

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Summerfield Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents	
School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Summerfield Elementary School

11990 BIG BEND RD, Riverview, FL 33579

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Andrea Bryner

Start Date for this Principal: 7/25/2022

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: B (57%) 2018-19: C (49%) 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	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.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Summerfield Elementary School

11990 BIG BEND RD, 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	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	70%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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
Alfano, Carmine	Principal	Maintain school safety, instructional leader, implements and maintains high quality instruction using district adopted curriculums. Communicates school-wide data to PSLT and stakeholders. Progress monitors academic success, attendance, and discipline. Hire high quality personnel to meet the multi-cultural needs of the school. Establishes a collaborative culture utilizing SEL and Restorative practices to include all stakeholders.
Woods, Jodie	Assistant Principal	Oversees instructional materials and testing compliance, Maintain school safety, instructional leader, implements and maintains high quality instruction using district adopted curriculums. Communicates school-wide data to PSLT and stakeholders. Progress monitors academic success, attendance, and discipline. Hire high quality personnel to meet the multi-cultural needs of the school. Establishes a collaborative culture utilizing SEL and Restorative practices to include all stakeholders
Aagaard, Noel	Teacher, K-12	Represents First Grade in the I.L.T. process of analyzing data and making instructional decisions school-wide to facilitate change within the grade level represented. Communicates all compliance matters to the team represented and brings ideas and solutions to collaborative discussions regarding the direction the school is striving to achieve.
Beall, Kelley	ELL Compliance Specialist	Oversees all implementations of ELL strategies and supports involved in coaching and monitoring interventions for this sub-group. Oversees WIDA testing and accommodations for ELL learners.
BonannoAkel, Judith	SAC Member	SAC Chair. Organizes and facilitates SAC committee meetings, classroom teacher in Fifth-grade with strong ELA strategies to share schoolwide.
Bondoc, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	Represents Second Grade in the I.L.T. process of analyzing data and making instructional decisions school-wide to facilitate change within the grade level represented. Communicates all compliance matters to the team represented and brings ideas and solutions to collaborative discussions regarding the direction the school is striving to achieve.
Debrocke, Heather	Teacher, K-12	Represents Third Grade in the I.L.T. process of analyzing data and making instructional decisions school-wide to facilitate change within the grade level represented. Communicates all compliance matters to the team represented and brings ideas and solutions to collaborative discussions regarding the direction the school is striving to achieve.
Hill, Alexis	Teacher, K-12	Represents Kindergarten in the I.L.T. process of analyzing data and making instructional decisions school-wide to facilitate change within the grade level represented. Communicates all compliance matters to the

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		team represented and brings ideas and solutions to collaborative discussions regarding the direction the school is striving to achieve.
Maynard, Heidi	Teacher, K-12	Represents Fifth Grade in the I.L.T. process of analyzing data and making instructional decisions school-wide to facilitate change within the grade level represented. Communicates all compliance matters to the team represented and brings ideas and solutions to collaborative discussions regarding the direction the school is striving to achieve.
Simpson, Karen	Reading Coach	Create high quality coaching sessions for all teachers in grades K-5 and ESE. Progress monitor all ELA and writing data that is intertwined within the curriculum instructional frameworks. Provide trends of reading success and deficits to the PSLT on a regular basis. Implement and lead professional development that increases instructional capacity for all ELA teachers. The Literacy Champion of the school who monitors resources and trends within the literacy program to improve the love for reading and writing.
Urquhart, Christopher	Teacher, ESE	ESE Specialist who oversees all ESE programs, services, compliance and supports. Organizes daily coverages in the ESE department and supports with behavior, curriculum, and other related services.
Urquhart, Meghan	Teacher, K-12	Represents Fourth Grade in the I.L.T. process of analyzing data and making instructional decisions school-wide to facilitate change within the grade level represented. Communicates all compliance matters to the team represented and brings ideas and solutions to collaborative discussions regarding the direction the school is striving to achieve.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/25/2022, Andrea Bryner

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.*

2

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

51

Total number of students enrolled at the school

667

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

16

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

12

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	110	125	126	89	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	618	
Attendance below 90 percent	1	43	46	38	26	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	192	
One or more suspensions	1	4	2	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	21	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	29	23	340	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	392	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	7	5	18	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	

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	4	2	2	13	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	1	7	5	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	
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

Monday 7/25/2022

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	5	7	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	5	7	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	50%	53%	56%				48%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	63%						48%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	62%						52%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	51%	50%	50%				51%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	69%						50%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%						44%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	45%	59%	59%				50%	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	49%	52%	-3%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	47%	55%	-8%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2022					
	2019	40%	54%	-14%	56%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

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	49%	54%	-5%	62%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	49%	57%	-8%	64%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2022					
	2019	48%	54%	-6%	60%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	49%	51%	-2%	53%	-4%
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	36	46	42	40	57	47	37				
ELL	37	63	53	44	55	42	25				
BLK	37	47		34	50	50	30				
HSP	45	60	57	45	68	57	31				
MUL	60	74		57	71		67				
WHT	63	70		64	75		67				
FRL	44	59	62	44	65	59	38				
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	33	32	36	29	32	33	37				
ELL	16	38	70	28	40	38	14				
ASN				90							
BLK	41	33		27	50		31				
HSP	32	36	54	29	42	44	21				
MUL	59			41							
WHT	72	65		57	52		69				
FRL	42	40	50	33	43	45	34				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	31	41	35	27	36	40	14				
ELL	23	42	69	37	42	33	32				
BLK	40	46	38	34	46	50	39				
HSP	42	44	53	46	38	38	43				
MUL	55	68		58	62						
WHT	56	47	50	59	61	40	63				
FRL	40	47	56	44	42	44	41				

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	57
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	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	452
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
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	46
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	41
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	66
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	68
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	53
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?

Content specific vocabulary across all grade levels and subjects will continue to be a strong focus this year. Although proficiency in math went up in grade 4, the use of strong small group intervention strategies to differentiate instruction across all grade levels is needed and will be a major "Look For" during classroom walkthrough data collection. ELA proficiency is still struggling across grades 3-5 due to the lack of growth using informational text coupled with vocabulary development. ESE data improved as well as ELL regarding ESSA Federal subgroup categories. All subgroups showed improvement due to gain scores, however with no gain scores calculated this upcoming year, proficiency must be the focus in all grade levels.

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

Science proficiency in grade 5 only increased from 39% to 45% which is a minimal gain compared to the drop we had last year from 50% to 39% in the 2020-21 year. ELA proficiency in grades 3 and 5 is still below the RAISE target of 50% with grade 4 reaching 58%. All grades, especially upcoming K-2 need intensive small group differentiated instruction across all sub groups to elevate above 50% target. Wonders data in the mid-year exhibited a great need to maintain ELP focus on phonics, decoding, and vocabulary development in the primary grades.

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

Core instruction is still our main targeted focus across all grade levels. Small group differentiated practice in ELA and Math is essential to elevating proficiency levels going into this upcoming year. Due

to attendance issues and tardy data that increased due to the pandemic, many students lost the continuity of continued development with foundational skills in Math and Reading. Science development did increase, however the increased use of Long Term Investigations across all grade levels is needed and will strengthen the core instruction, especially in grade 5. The strong interrelationship of planning and use of the Academic Services resources and new BEST standards curriculum will support high quality lesson planning practices if used with fidelity.

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

Both ELA and Math made significant gains in the bottom quartile across grades 4 and 5. Science made minimal gains, however those gains did not capture the entire 11% points we dropped from the year prior.

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

In the area of ELA, we intensified the use of coaching cycles by the Literacy coach coupled with the ELL intervention resource teacher to bridge those learning gaps we targeted. We had a schoolwide focus on vocabulary development launched by your "Vocabulary Walk" event last fall. The area of Math was strongly influenced by the data monitoring of the "Math Monthlies" by using timely data to steer lesson planning and core instruction. We also used the resource "Reflex Math" to bridge the level of foundational skill development in grades 1-5. Our Science improvement in grade 5 was supported with more Long Term Investigations and gap instruction prior to the state assessment of those foundational science skills many students missed in grades 2-4.

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

Provide standard-based core instruction that is data driven through high quality collaborative planning. Increase our Parent and Family Involvement directly tied to academic supports, academic night family functions, and wrap-around services (SEL Supports) to enhance systems of support for each child across all grade levels. Lastly, the implementation of small group instruction to utilize scaffolding strategies to differentiate learning through rich grade-level content.

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.

This year all content champions identified across Primary, Intermediate, and ESE will lead PD Monday sessions with a variety of core content opportunities to develop use of the BEST standards and district resources to enhance instruction. Other PD sessions focusing on SEL implementation, ESE and ELL differentiated supports will also be embedded in the variety of month sessions that teachers can choose to attend that will impact their individual needs and practice. We used data driven focus last year to develop patterns of timely use of that data to drive planning. This year will continue to use data and walk through feedback from administration to elevate small group instructional practices that align with grade level instructional frameworks and core content.

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

The increased focus on coaching cycles with follow-up reflections, model classroom walks across all grade levels and ELP focus on more Primary instruction to capture the gap instruction we noticed during the two years of virtual learning for many youngsters is apparent and a strong focus to sustain growth. The use of consistent feedback from administration that is equitable and content specific will also keep fidelity to the performance targets each teacher is expected to differentiate for all learners at all levels.

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.	<p>The purchase of a Literacy coach out of title I funds to focus on coaching, modeling and data driven differentiated interventions to develop the use of grade level comprehension by developing vocabulary development within writing practice related to multiple genres across all literature. The need to continue our focus on phonics development in the Primary grades to establish better decoding skills by grade 3 in order to master the BEST standards and elevate proficiency across all reading groups and grade levels. Unfinished learning is still apparent across all grade levels and of great need of differentiated strategies from the Literacy coach, the ESE Specialist, and the ELL resource teacher as small group instruction develops out of strong core instruction.</p>
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	<p>The goal of 10% proficiency growth in grades 3 and 5 with a 5% growth in grade 4 is the target. The use of coaching cycles and PD that targets deficit areas of data from I-ready progress monitoring data will steer the supports for coaching, learning walks, and rich reflective discussions with administration.</p>
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	<p>The highest need teachers who struggle based on district, and formative assessments will be high priority as we launch the coaching cycles and PD needed in the first few months of the school year. Gaps in instructional data at the three testing windows will steer the PD needed by each grade level and content area.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Karen Simpson (karenm.simpson@sdhc.k12.fl.us)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented	<p>Hattie's work on scaffolding and differentiation shows a 182 influence on improved achievement and this similar targeted goal was successful last year and we plan to build on it with more fidelity by the instructional staff across all content and grade levels.</p>

**for this Area
of Focus.**

**Rationale for
Evidence-
based**

Strategy:

**Explain the
rationale for
selecting
this specific
strategy.**

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

Due to the large subgroup dynamics of our site, the proper modeling and follow-up feedback provided to the differentiated and scaffolding strategies will enhance learning outcomes for all students at whatever level are at. We often forget about the higher students and this will ensure their continued growth with this sustained strategy of meeting the student at their level and scaffolding their differentiated needs to meet proficiency.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	<p>Although subgroups did elevate above the 41% baseline established by the state to avoid specific group interventions, the need to continue with vocabulary development and strong math foundational skill development is needed across all groups to sustain the growth we made this year. The continued development of quality grade level planning sessions either as a team or a subject department area is critical to build strong core lessons and formative assessments to progress monitor student achievement. Students in the ESE and ELL subgroups need continues interventions that increase their capacity to be exposed to grade level benchmarks and the differentiated tools to access those standards in daily inclusive instruction. What will drive the core instruction will be a strong classroom culture, student academic ownership of the grade level content, rigorous content that challenges all students at their developmental grade level, and the ability for all learners to be confident in demonstrating their learning daily.</p>
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	<p>The schoolwide goal is a 5% increase in all subgroups from the prior year, which is a lofty goal, but obtainable with better scaffolding/differentiation practices that is a direct response to interventions needed. To enhance the use of stronger small group interventions will be impacted by timely feedback and targeted "Look For" practices that support core schoolwide.</p>
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	<p>The consistent use of "Look For" data collection and I.L.T. review of that data that is teacher and grade level specific will keep each grade level calibrated solely on the relationship between student performance data and teacher's individual walkthrough feedback data by administration.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Jodie Woods (jodie.woods@hcps.net)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being	<p>Hattie's Response to Intervention impact of 1.29 and Scaffolding impact of 0.82 launched this past year and we need to build on sustained growth across all grade levels, not just the struggling grades and teachers. Response to intervention will elevate the Tier 2 and 3 learners, but can also impact Tier 1 students who need to be pushed.</p>

**implemented
for this Area
of Focus.**

**Rationale for
Evidence-
based**

Strategy:

**Explain the
rationale for
selecting
this specific
strategy.**

Hattie's work shows a direct relationship between targeted interventions that are driven by data driven differentiated opportunities for all learners will elevate every instructional subgroup positively.

**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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Family and Community Engagement**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

From our Title I Impact Survey the need to have more parent, community and stakeholder involvement in the academic and social event of the school showed a great need. Because of the pandemic the past two years, there has been limited stakeholder access to our campus for safety reasons and contact tracing concerns that could negatively impact our attendance rates for students and staff.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

To support the use of scaffolding strategies that are differentiate across all learning subgroups, the calendar of events for the school year is over 20 individual functions for all families to attend.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Through the use of surveys, sign-in sheets, and proper advertisement and RSVP strategies, we are targeting a 100% increase from our 2019-2020 data before the pandemic hit.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carmine Alfano (carmine.alfano@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Parental involvement has a 0.50 impact size related to Hattie's work on student achievement. Coupled with taught parent strategies to support differentiated deliberate practice at home with students also has an impact of 0.79 on achievement. The combination of these two strategies fostered at our academic nights and a stronger attendance rate at these events will impact student learning across all groups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

This response to intervention targets learning supports that can support and create some continuity between independent practice at home with concepts presented daily during 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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

Looking at our Pre-K AP3 assessment, those students in Pre-K heading to Kindergarten had 15 students (45%) needing support in Letters and Sounds as they transition to KG. Our KG students had 9 students below level based on their EOY Wonders screening. Our First grade had 39 students (33.1%) below level on their OY Wonders Screening tool. Our Second grade had 40 students (31.5%) also on their EOY Wonders screening. These are relevant data totals because these students will be transitioning to the next grade level. There is 1 KG, 6 First graders and 4 Second graders that were retained and will remain in their grade level data pool for the upcoming year.

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

Grade 3, 47% Proficient; Grade 4 60% Proficient; and Grade 5 46% Proficient was starting point this year: Based on 5 retentions in Grade 3 after portfolio attempts, we had 20 students who did not meet grade level expectations moving into Grade 4. Of our Grade 3 proficiency we only achieved 47% of the total grade level. Our Fourth graders had 60% proficiency of students who were Above grade level. Our Grade 5 students achieved on 46% proficiency. 54% did not achieve grade level proficiency goals for the grade level. All three grade levels used intensive small group work targeting informational text and grade level specific vocabulary which has shown diagnostic data as an area of need. Our intentional use of the literacy coach to target gaps in decoding for those at least two grade levels below their actual grade showed greater gains in grade 4 than in grades 3 and 5. We also instituted a vocabulary gallery walk event that motivated students to investigate words and their meanings. The impact would have been greater if we moved the event up on the calendar like we will do this academic year.

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)

KG will use the Wonders screener to reduce the 45.5% of Pre-K students entering KG to 90% or higher by the end of the year in KG regarding Letter and Sound recognition. Only 9 students entering First Grade need immediate intervention and ELP tutoring will target those 9 youngsters in Grade 1 to accelerate their learning to grade level. Our major target will be using Wonders screenings to attack our 39 First graders who scored below level on their EOY Wonders assessment as they enter grade 2. Because 7 of those youngsters were retained, the goal is to accelerate 80% of those who were below level by the end of the year. Lastly, our Second graders had 40 students below level with 4 of them repeating Grade 2. ELP tutoring will be a direct impact on reducing this number so 80% accelerate to grade level proficiency by the end of the year in grade 3. All KG- Grade 2 students will be progressed monitored using I=Ready LAFS intervention lessons and data collection.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Our 5 retained students will get Tier 3 interventions from the Reading Literacy Coach and ELP tutors with extensive use of Jennifer Seravallo strategies throughout these tiered intervention lessons. The goal is to reduce this gap of grade level use of vocabulary and word usage to support the comprehension within the text by the end of Grade 3. This intensive strategy will also target our 5 retained students from last year who need another dose of vocabulary and word usage development. Additional supports will focus on decoding for our retained students. Our 36 students from Grade 2 entering Grade 3 will also be targeted with Seravallo mini-lessons in small group instruction and ELP sessions to address their weak areas. With this and our vocabulary focus we hope to not repeat the proficiency levels of 47% we achieved last year and raise that total well above 50%. Our goal this year is to raise our grade 3 proficiency levels at least 10% to 57% proficiency on the new State assessments. All grades 3-5 will also be monitored using I-ready LAFS lessons and data to bridge the acceleration gap for these youngsters. Our grade 4 students entering Grade 5 did have a 60% proficiency level, however continued attention to informational text and vocabulary will continue. Our goal is to elevate these youngsters another 5% points in grade 5. The addition of a reading incentive program like Accelerated Reader will be implemented school wide so set goals and challenges for all our readers at all grade levels, including our ESSA subgroup kids who made nice gains last year. Our goal with our ESSA subgroups is to keep them above the 41% state level or higher as we target our learners with small group strategies.

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.

Wo0nders Screening and I-Ready in grades KG-Second Grade.

I-Ready Progress Monitoring Testing Cycles, PMA's and informative assessments in Grades 3-5.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Simpson, Karen, karenm.simpson@sdhc.k12.fl.us

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. Â§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?

I-Ready does not align to the BEST standards yet, however it does provide valid diagnostic data for the ELA component of literacy development. In addition, Jennifer Servallo and her mini-lessons in reading and writing have shown great correlation between district and state assessment criteria and grade level ELA development.

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?

The designed evidence based practices have been very reliable as we have targeted our sub-groups in ELL, ESE, Free and Reduced students, and BQ groups in general.

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 based on teacher need and data reflection from prior year assessment scores, especially in grades 3-5.	Simpson, Karen, karenm.simpson@sdhc.k12.fl.us

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.

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

Each classroom establishes a "safe place" and a family meeting is encouraged for those classes who struggle with cohesive continuity or struggles within the framework of each homeroom. The utilization of social media, parent links and weekly flyers keeps the communication lines active and positive and creates true transparency between the school staff and all our families. We also invite many business partners to set up tables at family events if they have resources and programs that may support any sub-group of our population that may be interested in their services.

Our attention to most needed demands centers around our Student Services team that provided meals, backpacks and school supplies to any family that needs support. Our family resource program has improved each year and the wrap-around supports we can direct our families to are very helpful and supportive.

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

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

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

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

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

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