Summerfield Crossings Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Summerfield Crossings Elementary School

11050 FAIRWAY MEADOW DR, Riverview, FL 33579

[no web address on file]

Demographics

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

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	97%
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: B (54%) 2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: D (40%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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

Summerfield Crossings Elementary School

11050 FAIRWAY MEADOW DR, Riverview, FL 33579

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	97%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	79%

School Grades History

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

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

Together we will do "Whatever It Takes"!

School Leadership Team

Membership
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
Harvey, Brian	Principal	Student safety, instructional leadership and leadership development.
Bryner, Andrea	Assistant Principal	Student safety, instructional leadership and leadership development.
Brush, Kara	Math Coach	Coaching cycles, side-by-side teaching, K-5 PLC support, data disaggregation and small groups supporting the bottom quartile.
Schulte, Laura	Reading Coach	Coaching cycles, side-by-side teaching, K-5 PLC support, data disaggregation and small groups supporting the bottom quartile.

Demographic Information

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

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.*
1

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.*
14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
41

Total number of students enrolled at the school
840

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
14

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
6

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	148	116	150	167	134	181	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	896
Attendance below 90 percent	4	38	27	35	36	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	166
One or more suspensions	1	6	1	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	57	28	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	24	38	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
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	1	2	1	6	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	5	7	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
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
Sunday 8/21/2022

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	129	117	145	167	134	184	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	876
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	28	29	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	40	35	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	3	0	1	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	129	117	145	167	134	184	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	876
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	28	29	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	40	35	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	3	0	1	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	47%	53%	56%				53%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	53%						58%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%						47%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	54%	50%	50%				53%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	65%						67%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62%						54%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	46%	59%	59%				57%	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	46%	52%	-6%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	60%	55%	5%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

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	44%	54%	-10%	62%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	53%	57%	-4%	64%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2022					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	60%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	51%	51%	0%	53%	-2%
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	17	48	43	25	64	67	21				
ELL	41	55	41	42	68	72	26				
BLK	37	50	50	35	56	56	36				
HSP	45	49	47	54	64	63	40				
MUL	54	67		68	70		46				
WHT	57	57	60	74	81		72				
FRL	39	48	46	45	61	60	36				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	7	29	33	18	36	38	14				
ELL	30	50		28	25		20				
BLK	34	42	42	32	30	50	19				
HSP	44	57		44	40		38				
MUL	52			60							
WHT	57	53		57	50		44				
FRL	37	48	43	37	37	55	30				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	16	46	41	21	51	42	32				
ELL	30	35	32	40	63	50	41				
BLK	42	49	36	44	62	50	42				
HSP	48	54	40	49	67	61	50				
MUL	70	74		65	74		91				
WHT	64	68	79	65	71	53	69				
FRL	44	50	41	46	61	51	49				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	423
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
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	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
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	61
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	67
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	48
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?

During the 2021-2022 school year our 2022 FSA data trended upwards in all content areas. ELA proficiency increased 2%, Math proficiency increased 9% and Science proficiency increased 12%. ELA learning gains increased 3%, ELA bottom quartile learning gains increased 5%, Math learning gains increased 26% and Math bottom quartile learning gains increased 12%.

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

The data component that demonstrated the greatest need for improvement was our 3rd grade ELA proficiency scores. 3rd grade ELA proficiency dropped from 45% to 41% (-4%).

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

Factors contributing to the decrease in ELA proficiency reflect the multiple years of pandemic related instruction that did not provide optimal teaching environments. We will address this need for improvement with interactive Kagan strategies allowing students the opportunity to work together and LEAD teaching. We will also continue to provide differentiated small group instruction that will meet students exactly where they are and provide them the tools necessary to accelerate.

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

Three areas showed significant growth during the 2022 state assessment. Science increased 12%, Math learning gains increased 26% and Math bottom quartile learning gains increased 12%.

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

The biggest factor contributing to the improvement in Science and Math scores was the use a manipulatives and hands-on activities. Through strategic planning and preparation our students were provided opportunities to work with manipulatives, engaging students in instruction and enhancing math engagement. Long term investigations, hands-on activities, classroom research that crossed over into the ELA classroom and promoting the love of Science on our Morning Show, all are contributing factors to our improved Science outcomes.

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

We will ensure students receive individualized instruction meeting their specific needs. Collectively we need to ensure students receive small group differentiated instruction that will move our bottom quartile, push students into proficiency and also strengthen our highest achieving students. Professional Learning Communities will facilitate strategic backwards planning, data disaggregation and review social/ emotional development strategies when targeting growth for all of their students. Providing this time will be crucial.

Specifically in math, teachers have access to the foundational support resources in the Math GCG's to support instruction and planning. Each unit has an accessing prior knowledge section and there is a foundational builder section for further differentiation. This a guide and will support teacher practice.

In reading, K-2 specifically, engaging resources are accessible through our Reading Coach . Hands on literacy activities that stimulate high engagement are available.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

We will facilitate a "Kagan Cooperative Learning" PD tiered for new teachers and also for experience teachers. We will also provide tiered PD sessions using the book "The 5 Practices in Practice" which focuses on successfully creating discussion in the elementary math classroom. Teachers will receive a copy of both books when they participate.

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

We will utilize our Reading and Math Coaches to facilitate coaching cycles, side-by-side teaching, PLC support and also timely data disaggregation our teachers can immediately use to drive instruction. Kagan professional development will help introduce new strategies to our newest teachers and sharpen the use of these strategies with our veteran teachers.

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 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.	Our school leadership worked alongside our instructional leaders and reviewed all available data. FSA, Math Monthly, PMA, Science assessments and i-Ready data was available as we analyzed areas of success and areas of growth. As we looked at grade level data and subgroup data, we were able to pinpoint successful strategies which allowed us to show growth and provided encouraging trend data. The strategy was differentiated, small group instruction that met the needs of our students.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	We will use Math/ELA data from the K-2 STAR progress monitoring assessment and tier students into Tier 1 (41st percentile or higher), Approaching Tier 1 (25th-40th percentile), Tier 2 (11th-24th percentile) and Tier 3 (below the 11th percentile). We will compare i-Ready diagnostic 1 data to STAR data and create goals for each student/grade level. This is our first year utilizing the STAR assessment, but our goal is to increase on-grade level results compared to last years assessments. Increasing on-grade level results by 10% in Math/ELA in K-2 is our goal. We will review Math/ELA data for the 3-5 F.A.S.T. assessment and tier students. This is our first year with the F.A.S.T. assessment and we want an increase scores that compare to an FSA level 3. Our reading goal is over 50% and our math goal is over 60% the equivalent of a level 3 on the FSA.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	School Leadership will collaborate with Instructional Coaches weekly to analyze and disaggregate real time data. Action plans around that data will be created and growth monitored.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brian Harvey (brian.harvey@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being	The evidence based strategy of differentiated, small group instruction is effective and highly supported through research. In John Hattie's book "Visible Learning for Literacy (2016)", he discusses a hinge point of .40. When a strategy yields a result of .40 or higher, the data suggests a students learning extends beyond what is expected from attending school for one year. The strategies existing within our area of focus are Differentiation (Scaffolding) .42 effect size, Small Group Learning .49 effect size and Standards Aligned Instruction (Teacher Clarity) .75 effect size. As teachers provide clarity through explicit

implemented for this Area of Focus.	learning objectives during whole class instruction and during differentiated, small group instruction, we are making an impact by providing exactly what students need.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Addressing every students specific academic needs is extremely difficult for any teacher. Creating smaller groups allowing teachers the ability to focus on the specific academic needs of a few students provides an opportunity for significant impact. To ensure all students increase in reading, math and science proficiency, receiving time in small group, differentiated instruction, based on current data, is invaluable.

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.

Reading and Math Coaches will facilitate planning sessions that focus on small group instruction. Differentiated tasks will be planned based on students needs and current data.

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

The administrative team will conduct weekly walkthroughs to observe small group instruction and differentiation in the classroom. Data will be gathered to determine the needs and next steps for teachers.

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

Kagan Cooperative Learning tiered PD. Our Instructional Coaches will facilitate tiered PD sessions. One will be for teachers that have experience with Kagan structures and the other will be for our newer teachers. We will focus on how Kagan structures can be utilized daily in the classroom and also during differentiated instruction. Administrative walkthroughs and observations will provide timely data and opportunities for creating next steps for teachers.

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

ELP will be provided for select students to address critical learning skill gaps and provide additional time with grade level standards in ELA and Math. Data will be reviewed to determine the success of the program and whether additional students join.

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

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to reducing tardies	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Being tardy to school directly impacts a student's instruction. During the 21-22 school year we saw a significant increase in student tardies. Students with 10 tardies increased from 194 students to 309 students. Students with 20 tardies increased from 109 to 191, Students with 30 tardies increased from 59 to 117. Finally, students with 40 tardies increased from 43 to 75.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	We want to observe a 50% reduction in tardies across our 10+, 20+, 30+ and 40+ categories.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Administration will meet with student services weekly to review data. Data will be pulled weekly from the mainframe to pinpoint students and grades with the highest need. Meeting weekly will allow us to make decisions quickly that will impact instructional minutes immediately.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brian Harvey (brian.harvey@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	We will use positive reinforcement and school-wide/classroom recognition alongside encouraging students to contribute to the classroom as the day begins. "When students contribute, they feel needed. Students who are needed feel they belong. Those who belong develop high self-esteem. Students with high self-esteem have much to contribute. It's a wonderful circular process in which each part reinforces the other." - Cooperative Discipline, Linda Albert.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	School-wide and classroom incentives will provide recognition for arriving on-time. Incentive plans will be created for students with severe and chronic tardies. We will also implement strategic classroom jobs for students, encouraging everyone to arrive in class on-time.

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.

Weekly school-wide messaging that encourages all students to arrive on time - parentlinks.

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

Students with a history of chronic tardies will be considered for a specific incentive plan.

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

The school social worker will provide monthly awards for the classroom in each grade level that has the fewest tardies. This will be celebrated on the morning show. There will also be specific incentives through our business partners for our most severe tardy situations.

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

Monthly administrative meetings with Student Services to review current tardy trend data. Goals will be reviewed and strategies will be updated as needed.

Person Responsible   Andrea Bryner (andrea.bryner@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

In Kindergarten the i-Ready spring reading diagnostic indicated 79% of our students were early on, mid or above grade level. In 1st grade, 54% of our students were early on, mid or above grade level. In second grade 65% of our students were early on, mid or above grade level. As we continue to address student needs and growth, we will implement a consistent planning structure in K-2 that supports timely data disaggregation and implementation of backwards planning strategies with internalization. Outcomes will provide standards focused instruction for whole group and identify specific foundational skills that can be utilized during differentiated small group instruction.

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

Results from the 2022 FSA indicated 43% of our 3rd graders, 42% of our 4th graders and 53% of our 5th graders were scoring at a level 3 or higher. As we continue to address student needs and growth, we will implement a consistent planning structure in 3-5 that supports timely data disaggregation and implementation of backwards planning strategies with internalization. Outcomes will provide standards

focused instruction for whole group and identify specific foundational skills that can be utilized during differentiated small group instruction.

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)

We will review ELA data from the STAR progress monitoring assessment and group students into Tier 1 (41st percentile or higher), Approaching Tier 1 (25th - 40th percentile), Tier 2 (11th-24th percentile) and Tier 3 (below the 11th percentile). We will compare the i-Ready diagnostic 1 data to STAR data and create reasonable goals for each student. This is our first year utilizing the STAR assessment and our goal is to increase on grade level results. Kindergarten we would like to sustain 80% on or near grade level performance. We would like to increase 1st and 2nd grade to 70% on grade level performance.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

We will review ELA data from the F.A.S.T. assessment and tier our students. This is our first year with the F.A.S.T. assessment and want to see an increase in scores that compare to an FSA level 3. Goal: Grades 3-5 will have results indicating over 50% of the students have scored at a level equivalent to an FSA level 3.

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.

Administration and our reading coach will participate in weekly PLC's to ensure fidelity of planning. Administration will also look for evidence of common planning and development of differentiated small groups through weekly walkthroughs and observations.

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

Harvey, Brian, brian.harvey@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 weekly planning structure (weekly common planning) with ELA grade level teams that provide time for timely data disaggregation and implementation of backwards planning strategies with internalization. Outcomes will provide standards focused instruction for whole group and identify specific foundational skills that can be utilized during differentiated small group instruction.

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?

Discussions revolving around student growth, lack of student growth, grade level specific standards, small group implementation and data analysis are invaluable during a PLC. In "Revisiting Professional Leading Communities at Work" Dufour, Dufour and Eaker state "the very essences of a learning community is a focus on and a commitment to the learning of each student". Our reading coach and administration will support PLC's and provide them with the tools to backwards plan. Addressing specific student needs is crucial as we continue to academically accelerate our students.

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
Develop a framework for team backwards planning around the student end task that aligns with the focus standards.	Schulte, Laura, laura.schulte@hcps.net
Conduct focused walkthroughs providing feedback to teachers on the instructional objectives, the task and the alignment to the standards.	Harvey, Brian, brian.harvey@hcps.net
Utilize teacher leaders as models and think partners during both instruction and planning to help build teachers capacity across the school. Create primary and intermediate demonstration classrooms to show teachers across all grade levels what the connection between the objective and task looks like, along with how to coordinate strategic small group instruction through backwards planning.	Harvey, Brian, brian.harvey@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.

Summerfield Crossings staff will create positive environments in and out of the classroom by teaching our students school-wide behavioral expectations. All staff will have the chance to compliment and celebrate students or classrooms exemplifying positive behavior on campus. Teachers will track "points" they have received on campus for positive comments and celebrate with the students when their classroom goal has been met.

We also server Breakfast in the Classroom which allows our teachers to talk with students and create healthy classroom families.

Student and classroom celebrations will also be promoted on our school's morning show, allowing other students to learn about what great work our students are doing on campus.

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

Patricia Mendez (School Counselor) and Vaniece Johnson (Social Worker) are two key staff members who will ensure our character based "point system" runs smoothly. They celebrate students and classes on the morning show, conduct 7-Habits lessons in the classroom, promote positive social/emotional growth during Mindful Thursdays and consistently talk to our students about making positive choices.

Classroom Teachers are also integral stakeholders. Our teachers are the front line of community building.

They promote healthy classroom environments and use "breakfast in the classroom" time to learn more about their students so they can create closer connections which will increase student engagement.