

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Summerfield Crossings Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	19
VI. Title I Requirements	22
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Summerfield Crossings Elementary School

11050 FAIRWAY MEADOW DR, Riverview, FL 33579

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

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.
Schulte, Laura	Reading Coach	Coaching cycles, side-by-side teaching, K-5 PLC support, data disaggregation and small groups supporting the bottom quartile.
Brush, Kara	Math Coach	Coaching cycles, side-by-side teaching, K-5 PLC support, data disaggregation and small groups supporting the bottom quartile.
Goodridge, Wendi	Science Coach	Coaching cycles, side-by-side teaching, K-5 PLC support, data disaggregation and small groups supporting the bottom quartile.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The instructional leadership team participated in an annual review leading to the creation of our school improvement plan.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be reviewed quarterly by the instructional leadership team to ensure progress towards school-wide goals. The SIP is open for review and/or adjustments throughout the year as needed.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	79%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	97%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: D
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	3	43	37	32	39	37	0	0	0	191	
One or more suspensions	1	3	2	4	4	2	0	0	0	16	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	9	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	55	44	0	0	0	0	99	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	44	54	0	0	0	0	98	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	0	8	22	26	0	0	0	57

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	4	5	11	1	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	4	38	27	35	36	26	0	0	0	166	
One or more suspensions	1	6	1	2	2	2	0	0	0	14	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	57	28	22	0	0	0	107	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	24	38	26	0	0	0	88	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	2	1	6	12	1	0	0	0	23

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	7	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	4	38	27	35	36	26	0	0	0	166	
One or more suspensions	1	6	1	2	2	2	0	0	0	14	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	57	28	22	0	0	0	107	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	24	38	26	0	0	0	88	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	2	1	6	12	1	0	0	0	23

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	7	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	38	50	53	47	53	56	45		
ELA Learning Gains				53			50		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49			44		
Math Achievement*	47	56	59	54	50	50	45		
Math Learning Gains				65			39		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62			50		
Science Achievement*	38	50	54	46	59	59	34		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	76	59	59	47			68		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	240
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	423
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	20	Yes	1	1
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	34	Yes	1	
HSP	46			
MUL	44			
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	40	Yes	1	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	41			
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	46			
HSP	52			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	61			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	48			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	38			47			38					76
SWD	16			27			13				4	
ELL	24			52			43				5	76
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29			43			30				4	
HSP	38			44			30				5	80
MUL	34			32			75				4	
PAC												
WHT	49			61			53				4	
FRL	28			37			27				5	78

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	47	53	49	54	65	62	46					47
SWD	17	48	43	25	64	67	21					
ELL	41	55	41	42	68	72	26					47
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK	37	50	50	35	56	56	36					
HSP	45	49	47	54	64	63	40					51
MUL	54	67		68	70		46					
PAC												
WHT	57	57	60	74	81		72					
FRL	39	48	46	45	61	60	36					47

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	45	50	44	45	39	50	34					68
SWD	7	29	33	18	36	38	14					62
ELL	30	50		28	25		20					68
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	34	42	42	32	30	50	19					
HSP	44	57		44	40		38					59
MUL	52			60								
PAC												
WHT	57	53		57	50		44					
FRL	37	48	43	37	37	55	30					63

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	41%	53%	-12%	54%	-13%
04	2023 - Spring	38%	54%	-16%	58%	-20%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	38%	46%	-8%	50%	-12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	50%	55%	-5%	59%	-9%
04	2023 - Spring	45%	59%	-14%	61%	-16%
05	2023 - Spring	49%	53%	-4%	55%	-6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	35%	47%	-12%	51%	-16%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data components showing the lowest performance were 3rd grade ELA at 38% proficient (8% below the district average), 4th grade ELA at 38% proficient (16% below the district average) and 5th grade Science at 35% proficient (11% below the district average). Factors that contributed to our performance included increased absences, elevated student tardiness and midyear teacher movement leading to increased classroom sizes.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

The data components showing the greatest decline were 5th grade ELA at 41% proficient (dropping 11% from the prior year), 3rd grade math at 50% proficient (dropping 6% from the prior year), 4th grade math at 45% proficient (dropping 6% from the prior year) and 5th grade Science at 35% proficient (dropping 11% from the prior year). Teacher movement leading to elevated classroom sizes and student absences/tardies.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Our 4th grade ELA scores have the largest gap when looking at our scores compared to our Districts scores. The District 4th grade ELA average was 54% as our proficiency score was 38%. Student absences and tardiness were both contributing factors to our decreasing proficiency scores.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The data showing the most sustainability for us was our 5th grade Math scores. Our data was only 4% below the District average and we maintained the 13% increase from 2021. At 50% proficiency, we see opportunity to increase the score and close the gap with the District average.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Looking at our Early Warning Sign data, a potential area of concern is the number of students who have attendance below 90%. Last year we had approximately 191 students across K-5 with attendance below 90%.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

- 1)Increasing Attendance and Reducing Tardiness
- 2)Identifying bottom quartile students and ensuring they are receiving differentiated instruction
- 3)Supporting newer teachers (0-3 years) with implementing core instruction
- 4)Staff PD across all content areas

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Absences and tardiness directly impact a student's instruction. During the 2022-2023 school year, we maintained a high level of student tardies and had a high level of students below 90% attendance. We are working to decrease absences and tardiness during the 2023-2024 school year.

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 tardiness within 4 groups of students. The groups include students who average 10+ tardies, 20+ tardies, 30+ tardies and 40+ tardies. We are also aiming to reduce the number of students who are below a 90% attendance rate by 50%.

Monitoring:

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

Administration will meet with Student Services weekly to review current absence and tardy data. data will be pulled from the mainframe to pinpoint students and grades with the highest need. Meeting weekly will allow the school an opportunity to make decisions quickly which will impact instructional minutes immediately.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brian Harvey (brian.harvey@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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 Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

School-wide and classroom incentives will provide recognition for arriving on-time (Beat the Bell program). 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.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 encouraging all students to arrive on time - parentlinks.

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

By When: Parentlinks starting week 3.

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

Person Responsible: Vaniece Johnson (vaniece.johnson@hcps.net)

By When: When the 2023-2024 school year begins.

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: Vaniece Johnson (vaniece.johnson@hcps.net)

By When: When the 2023-2024 school year begins.

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)

By When: When the 2023-2024 school year begins and monthly.

#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 crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our school leadership worked alongside our instructional leaders and reviewed all available data. FAST/STAR data, 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. The strategy was differentiated, small group instruction meeting the specific 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. Our goal is to increase on-grade level results compared to last year's 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.

Our reading goal is over 50% and our math goal is over 60% proficient.

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 Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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 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 Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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)

By When: Monthly

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)

By When: Beginning in August.

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: Andrea Bryner (andrea.bryner@hcps.net)

By When: During the 2nd quarter.

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)

By When: Starting in September.

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)

By When: Starting in September.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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 STAR assessment indicated that 63.5% of our students were at or above benchmark in reading. In first grade 58.2% of our students were at or above benchmark in reading. In second grade 54.2% of our students were at or above benchmark in reading. As we continue to address student needs and growth, we will implement a consistent planning structure in K-2 supporting timely data disaggregation and implementation of backwards planning strategies. Outcomes will provide standards focused instruction for whole group and identify specific foundational skills which can be utilized during differentiated small group instruction.

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

Results from the 2023 FAST assessment indicated 38% of our 3rd graders, 38% of our 4th graders and 41% of our 5th graders were scoring at a proficient level. As we continue to address student needs and growth, we will implement a consistent planning structure in 3-5 which supports timely data disaggregation and implementation of backwards planning strategies. Outcomes will provide standards focused instruction for whole group and identify specific foundational skills which 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 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 Measurable Outcomes

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 (all students are taking) to STAR data and create reasonable goals for each student. This is our second year utilizing the STAR assessment and our goal is to increase on grade level results. In kindergarten we would like to sustain a 75% at or above benchmark level performance. We would like to increase 1st and 2nd grade to 70% at or above benchmark level performance.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

We will review ELA data from the FAST assessment and tier our students. This is our second year with the FAST assessment and want to see an increase in proficiency scores. Goal:
Grades 3-5 will have results indicating over 55% of the students scoring in the proficient range.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

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 group instruction 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

Description:

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, providing time for timely data disaggregation and implementation of backwards planning strategies. Outcomes will provide standards focused instruction for whole group and identify specific foundational skills which can be utilized during differentiated small group instruction.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based 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 Learning 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 grade level backwards planning around the student end task aligning 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

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The school improvement plan will be presented and reviewed at each general assembly PTA meeting, reviewed at faculty meetings and at SAC meetings. The SIP will be available for review with the school principal upon request.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

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.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

We will first leverage the depth of knowledge from our Reading Coach, Math Coach and Science Coach to ensure all classrooms have what they need to begin the year. Their support, particularly with our new teachers, will be crucial in increasing the amount of quality learning time our students have.

Implementing breakfast in the classroom also increased the amount of time a student has in the classroom. Teachers provide academic opportunities for students who have finished breakfast and awaiting the day to begin.

Beginning in September, our extended learning program will begin and also offer numerous students the chance to engage in differentiated learning outside of their typical classroom time.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

We work cooperatively with all programs and welcome the support of all outside agencies.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

The student services team plans weekly and meets with administration weekly to ensure students in need are provided the support they need to be successful. Student services provides small group counseling, one-on-one counseling, social skills groups, support for parents/families and referrals for services off campus ensuring students receive the skills, outside their academic subject areas, to be successful.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

At the Elementary level, this does not typically apply to our students.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Our school has a Tier 1 behavioral/procedural plan which we expect all students to follow. If a student is displaying behavioral concerns, our student services team, alongside administration, schedule Tier 2 meetings. We hold these meetings weekly and it allows for the development of an individualized student behavior plans. As more significant behavioral concerns arise, we engage in creating FBA's, we provide agency referrals, and coordinate with parents/guardians.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Our instructional coaches support PLC's monthly, offering time to discuss all aspects of planning and instructional delivery. Professional development wrapped around Kagan Strategies and how to best implement differentiated small group instruction is also provided. Data chats are held quarterly to monitor school wide progress. Administration also meets with new teachers quarterly to engage in authentic conversation around new and timely topics.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Summerfield Crossings has 2 PEEPS/VPK classrooms on campus. These classes focus on the development on foundational skills and work towards the seamless integration into our Kindergarten

classrooms the following year. This school year we have added a Kindergarten Inclusion Classroom (KIC) allowing more support to the students who need it the most.