

Pasco County Schools

# Anclore Elementary School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## 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>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>20</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>20</b> |

# Anclote Elementary School

3610 MADISON ST, New Port Richey, FL 34652

<https://aes.pasco.k12.fl.us>

## Demographics

**Principal: Ellen Thomas**

Start Date for this Principal: 4/16/2018

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 82%  |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students*<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (51%)<br>2017-18: D (40%)<br>2016-17: C (49%)<br>2015-16: C (46%)   |
| <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>   | TS&I   |

\* 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 Pasco 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>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>20</b> |

## Anclore Elementary School

3610 MADISON ST, New Port Richey, FL 34652

<https://aes.pasco.k12.fl.us>

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | Yes                    | 74%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 41%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | C       | C       | D       | C       |

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pasco 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.

Anclote Sailors - Dream, Believe and Achieve.

Dream - With all of our minds

Believe - With all of our hearts

Achieve - With all our might

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

All students achieving success in college, career and life.

### 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   |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|
| Thomas,<br>Ellen    | Principal              | The administration leads the guiding coalition, a team of leaders wanting to promote excellence and lead change throughout the building. This will be accomplished through identifying best practices and building upon them, problem solving issues, to come up with innovative, practical responses to improve or correct the problems and building a culture of community by modeling personal dedication to students, faculty, parents and the community at large. The undertone of all decisions will be made by answering the question - Is this best for students? |
| Pitkoff,<br>Jessica | Assistant<br>Principal |   |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 4/16/2018, Ellen Thomas

**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.*

1

**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.*

6

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

22

### Demographic Data

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 82%  |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students*<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (51%)<br>2017-18: D (40%)<br>2016-17: C (49%)<br>2015-16: C (46%)   |
| <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>   | TS&I   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |  |



**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               | 70          | 71 | 69 | 79 | 69 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 432   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 21          | 6  | 10 | 12 | 12 | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 67    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 1           | 2  | 1  | 2  | 1  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 18 | 10 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 52    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 34 | 20 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 85    |
|   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
|   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
|   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 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 | 4           | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19    |

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

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

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

Monday 7/27/2020

**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     | 77          | 90 | 84 | 93 | 81 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 511   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 4           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 2  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 13    |
| One or more suspensions         | 3           | 6  | 3  | 9  | 2  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 25    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 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 | 2           | 4 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14    |

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

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 2           | 1 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |
| Students retained two or more times | 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     | 77          | 90 | 84 | 93 | 81 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 511   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 4           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 2  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 13    |
| One or more suspensions         | 3           | 6  | 3  | 9  | 2  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 25    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 18 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 18    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 52 | 30 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 137   |

**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 | 2           | 4 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14    |

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

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 2           | 1 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis****School Data**

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        | 46%    | 58%      | 57%   | 54%    | 56%      | 55%   |
| ELA Learning Gains     | 57%    | 56%      | 58%   | 51%    | 55%      | 57%   |

| School Grade Component      | 2019   |          |       | 2018   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 60%    | 54%      | 53%   | 39%    | 52%      | 52%   |
| Math Achievement            | 46%    | 60%      | 63%   | 53%    | 57%      | 61%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 60%    | 61%      | 62%   | 55%    | 58%      | 61%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 44%    | 50%      | 51%   | 58%    | 47%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 41%    | 53%      | 53%   | 30%    | 49%      | 51%   |

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) |     |     |     |     |     | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
|           | K                                 | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   |       |
|           | (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.

| ELA                   |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 32%    | 60%      | -28%                       | 58%   | -26%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 47%    | 57%      | -10%                       | 57%   | -10%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -15%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 60%    | 59%      | 1%                         | 58%   | 2%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 40%    | 55%      | -15%                       | 56%   | -16%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 20%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 13%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 44%    | 55%      | -11%                       | 56%   | -12%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 44%    | 56%      | -12%                       | 55%   | -11%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 4%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 36%    | 59%      | -23%                       | 62%   | -26%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 45%    | 59%      | -14%                       | 62%   | -17%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -9%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 51%    | 62%      | -11%                       | 64%   | -13%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 44%    | 59%      | -15%                       | 62%   | -18%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 7%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 6%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 49%    | 57%      | -8%                        | 60%   | -11%                    |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|                       | 2018 | 34%    | 58%      | -24%                       | 61%   | -27%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 15%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 5%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                    | 2019 | 41%    | 53%      | -12%                       | 53%   | -12%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 41%    | 56%      | -15%                       | 55%   | -14%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

### 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                                       | 22       | 38     | 57          | 26        | 48      | 43           | 7        |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 32       | 56     |             | 32        | 43      | 45           | 30       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 73       |        |             | 64        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 31       |        |             | 13        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 41       | 56     | 50          | 39        | 45      | 55           | 50       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 70       | 90     |             | 80        | 80      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 45       | 53     | 65          | 48        | 63      | 42           | 38       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 41       | 57     | 62          | 42        | 56      | 42           | 34       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 26       | 29     | 29          | 27        | 29      | 18           | 19       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 35       | 31     |             | 31        | 25      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 67       |        |             | 50        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 24       | 43     |             | 10        | 21      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 38       | 36     | 20          | 39        | 35      | 36           | 32       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 56       | 25     |             | 56        | 50      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 47       | 49     | 29          | 46        | 44      | 25           | 55       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 44       | 46     | 30          | 40        | 40      | 31           | 41       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 19       | 38     | 38          | 16        | 41      | 50           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 24       | 50     |             | 29        | 54      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 57       |        |             | 71        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |

| 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 |
| BLK                                       | 38       | 31     |             | 30        | 33      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 45       | 48     | 40          | 52        | 58      |              | 27       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 57       |        |             | 50        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 60       | 56     | 38          | 55        | 58      | 57           | 32       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 51       | 52     | 38          | 49        | 55      | 58           | 28       |         |           |                   |                     |

### ESSA Data

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

| ESSA Federal Index  |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 54   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 2    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 77   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 431  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |
| Percent Tested  | 99%  |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 34   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 0    |
| English Language Learners   |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 45   |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%        | 0    |
| Native American Students  |      |
| Federal Index - Native American Students  |      |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                | N/A  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%         | 0    |

| Asian Students   |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Asian Students   | 69  |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                      | 0   |
| Black/African American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                    | 22  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?            | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%     | 2   |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 52  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%                   | 0   |
| Multiracial Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 80  |
| 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   | 51  |
| 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                                | 52  |
| 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.**

Our lowest performing students were students with disabilities and black students. While we focused on our lowest quartile we did not focus on subgroups within the lowest quartile. Our third grade ELA and Math scores showed a dramatic drop.

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

Our overall Science score declined from the previous year. We did not have a clear focus on Science as we were mainly focusing on Math and ELA. We had two teachers new to fifth grade as well.

**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 data component that had the greatest gap compared to the state average were our science scores. We did not have a clear focus on Science.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was our lowest quartile. We had a tight MTSS for our lowest quartile of students. Learning of our sub-group distribution of scores will highlight the depth of data needed for overall improvement.

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

Attendance and number of discipline referrals.

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

1. Blended Learning
2. Tier 1 instruction
3. Writing across curriculum
4. MTSS
5. Knowledge based learning

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Community Involvement****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

At this time, students and staff are not leading their learning and promoting the engagement and culture of the school. Until all stakeholders play a role in the overall success of the school, there will not be long lasting change and improvement. All stakeholder's engagement must be addressed in order for improvement manifestation over time. Improving engagement will in itself improve culture and assist in retaining teachers.

**Measurable Outcome:**

Students will attend school at a higher average rate as they want to be part of the school community. Behavior referrals and discipline calls will be reduced as a result of the continuation of restorative circles and the implementation of the Leader in Me Process to support Staff and Student leadership. As students and teachers are more engaged, they will be present at a higher percent, than it is expected that student achievement will go up. Building relationships will also help improve the overall achievement of our subgroups that are underperforming. (SWD's and Black) We will learn to better understand their plights and respond with respect and understanding. We will also be reaching out to parents with our leadership training as well to be partners.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Ellen Thomas (ethomas@pasco.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

We will continue our work with the Leader in Me (Franklin Covey) This year we are building our learning about Leadership, Culture and Academics. Leveraging leadership is a way to engage all stakeholders in many facets of the school community. By learning to be leaders we expect student and staff engagement to improve. Expectations and language will be clear and aligned.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

We selected this strategy last year as a means to build engagement at our school. Our Gallup scores, both in Staff and 5th grade were low compared to nationwide and District comparable data. We also completed a comprehensive needs assessment where teachers and staff we at a high level of concern for safety because of the behaviors in the school. We believe this approach to positively build leaders instead of the typical punitive model may benefit our students who need the SEL as well as the skills necessary to be engaged in their learning. By continuing our restorative circle work we began last year and add the leadership component, through LiM daily lessons we believe engagement will increase, leading to more productivity and proficiency. We will continue to offer leadership opportunities to students as a way to further their engagement and knowledge building in school.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Conduct interviews and surveys for a Comprehensive Needs Assessment. Analyze data and come up with a plan. Investigate options. (Yearly)
2. Continue work with the coaches of The Leader in Me for information regarding their process to build teacher and student leaders in an organization.
3. Conduct a book study on the book The Leader in Me with new instructional staff
4. Contract with Franklin Covey to provide 7 Habits training with Staff for Core 2 (Priority PD days).
5. Work in school teams for continued alignment of behavior and 7 habits processes and expectations.
6. Provide PD to staff on Launching Leadership and Building Culture in the classroom to new teachers, add Core 2, academics to year 2 plan. (Franklin Covey)
7. Bi-Weekly meetings with Lighthouse Team, to get feedback on how things are going and determine if a response is necessary(PD), or we remain on the path.



8. Maintain a Sharepoint to store lessons, resources and ideas to continue to progress.
9. Work in conjunction with Lighthouse team, Behavior experts, Leadership team to create a plan to celebrate 7 Habits language and usage with students and staff. Create a student and staff celebration plan.
10. Conduct parent nights to educate on the 7 habits and leadership strategies.

**Person**  
**Responsible** Ellen Thomas (ethomas@pasco.k12.fl.us)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

At this time, teachers do not have a systematic and vertical approach to building knowledge across the grade levels and content areas. Thus as a staff, we are well positioned to help teachers meet the increased rigor and expected reading-writing integration of the BEST Standards by improving students overall knowledge of content. This interdisciplinary approach to literacy recognizes that as students learn to read, write, and think critically in response to a variety of texts across the curriculum, relationships are discovered, connections become clear, and student achievement improves. As students become more knowledgeable, their vocabulary increases and therefore their understanding of reading comprehension improves.

**Measurable Outcome:**

Student proficiency will increase as measured by the FSA in grades 3-5. Common Formative Assessments will be utilized in grades K-5 to measure proficiency in reading and to inform instruction for writing. Both underperforming subgroups (SWD and Black) will perform at or above the 41st percentile by using the reading and writing skills and strategies and their improvement in vocabulary through knowledge based teaching.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Ellen Thomas (ethomas@pasco.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Current Curriculum will be utilized with new meaning and purpose. Instead of the typical approach to teaching the strategies, the focus will be on building knowledge with strategies built into the content of instruction. By building content knowledge children will improve vocabulary and general knowledge to make connections to new text. Thus improving overall reading/writing comprehension.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

We selected this strategy as a means to increase student reading and writing competency across all grade levels. In addition, we expect to see an increase in proficiency as measured by the FSA. Over a three year period our FSA scores have decreased in grades 3-5 in ELA. We started implementing Core Connections in 4th grade in the 2018/2019 school year. (writing approach) We saw a significant increase in proficiency in our 4th grade students 47% to 60%. We expect to see more overall improvement with a focus on knowledge building.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Full day initial overview workshop with administrators on the importance of building students content knowledge and how to change the focus of lessons from reading and writing strategies to content knowledge using the strategies. .
2. 2 times Quarterly, grade level teams meet with administration and analyze and respond to student work on building knowledge, and then participate in model lessons for students.
3. Ongoing teacher lessons to model an implement in their classroom and formative assessment to measure student progress.
4. Weekly PLC's to analyze data and create actions steps based on student need. A deliberate focus will be made to dissegment the data for our SWD's and Black students who are performing below the 41st percentile.
5. Learning Design Coach will have a focus on knowledge building and writing, coaching teams and individual teachers.

**Person Responsible**

Ellen Thomas (ethomas@pasco.k12.fl.us)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | Data Driven Decisions- Tier 1 Instruction - At this time, few grade level teams have core instruction that meets the standard of 80 percent proficiency in Tier 1. We will continue to build on our knowledge of identifying students that require tier 2 and tier 3 instruction, but we must improve the proficiency in Tier 1. For the 19/20 school year the focus was on the Tiers of support and interventions. The number of students requiring intervention was too high. We cannot Tier 2 and 3 ourselves out of an ineffective Tier 1. |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | Student proficiency will increase by 5% in ELA and Math by providing effective tier 1 instruction and then follow it up with dynamic tiered levels of support. Student subgroups performing below the 41st percentile will increase their overall proficiency to at least 41 percent.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Ellen Thomas (ethomas@pasco.k12.fl.us)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | MTSS is a systematic process to ensure every student receives additional time and support to learn at high levels. Professional Learning Communities that focus on learning, work collaboratively and are results driven, have a significant impact on student achievement. PLC's will focus on data to drive instruction. We will utilize the Processes and instructional practices for highly effective PLC's to improve our overall classroom practices in Tier 1 Instruction.  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | Professional Learning Communities offer the foundation for teachers to learn and grow in their instructional practice. By utilizing classroom data to reflect on our instruction, reading about and learning effective practices, the number of students proficient should improve with better Tier 1 instructions.  |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Develop a Master Schedule including multiple interventions times for tiers of support. Provide PD on analyzing data, and responding to data.
2. PLC teams will Identify priority standards by Unit/Module of Study.
3. Unpack the Standards (answer the questions, what do we expect students to learn, how do we know they are learning it, how do we respond when they do not learn, how do we respond when they have already learned?)
4. Develop Common Formative Assessments to measure our Tier 1 progress.
5. Implement the Teach Teaching-Assessing Cycle
6. Identify Students for Tier 2 Support by Student, by Standard, and Learning Target - Pay particular attention to our SWD's and Black students.
7. Monitor Progress of students receiving Tier 2 supports
8. Identify Students needing intensive (Tier 3) levels of support
9. Provide necessary supports in Tier 2 and 3 while working to improve the number of students proficient in Tier 1.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**Blended Learning will be incorporated into the Standards based aligned Instructional goal.**

## 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.

We are a Leader in Me School in our second year of implementation for the upcoming school year which entails, building leadership among our students, staff, and families. As part of our goal we will be offering parenting classes utilizing the Seven Habits of Highly Effective Families. Families will be invited monthly to attend digital workshops that will help build stronger relationships, supports, and understanding for one another. By utilizing the 7 habits we intend to build stronger relationships with our lower performing sub-groups to better understand and serve them.

### 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: Culture & Environment: Community Involvement |  |                 |     | \$54,005.20 |
|---|----------|--|--|-----------------|-----|-------------|
|   | Function | Object   | Budget Focus   | Funding Source  | FTE | 2020-21     |
|   | 6300     |  | 0901 - Anclote Elementary School   | Title, I Part A |     | \$1,789.20  |
|   |          |  | Notes: Leader in Me PD and Lighthouse Team guides  |                 |     |             |
|   | 6400     |  | 0901 - Anclote Elementary School   | Title, I Part A |     | \$33,677.00 |
|   |          |  | Notes: PD for Leader in Me - Core 2, Avid Membership dues and PD, Professional Memberships |                 |     |             |
|   | 5100     |  | 0901 - Anclote Elementary School   | Title, I Part A |     | \$17,040.00 |
|   |          |  | Notes: Leader in Me student guides, binders and dividers, Tea                              |                 |     |             |

|          |               |  |   |                 |               |                     |
|----------|---------------|--|---|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|
|          | 6150          |  | 0901 - Anclore Elementary School  | Title, I Part A |               | \$1,499.00          |
|          |               |  | <i>Notes: Conference Nights</i>   |                 |               |                     |
| <b>2</b> | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction</b>     |   |                 |               | <b>\$164,673.00</b> |
|          | Function      | Object   | Budget Focus  | Funding Source  | FTE           | 2020-21             |
|          | 5100          |  | 0901 - Anclore Elementary School  | Title, I Part A |               | \$31,560.00         |
|          |               |  | <i>Notes: Time for kids, Studies Weekly, SSYR Classroom Books, Art Teacher 2 days</i> |                 |               |                     |
|          | 6400          |  | 0901 - Anclore Elementary School  | Title, I Part A |               | \$70,130.00         |
|          |               |  | <i>Notes: Instructional Coach, PD teacher Salary</i>                                  |                 |               |                     |
|          | 5100          |  | 0901 - Anclore Elementary School  | Title, I Part A |               | \$62,983.00         |
|          |               |  | <i>Notes: Instructional Assistants</i>  |                 |               |                     |
| <b>3</b> | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities</b> |   |                 |               | <b>\$3,865.00</b>   |
|          | Function      | Object   | Budget Focus  | Funding Source  | FTE           | 2020-21             |
|          | 6300          |  | 0901 - Anclore Elementary School  | Title, I Part A |               | \$2,522.00          |
|          |               |  | <i>Notes: Afterschool Planning</i>  |                 |               |                     |
|          | 6400          |  | 0901 - Anclore Elementary School  | Title, I Part A |               | \$1,343.00          |
|          |               |  | <i>Notes: PLC Planning Day coverage</i>   |                 |               |                     |
|          |               |  |   |                 | <b>Total:</b> | <b>\$237,879.20</b> |