



---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>34</b>

# James B. Sanderlin K 8

2350 22ND AVE S, St Petersburg, FL 33712

<http://www.sanderlinib.com/>

## Demographics

Principal: **Carrie Armstrong**

Start Date for this Principal: 1/7/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	49%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: A (71%) 2015-16: A (72%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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 Pinellas 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>34</b>

# James B. Sanderlin K 8

2350 22ND AVE S, St Petersburg, FL 33712

<http://www.sanderlinib.com/>

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	No	35%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	54%

## School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pinellas 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.**

James B. Sanderlin K-8 is committed to teaching and learning with the brain and heart in mind. Our diverse community of active, lifelong learners will use an inquiry approach through our challenging programmes to become successful internationally-minded citizens.

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

100% Student Success!

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Armstrong, Carrie	Principal	The Principal performs responsible administrative and supervisory work in the area of instruction, personnel, curriculum, safety, budget, purchasing, public relations, plant operations, food service, and transportation. Position is responsible for the total operational management of the school.
Becker, Megan	Assistant Principal	This position is second only to the Principal in the administration of the school and serves as liaison between principal and other school personnel. This administrator assumes any duties assigned by the Principal and is fully responsible for the school program in the absence of the Principal.
Cagle, Lilia	Teacher, K-12	Instructional position responsible for the educational leadership of students in a group or class in a middle school. The educational leader is expected to understand and demonstrate the use of the Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment, and Improvement (CIAI) model to maximize educational achievement for all students; work collaboratively to ensure a working a learning climate for all students that is safe, secure, and respectful of diversity; and use a PBISbased system to effectively and efficiently organize and manage the classroom to maximize highest student achievement.
Dahl, Luci	Teacher, K-12	This is an instructional position with responsibility for guiding and directing the learning experiences of pupils in a group or class within an elementary school.
Muto, Laura	Teacher, K-12	This is an instructional position with responsibility for guiding and directing the learning experiences of pupils in a group or class within an elementary school.
Niola, Nicola	Teacher, K-12	This is an instructional position with responsibility for guiding and directing the learning experiences of pupils in a group or class within an elementary school.
Reeves, Kim	Teacher, K-12	This is an instructional position with responsibility for guiding and directing the learning experiences of pupils in a group or class within an elementary school.
Salyers, Jeremy	School Counselor	Provides a comprehensive school-counseling program that assists all students in acquiring the skills and knowledge to maximize highest student achievement in a safe learning environment. Responsibilities may vary depending upon the specific work setting and counselor to student ratio and should correspond to the needs and priorities established in the schools and district's counseling program.
Herman, Kristen	Instructional Coach	Provide curriculum support and coaching to instructional staff for the IB program.



Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Nicholson, Katherine	Instructional Coach	Provide curriculum support and coaching to instructional staff for the IB program.
Webster, Keri	Instructional Media	Library, Media & Technology
Kearney, Kim	Teacher, K-12	
Mills, Dianna	Teacher, K-12	
Wells, Angeliki	Teacher, K-12	
Thompson, Laura	School Counselor	

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Monday 1/7/2019, Carrie Armstrong

**Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*

0

**Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*

0

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

422

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	49%

<p><b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)</p>	<p>Students With Disabilities* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students</p>
<p><b>School Grades History</b></p>	<p>2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: A (71%) 2015-16: A (72%)</p>
<p><b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b></p>	
<p><b>SI Region</b></p>	<p>Central</p>
<p><b>Regional Executive Director</b></p>	<p><a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a></p>
<p><b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>Year</b></p>	<p></p>
<p><b>Support Tier</b></p>	<p></p>
<p><b>ESSA Status</b></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a>.</p>	

**Early Warning Systems**

**Current Year**

**The number of students by 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	72	72	54	66	66	66	66	66	66	0	0	0	0	594
Attendance below 90 percent	0	12	4	5	2	4	5	3	3	0	0	0	0	38
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	9	9	3	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	13	10	6	3	0	0	0	0	32

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	

Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	

Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 7/22/2020

**Prior Year - As Reported**

**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	72	54	54	54	66	66	66	66	66	0	0	0	0	564
-----------------------------	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	-----

Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	1	2	1	3	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	15
-----------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	5	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	11
-------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Course failure in ELA or Math	0	7	4	1	8	3	10	4	1	0	0	0	0	38
-------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	

Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	3	2	10	4	1	0	0	0	0	20
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	

Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

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

**Prior Year - Updated**

**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	72	54	54	54	66	66	66	66	66	0	0	0	0	564
Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	1	2	1	3	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	15
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	5	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	7	4	1	8	3	10	4	1	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	3	2	10	4	1	0	0	0	0	20

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data**

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	74%	70%	61%	76%	65%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	63%	59%	62%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	56%	54%	51%	52%	51%
Math Achievement	74%	72%	62%	79%	64%	58%
Math Learning Gains	66%	63%	59%	63%	56%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	70%	54%	52%	51%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	66%	64%	56%	77%	55%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	91%	81%	78%	85%	81%	75%

**EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

**Grade Level Data****NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**

<b>ELA</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
03	2019	78%	56%	22%	58%	20%
	2018	53%	53%	0%	57%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		25%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	56%	-3%	58%	-5%
	2018	66%	51%	15%	56%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	55%	54%	1%	56%	-1%
	2018	65%	50%	15%	55%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
06	2019	78%	51%	27%	54%	24%
	2018	88%	49%	39%	52%	36%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
07	2019	91%	51%	40%	52%	39%
	2018	82%	48%	34%	51%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	89%	55%	34%	56%	33%
	2018	83%	55%	28%	58%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
03	2019	57%	62%	-5%	62%	-5%
	2018	49%	62%	-13%	62%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	64%	-3%	64%	-3%
	2018	41%	62%	-21%	62%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
05	2019	58%	60%	-2%	60%	-2%
	2018	65%	61%	4%	61%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				
06	2019	69%	44%	25%	55%	14%

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
	2018	89%	45%	44%	52%	37%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
07	2019	98%	60%	38%	54%	44%
	2018	94%	59%	35%	54%	40%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
08	2019	0%	31%	-31%	46%	-46%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-94%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
05	2019	50%	54%	-4%	53%	-3%
	2018	59%	57%	2%	55%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	84%	51%	33%	48%	36%
	2018	81%	53%	28%	50%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		25%				

<b>BIOLOGY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019					
2018					
<b>CIVICS EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	91%	68%	23%	71%	20%
2018	94%	66%	28%	71%	23%
Compare		-3%			
<b>HISTORY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	92%	55%	37%	61%	31%
2018	86%	57%	29%	62%	24%
Compare		6%			

  

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	56%	-56%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	56%	-56%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

**Subgroup Data**

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	39	47	55	32	42	42	27				
ASN	80	61		85	58						
BLK	50	51	57	54	63	67	50	69	82		
HSP	78	64		81	64		58				
MUL	72	32		68	68		60				
WHT	89	63	79	85	70	84	83	100	89		
FRL	52	52	62	54	57	63	53	78	71		

  

2018 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	24	35	27	23	28	20					
ASN	88	67		88	57						
BLK	53	44	44	52	52	47	38	100	81		
HSP	77	66		72	66		88				
MUL	70	69		65	50						
WHT	86	60	79	83	60	62	84	97	90		
FRL	58	48	45	59	49	40	57	88	91		

  

2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	24	27	18	36	44						
ASN	74	72		91	67						
BLK	52	49	46	60	48	37	46	76			
HSP	83	64	80	79	64		67				
MUL	87	50		78	55		69				
WHT	89	70	54	91	73	63	96	87	97		
FRL	60	52	44	63	51	40	56	81	100		

**ESSA Data**

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	650
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	71
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	60
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	69
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	60
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	82
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	60
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant 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 lowest performance areas and continued areas of concern are the proficiency levels of our African American and ESE students. Even though we are not below the Federal Index standards, the gap between these subgroups and our White students is still 30% and above.

The contributing factors seem to be a lack of CRT strategies, lack of a consistent PBIS plan and lack of the use of formative assessments to differentiate instruction and provide scaffolding to ensure equal access to grade level content for all students.

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

No data areas declined from the prior year.

**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.**

The greatest gaps we have included performance of AA and ESE students. This is a continuing trend for the school, although the performance in these areas has been trending upward. Please see the comments above for the explanation of this continued gap.

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

Students making Learning Gains in ELA and Math both in overall performance and in L25 increased significantly. Different courses and supports being offered in the middle school led to these gains.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?**

ESE student performance and African American student performance are the two biggest areas of concern.

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

1. School wide PBIS implementation
2. School wide AVID implementation
3. CRT PD quarterly and monitored implementation strategies in all classrooms.
4. Voice and Choice and Visual Thinking Routines reflected in all IB planners - revision of IB Unit planners (at least two per grade level) to reflect more current inquiry based themes and IB resources, more student agency and incorporation of Principles Into Practice changes.
5. PD on differentiation and the use of formative assessments to drive differentiated instruction.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** This area of focus is specific to ELA and Reading. Our current level of performance is 74% of students proficient and 57% making learning gains and 64% of L25 making gains , as evidenced in ELA FSA Data . The problem/gap is occurring because our instruction is not student centered with rigor for ALL students. If student centered instruction with rigor would occur in a way that ALL students could access grade level critical content, the problem would be reduced by 5%.

**Measurable Outcome:**

- 1) The percent of all students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 74% to 79%, as measured by FSA ELA.
- 2) The percent of student making learning gain in ELA will increase from 57% to 62%, as measured by FSA ELA.
- 3) The percent of students in the bottom quartile making learning gains in ELA will increase from 64% to 69%, as measured by FSA ELA.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Carrie Armstrong (armstrongcar@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** ELA strategy 1- Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks  
 ELA strategy 2- Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiate/scaffold instruction to meet the needs of each student.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The rationale for implementing these strategies is that they directly correlate to improved academic achievement in reading.

**Action Steps to Implement**

IB Coordinators will plan weekly with each grade level to develop Visual Thinking routines and voice and choice in the IB planners.  
 The AVID team will coordinate and build a consistent school wide implementation plan for AVID schoolwide, specific to focused note taking.  
 Leadership will monitor the progress of these steps through feedback tools in regular walkthroughs and using the walkthrough tool in effective educators.  
 Implement evidence based Visual Thinking routines across content areas and grade levels.  
 Embed authentic audience opportunities for “voice and choice” within Reading and Writing through IB PYP Units of Inquiry/ MYP global contexts.  
 Create two new IB unit planners that address more relevant topics and embed more culturally relevant topics.  
 Meet weekly in PLC's with IB coordinators to prioritize and align academic language/vocabulary in unit planning to ensure that IB and academic language is being taught consistently and in the appropriate vertical progression.

**Person Responsible** Carrie Armstrong (armstrongcar@pcsb.org)

Incorporate differentiated instruction in IB unit planners and all ELA instruction on a more consistent and daily basis to ensure that we are meeting the needs of all learners.  
 Utilize the new district formative assessments to help guide differentiated instruction plans.  
 Incorporate the use of formative assessments into newly created IB Unit planners based on the PYP Principles Into Practice guidance (moving away from former summative assessments).

IB Coordinators and Administration will meet weekly with each grade level PLC to create at least two new IB unit planners at each grade level that address the need for more differentiation, more current and culturally relevant topics.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our current level of performance is 74% overall proficiency, 57% making learning gains and 64% of the bottom quartile making learning gains, as evidenced by the Mathematics FSA . The problem would be reduced by 5% if teachers provided standards aligned formative assessments and utilized the resulting data to provide meaningful and timely interventions and remediation on math standards.

**Measurable Outcome:** The percent of all students achieving mathematics proficiency will increase from 74% to 79%, as measured by Mathematics FSA.  
The percent of overall students making learning gains will increase from 66% to 71%, as measured by the Mathematics FSA.  
The percent of the L25 making learning gains will increase from 70% to 75% as measured by the Mathematics FSA.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Carrie Armstrong (armstrongcar@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Support staff in using formative and summative assessments in the classroom and utilize assessment data to organize students to interact with content in a manner that differentiates/scaffolds instruction.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The use of formative assessments accurately in conjunction with district instructional resources directly correlates to an increase in student performance.

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide professional development opportunities to staff in district instructional resources.
2. Provide professional development opportunities to staff on how to create formative assessments and/or use district provided formative assessments that align to the standards.
3. Following each formative assessment, teachers will partake in facilitated discussions regarding their formative data in PLC's to help create targeted intervention and remediation groups.
4. Teachers will utilize formative and assessment data regularly to inform their instruction.
5. SBLT meeting schedule on a 3 week rotation to monitor formative assessment and cycle assessment data to make decisions on trends.
6. Administration will use school IB and district provided walkthrough feedback tools to give feedback to staff on their mathematics instruction and to monitor how assessment data is being used to inform instruction.
7. IB coordinators will meet once a week with administration to discuss mathematics instruction and planning.

**Person Responsible** Carrie Armstrong (armstrongcar@pcsb.org)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our current level of performance is 66% of students are proficient, as evidenced by 5th and 8th grade FSA Science data . The problem/gap is occurring because of lack of authentic learning opportunities for students in the lab setting and the need for a better use of formative assessment tools for guiding remediation in science standards. If proper use of the Science lab and better planning and PD around using formative assessments would occur, the problem would be reduced by 10%.

**Measurable Outcome:** By the end of the 2019-2020 school year, Sanderlin will see an increase in their Science FSA proficiency by 10%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Dianna Mills (millsdi@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Teachers will provide extensive inquiry based instruction which includes opportunities for students to think scientifically through research, content exploration, and writing opportunities (claims and evidence).  
In addition, using formative assessment tools in the proper way to facilitate instruction for remediation differentiation.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** There is a need to enhance staff capacity to identify district resources aligned to critical content within the Florida Standards and the IB standards.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Implement and utilize the Science Lab on a regular basis with a fully implemented schedule and plan.
2. Communicate with the district on when Science units have been adjusted for IB UOI's and better align our formative assessments to our actual instructional timeline.
3. Continue to implement conceptual learning opportunities for students within Science.
4. Use data to plan instruction that ensures differentiation, intervention, and enrichment while scaffolding learning to increase student performance.
5. Administrators monitor teacher practice and provide feedback to support teacher growth. Administrators regularly observe science lessons to monitor strategy implementation and provide feedback to teachers, literacy coach and science Instructional staff developer to support next steps.

**Person Responsible** Megan Becker (beckerme@pcsb.org)

**#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our current level of performance is 91% of our students are proficient in Civics , as evidenced by the Civics EOC scores data. The problem/gap is occurring because there are noticeable gaps in students reading comprehension of content specific texts. If Core Connections Reading and Writing strategies and research based note-taking strategies would occur, the problem would be reduced by 5%.

**Measurable Outcome:** By the end of the 2019-2020 school year, James Sanderlin students proficiency scores on the state Civics exam will increase by 5%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** William Barlow (barloww@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Utilization of research based strategies (Core Connections Reading and Writing Strategies and Focus Note-taking) to increase reading comprehension of content specific texts will be used in the classroom, daily.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Implementing evidence-based reading, writing, and note-taking strategies will increase the ability for students to comprehend content specific texts.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers will receive professional development on Focused Note-taking Strategies
2. Teachers will implement Core Connections Reading and Writing strategy into daily instruction
3. Staff will implement school-wide Focused Note-Taking strategies
4. Students will track data to identify areas of strength and weakness on content standards
5. Teachers will utilize formative assessment and computer based programming for content standard remediation.

**Person Responsible** William Barlow (barloww@pcsb.org)

**#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Conditions for Learning- Climate and Culture - The rationale for this area of focus is that Sanderlin continues to have the need for a consistent behavior plan that is explicitly taught to students and that teachers are given specific strategies to use for behavior management in their classrooms. There were 1193 minor infractions reported in the PBIS rewards system for the previous school year, only 9 of which resulted in the need for formal discipline measures.

**Measurable Outcome:** By the end of the 2020-2021 school year, Sanderlin will have a 50% reduction in in the number of minor and major infractions reported in the PBIS rewards system.  
By the end of the 2020-2021 school year, Sanderlin will have a functional MTSS team that meets on a monthly basis to review Tier 2 and Tier 3 academic and behavior interventions which will result in at least a 10% increase in overall student achievement.  
By the end of the 2020-2021, Sanderlin will have completed and become a model PBIS school.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Carrie Armstrong (armstrongcar@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Expectations and rules are developed and effective procedures for dealing with discipline are established.  
Establish and maintain positive relationships with students

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Strategies and actions are based on research and evidence-based nationally recognized programs (PBIS and Restorative Practices). The specific strategies and actions within our SIP were selected to match our school-specific needs based on our review of data utilizing an equity problem-solving process.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Implement a comprehensive PBIS plan with PBIS team.  
Conduct whole staff referresher and rewards training in August.  
Monitor PBIS data in SBLT for evidence of successful implementation. Utilize PLC's and staff training to continue to improve implementation processes and fidelity.  
Utilize MTSS team to make revisions as needed to the review.  
Meet monthly with MTSS team to review Tier 1, 2 and 3 plans and interventions for students success.  
All staff will be trained in how to develop lesson plans to teach and re-teach classroom rules and procedures. Staff will review expectations and rules at least once per week with all students during Restorative Circle time.  
Restorative Practices trainer will hold monthly 20 and out sessions during planning periods on classroom management including appropriate use of preventative and proactive surface management as well as minor and major corrective feedback that is delivered in culturally responsive ways.

**Person Responsible** Lisa Dahlstrom (dahlstroml@pcsb.org)

During the fall semester, staff will utilize an inquiry stance to collect data on the state of relationships in their classrooms and identify small changes that can be made with individual students to increase trust and positive interactions.  
Student input is solicited via survey on what rewards should be offered for the schoolwide recognition program. The SBLT will use this data to develop a menu of rewards that offer both tangible and social.  
Staff contact at least 2 student families with positive feedback on student performance each week and log

contact into the Focus call log. PBIS Coordinator will run monthly reports to monitor call home contact. Staff will ensure that all action steps above are completed both online and in the traditional environment.

**Person Responsible** Lisa Dahlstrom (dahlstroml@pcsb.org)



**#6. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** As the result of equity-centered problem solving within an MTSS framework, Sanderlin has identified the need for an equity goal to build relational capacity, empower student voice, and hold high expectations for all students. This goal will include whole school, sustained Professional Development and an overall increase the use of equitable practices in the areas of equitable grading, culturally relevant teaching and restorative practices.

**Measurable Outcome:** As a result of implementing the evidence based strategies and action steps below, the use of culturally relevant instructional strategies, equitable grading and restorative practices will increase by at least 25% as evidenced by their use in lessons plans, IB unit planners, and the development and implementation of grade level specific equitable grading plans.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Carrie Armstrong (armstrongcar@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Sanderlin will work to impact the equity mindset of teachers to improve and increase equitable instructional practices, specifically equitable grading and restorative practices.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The data explored using the Racial Equity Analysis Protocol (REAP) protocol identifies this as an area of focus which has been demonstrated to impact student learning and success. The changes in staff practices using the evidence based strategies above and the action steps below will increase student achievement. Progress Monitoring will take place throughout the school year using formative assessments and other program assessments such as MAP data, cycle data, iReady, iStation and Dreambox data to determine the effectiveness of the strategies.

**Action Steps to Implement**

- 1) Conduct a monthly staff book study on White Fragility facilitated by Leadership Team.
- 2) Conduct district created facilitated staff equity training and guide staff through creating equitable grading practices.
- 3) Restorative Practices trainer will conduct two restorative practices sessions to continue to re-enforce the use of restorative practices throughout the whole school community.
- 4) Equity champions will provide monthly discipline and achievement data for review at SBLT, MTSS meetings to determine effectiveness of strategies being implemented and determine the need to adjust any focus areas.
- 5) IB Coordinators and administration will use one grade level PLC a month to discuss the incorporation of culturally relevant teaching strategies into lesson plans and IB unit planners.
- 6) Collaborate with PTSA to revitalize all classroom libraries with more up to date, culturally relevant titles that closely align to the diversity, sexuality and religion needs of students.

**Person Responsible** Carrie Armstrong (armstrongcar@pcsb.org)

7) Create an Equity Leadership Team that meets on a monthly basis to develop the equity PD plan, complete the Academic Equity Workbook, oversee the implementation and analyze data to determine adjustments to the plan.

8) Administration will monitor each classroom using the Equity Classroom Walkthrough tool to give

specific feedback to teachers on equitable classroom practices. Monitoring will take place through lesson plans and viewing recorded lessons teachers are conducting.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

### #7. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** There is a gap in the achievement levels of our African American students at Sanderlin. Continued professional development with staff in culturally relevant teaching and instruction as well as creating equitable grading practices can help us provide more rigorous and engaging instruction for every student in our building.

**Measurable Outcome:** Our current level of performance is 53% in ELA and 49% and in Math , as evidenced by FSA evidence Math and ELA. The problem/gap is occurring because our African American students are not engaged in or being provided with strategies that give them access to grade level rigorous content. If the school creates an Equity Leadership team to complete the REAP and the Academic Equity Workbook to drive professional development choices, decisions and topics on a monthly ongoing basis, then we could increase African American student achievement by at least 10% in the 2020-2021 school year.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Carrie Armstrong (armstrongcar@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The school Equity Leadership team will provide professional development, a book study, specific teacher feedback using the equity coaching and classroom walkthrough tools specific to providing culturally relevant instruction.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The strategies listed above have demonstrated direct correlation in improved academic achievement for African American students.

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Conduct a semester long whole staff book study on the book "Why Are All The Black Kids Sitting Together In The Cafeteria?"
2. Create an Equity Leadership Team that meets on a monthly basis to develop the equity PD plan, complete the Academic Equity Workbook, oversee the implementation and analyze data to determine adjustments to the plan.
- 3) Administration will conduct at least one walkthrough a month in each classroom using the Equity Classroom Walkthrough tool to give specific feedback to teachers on equitable classroom practices.

**Person Responsible** Carrie Armstrong (armstrongcar@pcsb.org)

**#8. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:** Our SWD subgroup achievement has been increasing but there is still a 21 % achievement gap in the achievement levels of our SWD subgroup in comparison to our total school proficiency.

**Measurable Outcome:** By implementing the strategies below, our SWD subgroup will increase the total number proficient from 41% to 51%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Megan Becker (beckerme@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** We will provide opportunities for ESE and general education teachers to co-plan and implement differentiated instruction and support delivery of services.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Differentiated instruction was a major area of weakness in our IB Evaluation visit. In addition, the ESE Resource Teachers have created differentiation plans in collaboration with PLC's on a limited basis last year and is one of the reasons we saw the increase in SWD achievement. We will like to continue with and increase our focus in this area.

**Action Steps to Implement**

- 1) VE resource teachers will take part in at least two scheduled collaborative planning sessions a month with Grade level PLC teachers where they will intentionally plan for differentiation using ESE student data.
- 2) Lesson plans/unit plans will indicate differentiate strategies the teachers are using with all students and how the VE Resource teacher is using these strategies in a co-teach model or pull out model with her students.
- 3) Grade level PLC's will collect and interpret data from Dream Box, Istation, OPM, and MAP to monitor progress with IEP goals and objectives and drive instruction based on student need, including regular and purposeful adjustment to accommodations and interventions.

**Person Responsible** Megan Becker (beckerme@pcsb.org)

**#9. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** As a result of our recent feedback from IB, Sanderlin has realized the need to increase the effectiveness and productivity of our teachers during collaborative planning. This goal will include weekly PLC meetings with the support of administration and our IB coordinators, regular vertical planning meetings, a focus on formative assessments to ensure close monitoring of data to assist in purposeful planning.

**Measurable Outcome:** By the end of the 2020-2021 school year, the above student achievement goals will be met due to the increase in effectiveness and productivity of our teachers during their collaborative planning meetings.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Megan Becker (beckerme@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Teachers will be engaged in facilitated collaborative planning twice weekly that focuses on data driven discussions.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Based on our IB feedback, we need to ensure that teachers are utilizing data to drive instructional decisions and creating IB planners that are differentiated and include relevant engagements. Utilizing a facilitated model, we can provide teachers with a format and structure that ensures that this work is productive.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers will provide feedback on an electronic planning format.
2. Teachers will utilize the electronic planning platform to input their IB units to allow for effective horizontal and vertical planning. (Toddle)
3. Teachers will meet twice during the summer for paid summer planning to begin create a year at a glance that aligns their IB units with the current pacing guides provided by the district.
4. Teachers will meet twice weekly to engage in facilitated planning discussions.
5. Teachers will develop formative assessments for each unit to monitor progress towards mastery of standards and effective teaching practices.
6. Administration and IB Coordinators will meet monthly to gather planning analytics and assist in facilitating vertical planning discussions.

**Person Responsible** Kristen Herman (hermank@pcsb.org)

**#10. Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	After evaluating our current leadership practices, it was determined that teachers should be provided with specific feedback on a recurring basis to ensure alignment to IB practices and to assist administration in creating a PD plan that aligns to the needs of our teachers.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Administration will provide specific teacher feedback during walkthroughs at least twice per month.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Megan Becker (beckerme@pcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Administration will utilize a walkthrough tool to provide specific teacher feedback at least twice per month.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	By utilizing a walk through tool that aligns to the current goals of Sanderlin, administration can monitor classroom practices, identify specific areas of improvement to create an effective professional development plan, and highlight and celebrate successes of individual and/or groups of teachers.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Administration will work with the IB coordinators to create a walkthrough tool that will collect data on specific goals related to Sanderlin that will provide immediate and specific teacher feedback.
2. The leadership team will conduct walkthroughs and provide teachers with specific feedback at least two times per month.
3. The Leadership team will review data within the walkthrough tool monthly to gather analytics around strengths and areas of improvement.
4. The leadership team will utilize the data collected to create professional development plans that aligns with the needs of our school; as well as, highlight specific teachers or teams for highly effective lessons or activities that align to our school based goals.

**Person Responsible** Megan Becker (beckerme@pcsb.org)

**#11. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Differentiation was identified as a critical need based on our feedback from our IB evaluation visit.

**Measurable Outcome:** PLC's will collaborate with administration and IB coordinators to create and/or revise their IB planners to intentionally plan for differentiated instruction.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Megan Becker (beckerme@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Teachers will utilize specific data from Dreambox, iReady, MAP, iStation and formative and summative assessments to intentionally and purposefully plan for differentiated instruction. In addition, teachers will utilize the standard based rubrics to create specific groups and monitor student progress.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Based on our feedback from IB, teachers need to create and/or revise their current planners to explicitly plan for differentiated instruction. The new IB program pushes teachers to utilize formative assessment. By regularly reviewing data from many data sources, teachers can identify areas of concern and create specific differentiated plans to meet the needs of students within their classroom.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers will create and/or revise their current IB planners to intentionally include differentiated instruction.
2. PLC's will regularly monitor student data to create these intentional differentiated plans.
3. PLC's will create or utilize county based formative assessments to monitor teaching and learning within their classrooms and across the grade level to inform their planning.

**Person Responsible:** Carrie Armstrong (armstrongcar@pcsb.org)

**#12. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Community Involvement**

<b>Area of Focus</b>	Family and Community Engagement.
<b>Description and Rationale:</b>	Ensuring that families and the community are appropriately engaged in the school increases student achievement and social/emotional well being.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	There will be a 10% increase in the number of families engaged in parent events (online and traditional) in the 2020-2021 school year.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Carrie Armstrong (armstrongcar@pcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Provide academic tools to families in support of their students' achievement at home. Intentionally build positive relationships with families and community partners.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Implementing the evidenced based strategies above should improve community engagement by effectively providing opportunities for families and the community to engage in the school.

**Action Steps to Implement**

- Streamline family engagement efforts that are result-oriented (linked to learning), by confirming families practice new tips or tools; learn new tips to support their child a home; share knowledge about their child with teacher.
- Provide academic workshops (Face-to-Face; Webinars) for parents to increase student support at home.
  - Provide families/parents with academic tools/ resources on a regular basis.
- Develop and implement activities to build respect and trust between home and school
- Conduct home visit to increase relationships between teacher and family/parent
  - Increase positive interaction with parents/families on a regular basis.
  - Utilize focus groups to gather parents and family input for development of school improvement.

**Person Responsible** Carrie Armstrong (armstrongcar@pcsb.org)

**#13. Other specifically relating to Healthy Schools**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Our current level of performance is 6 out of 6 topics for Silver level recognition, as evidenced in Alliance for a Healthier Generation, Healthy Schools Program Framework. We expect to maintain our silver level recognition and move towards gold recognition by April 2021. Our barrier to achieving gold recognition includes lack of opportunities for physical activity before, during and beyond the school day and limited opportunities for employee wellness. Healthy students attend school regularly and therefor are more likely to be successful. If our healthy school team can monitor the implementation of the administrative guidelines for wellness our school would have a great opportunity to be eligible for recognition.

**Measurable Outcome:**

Our school will be eligible in 6 out of 6 topics for gold recognition by April 2021 as evidenced by the Alliance for a Healthier Generation’s Healthy Schools Program Framework.  
Our school will maintain criteria in 6 out of 6 topics for silver recognition for the 2020-21 school year as evidenced by the Alliance for a Healthier Generation’s Healthy Schools Program Framework.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Flo Brazukas (brazukasf@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Enhance staff capacity to support students through purposeful activation and transfer strategies.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Having a healthy school initiative creates better health and student improvement for our students and increase work production, health and capability of staff.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Assemble a Health / Wellness team to include the Wellness champion, classroom teachers and PE teacher to meet monthly to discuss wellness goals.
2. Attend District supported professional development for wellness.
3. Complete Healthy Schools Program Assessment.
4. Develop an action plan.
5. Celebrate healthy school changes/activities.

**Person Responsible**

Flo Brazukas (brazukasf@pcsb.org)



**#14. Other specifically relating to College and Career Readiness**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Area of Focus is College and Career Readiness. The rationale is that by providing more rigorous courses we give students the ability to be better prepared for college, career and the future.

**Measurable Outcome:** Sanderlin wants 100% percent of students to be scheduled into at least one advanced course and 50% of students to be scheduled into at least 2 advanced and/or high school credit courses in the 2020-2021 School year.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Carrie Armstrong (armstrongcar@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Strengthen teacher implementation of rigorous instructional practices.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Students involved in more rigorous coursework will increase their overall student achievement results.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Teachers monitor the extent to which their students demonstrate deeper levels of understanding in rigorous tasks and adjust academic support structures as needed.

- Principal and school leadership team implement, monitor and adjust school-wide systems for academic support for students in rigorous courses

Emphasize the importance of industry certifications for academic relevance and career readiness  
 Implement Pre-AP Geography for all 8th grade students.  
 Implement one Pre-AP Art class.  
 Increase the enrollment of students in DIT classes.

**Person Responsible** Carrie Armstrong (armstrongcar@pcsb.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

N/A

**Part IV: 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 to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. 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.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

James B. Sanderlin IB World school addresses positive school culture in several systemic ways throughout the entire school and surrounding community.

First and foremost, we are an International Baccalaureate school. As an IB school, we are evaluated on a 5 year cycle by the IB Organization on our ability to provide thematic, global inquiry based units to our students - 6 units per year in our PYP program and at least 4 units per academic subject area per year in our MYP program. These units must be globally based - meaning that students are required to take action on initiatives not just locally or nationally but globally as well. In order to make this happen, we have to involve all stakeholders in the learning process for our students. This takes place through various on campus events, mentor/mentee projects, field trips, presentations, etc. that must include a variety of community relationships.

In addition, as an IB school Sanderlin is required to involve all stakeholders in the yearly review and creation of four different policies - Diversity, Language, Academic Honesty and Assessment. These policies are created to ensure that all students, parents, and the surrounding community/stakeholders have equal access and input into the quality instruction that we are providing our students.

In addition, Sanderlin is a schoolwide PBIS and AVID school. PBIS focuses on building positive positive relationships with students by focusing on positive behaviors and their outcomes. AVID has built our college bound culture and focus and we have been able to invite more community, business partner and college presence on our campus and in field trips with the incorporation of this program.

In addition, Sanderlin has many different opportunities for parents and community stakeholders to become involved in the school - SAC, PTSA, Lawyers for Literacy, Community and Exhibition Projects, two Internationally Themed Taking Action Nights, etc. are just a few of the highlights of what our campus provides to build an ongoing community culture and relationship with all stakeholders.

**Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

**Part V: Budget**

**The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.**

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies	\$0.00

5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity	\$0.00
7	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American	\$0.00
8	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
9	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	\$0.00
10	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Specific Teacher Feedback	\$0.00
11	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
12	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Community Involvement	\$0.00
13	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Healthy Schools	\$0.00
14	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: College and Career Readiness	\$0.00
			<b>Total:</b> \$0.00