervention to support the students. Support teacher in determining the appropriate intervention and analyze students data every 6 weeks to track their progress.	

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.

Seffner Elementary School builds a positive culture and environment by establishing and promoting our schoolwide expectations to all stakeholders. These Four R's: Respect, Responsibility, Right Choices and Relationships.

Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support (PBIS) which involves a team of diverse teachers working to support each other as well as students on a daily and monthly basis through celebrations of positive behavior and learning. Seffner has an exceptionally effective program that involves a school store where students are able to utilize Mustang Dollars earned for positive interactions and academic success in exchange for a variety of high interest items.

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

Administrators will lead all stakeholders with establishing clear vision/mission statement ensuring a safe collaborative environment.
Faculty and Staff- implementation of PBIS and Restorative Practices
SAC Team- Supporting and the School Improvement Plan
Parents- Signing and Title 1 Compact