Sugarloaf School

leadership
analysis
Florida
college and career
mission
students
school improvement
ambitious
family and community involvement
striving
achievement
teaching
relationships
success
resources
areas of focus
instruction
needs assessment
supportive environment
growth
strategic planning
collaboration
vision
learning

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sugarloaf School

255 CRANE BLVD, Summerland Key, FL 33042

https://www.keysschools.com/domain/1469

Demographics

Principal: Trevor Tyler W

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	37%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Sugarloaf School

255 CRANE BLVD, Summerland Key, FL 33042

https://www.keysschools.com/domain/1469

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-8	No	29%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	33%

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 Monroe 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.

Sugarloaf School's mission places its primary emphasis on respect for the individual, quality programs, and high teacher and student expectations. Our positive climate promotes growth in integrity, individuality, and self-esteem. We promote opportunities for building leadership, a relevant curriculum, and an ongoing student evaluation program. Maintaining effective discipline which focuses on positive reinforcement is a high priority. Our objectives focus on the infusion of communication skills, problem-solving skills, cooperative effort, the application of critical thinking skills, and the use of individual learning styles to develop each student's unique strengths. We will prepare our students to move into our complex technological society through the development of student vision, interpersonal skills, and clear career goals.

Provide the school's vision statement.

FINS:
Focused Innovative Networked Scholars

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
Ellerbee, Alena	Teacher, K-12	Science Teacher
Fairbrother-Smith, Victoria	Teacher, K-12	ELA Teacher
Lanier, Kelley	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal
Vinson, Mindy	Administrative Support	Office Manager
Walden, Kevin	Instructional Technology	Technology Integration Specialist
Kruzick, Carleigh	Teacher, K-12	4th Grade Teacher
Cauley, Karen	Teacher, K-12	
Klessens, Tabitha	School Counselor	
McNaughton, Janet	Teacher, ESE	
Unke, Brett	Principal	
Means, Marissa	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Trevor Tyler W

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.*

2

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	37%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	

Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

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	45	52	45	70	56	57	76	69	78	0	0	0	0	548
Attendance below 90 percent	11	11	11	15	17	13	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	0	0	4	11	7	12	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	9	14	6	13	0	0	0	0	43

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4	6	0	0	0	0	23

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	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 10/14/2020

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	56	60	55	60	64	74	82	74	74	0	0	0	0	599
Attendance below 90 percent	9	10	6	5	4	6	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	1	6	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	2	1	5	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	18	12	24	4	9	0	0	0	0	81

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	4	3	5	3	2	8	0	0	0	0	25

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	56	60	55	60	64	74	82	74	74	0	0	0	0	599
Attendance below 90 percent	9	10	6	5	4	6	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	1	6	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	2	1	5	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	18	12	24	4	9	0	0	0	0	81

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	4	3	5	3	2	8	0	0	0	0	25

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	65%	64%	61%	57%	67%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	61%	59%	58%	64%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	51%	54%	55%	53%	51%
Math Achievement	68%	66%	62%	67%	68%	58%
Math Learning Gains	70%	64%	59%	71%	67%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	51%	52%	60%	56%	50%
Science Achievement	75%	67%	56%	76%	67%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	96%	85%	78%	91%	85%	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.

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	70%	70%	0%	58%	12%
	2018	57%	62%	-5%	57%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	46%	58%	-12%	58%	-12%
	2018	53%	66%	-13%	56%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
05	2019	67%	62%	5%	56%	11%
	2018	52%	58%	-6%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
06	2019	52%	57%	-5%	54%	-2%
	2018	58%	56%	2%	52%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	70%	58%	12%	52%	18%

ELA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	53%	56%	-3%	51%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
08	2019	69%	60%	9%	56%	13%
	2018	64%	64%	0%	58%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	59%	62%	-3%	62%	-3%
	2018	59%	63%	-4%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	60%	-8%	64%	-12%
	2018	52%	64%	-12%	62%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	69%	66%	3%	60%	9%
	2018	66%	60%	6%	61%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				
06	2019	25%	53%	-28%	55%	-30%
	2018	53%	55%	-2%	52%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-28%				
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
07	2019	73%	61%	12%	54%	19%
	2018	62%	62%	0%	54%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				
08	2019	79%	61%	18%	46%	33%
	2018	69%	59%	10%	45%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	69%	65%	4%	53%	16%
	2018	66%	64%	2%	55%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	75%	56%	19%	48%	27%
	2018	62%	60%	2%	50%	12%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	95%	80%	15%	71%	24%
2018	84%	74%	10%	71%	13%
Compare		11%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	70%	30%	61%	39%
2018	95%	76%	19%	62%	33%
Compare		5%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	69%	31%	57%	43%
2018	100%	72%	28%	56%	44%
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	32	52	53	38	62	55	33	83			
ELL	31	38	40	44	65						
HSP	56	55	54	51	70	70	63	94	92		

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
WHT	69	61	54	75	70	49	83	96	79		
FRL	53	57	50	53	65	60	67	100	79		

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	25	34	31	44	55	46	25	60			
ELL		40			80						
HSP	54	48	23	57	61	52	68	80	73		
WHT	63	53	37	74	65	48	67	92	79		
FRL	58	50	24	67	63	54	68	81	84		

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	28	47	38	45	66	43	54	80			
ELL	20			50							
BLK	30			30							
HSP	54	51	44	58	64	56	52	93	64		
WHT	59	60	59	72	76	66	81	90	82		
FRL	47	53	45	57	69	64	65	89	63		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
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	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	686
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	51
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	66
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	71
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	63
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.

Students With Disabilities (SWD) showed the lowest performance within all sub-groups and overall data. One contributing factor is SWD only received their Exceptional Student Services (ESE) support and not additional Tier 3 support. Our SWD also consistently falls under our lowest 25% in reading and Mathematics from year to year.

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

Sugarloaf School did not have any gaps in data this school year. Sugarloaf School had positive learning gaps between the State and us. The largest positive learning gap was in Social Studies achievement. The state had 78% Social Studies achievement, and Sugarloaf School had 96% Social Studies achievement. Sugarloaf School was 18% higher than the state average. Sugarloaf has had a trend of growth in Social Studies achievement these past three years due to engagement. The level of engagement has increased due to the teacher.

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.

Sugarloaf School did not decline from the prior year within any major data component. We had gains or remained the same within our major data components. Sugarloaf School did show some decline within the Hispanic subgroup. The contributing factor was the growth in our student population in our Hispanic sub-group. From 2017-2018 to 2018-2019, we had an increase of ten students within the Hispanic sub-group.

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

Sugarloaf School showed the most improvement in ELA Lowest 25%. In 2018 Sugarloaf School was at 32% proficient and in 2019 increased 22% to 54% proficiency. Sugarloaf School added one full-time interventionist and two part-time interventionists. Sugarloaf implemented an intervention plan to work with all our tier 3 students and all our students in the lowest 25%. The interventionist plan was done with fidelity and integrity by all concerning parties.

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

According to Sugarloaf's EWS data, Part 1 (D) Sugarloaf School has an area of concern within Kindergarten and 1st-grade attendance below 90%. Sugarloaf has struggled with these two grade levels with attendance for the past 5 years. Sugarloaf has seen a small increase in the past three

years with attendance in Kindergarten and first grade due to an "Attendance Matters" plan the school put in place three years ago. Sugarloaf also has an area of concern within the amount of level 1's on statewide assessments. There was a significant amount of level 1's in the 4th and 6th grades.

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

1. Increase proficiency in our SWD data in both reading and Mathematics.
2. Continue to improve proficiency in the lower 25% in both reading and Mathematics.
3. Increase student attendance above 95% school-wide.
4. Continue to increase learning gains proficiency in both reading and Mathematics.
5. Increase Hispanic sub-group proficiency in all areas.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Sugarloaf School has attempted to maintain a positive school culture during the pandemic to ensure students' academic and emotional well-being are supported. The leadership team suspects COVID-19 has negatively affected students' academics due to the instability of their social/emotional welfare. This has been identified by student behaviors, such as the inability to complete classwork due to the nontraditional learning environment from COVID-19.
Measurable Outcome:	After the first quarter of the 2020-2021 school year, 33% of students received an "I" for incomplete assignments/assessments. By May 2021, the number of Incompletes will decrease by 15% to a percentage of 18%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tabitha Klessens (tabitha.klessens@keysschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	To increase student achievement and reduce the number of incomplete grades, a select number of students will be removed from the A/B rotation and return to a full-time schedule.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The students are chosen based on fall STAR Scores, first nine-week grades, attendance, Documented IEP plans, Early Warning Sign Indicators (EWS), and teacher recommendation.

Action Steps to Implement

Sugarloaf School created a Rescue Team to identify students in need of a more traditional school day.

Person Responsible	Brett Unke (brett.unke@keysschools.com)

After students were identified by the Rescue Team, teachers began conferencing with parents and students.

Person Responsible	Tabitha Klessens (tabitha.klessens@keysschools.com)

Following the parent and student conferences, the teacher will make recommendations for small group meetings with district social workers, CIN/FINS, and Guidance Care Center.

Person Responsible	Tabitha Klessens (tabitha.klessens@keysschools.com)

In addition to counseling, the district social worker and SRO will make home visits to touch-base with struggling students.

Person Responsible	Kelley Lanier (kelley.lanier@keysschools.com)

Students will be offered credit retrieval beginning in the second semester and the summer of 2021, if needed, in place of a second elective. After school, tutoring will also be offered to those students.

Person Responsible	Kelley Lanier (kelley.lanier@keysschools.com)

Selected students will not be on an alternate day schedule. All students selected by the rescue will report to the physical building each day.

Person Responsible   Brett Unke (brett.unke@keysschools.com)

Person Responsible   Brett Unke (brett.unke@keysschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	2018-2019 FSA data showed a 7% increase to 32% satisfactory performance of ESE students grades 3-8. This is a significant gap from the school population, which achieved a 65% satisfactory performance.
Measurable Outcome:	By May 2021, 40% of ESE students in grades 3-8 will achieve satisfactory performance as determined by the FSA ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelley Lanier (kelley.lanier@keysschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	ESE Students will receive intensive intervention in their diagnosed areas of weakness in addition to their tier 1 instruction. Progress monitoring will occur weekly or monthly as determined by individual student tiers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows for each year a student is below grade level they will require an hour a day of reading intervention to correct the reading deficiency. Progress monitoring is used to determine the effectiveness of interventions which allows changes in instruction to be made as needed. Hattie 2018 states that response to intervention has an effect size of 1.29.

Action Steps to Implement

Triangulated school-wide reading data.

Person Responsible	Marissa Means (marissa.means@keysschools.com)

Classroom teachers, MTSS Team, and intervention teachers reflected upon the data and determined the student tiers.

Person Responsible	Kelley Lanier (kelley.lanier@keysschools.com)

Student reading deficiencies were determined, and students were placed into tiered small groups based upon their areas of weaknesses.

Person Responsible	Randi Malone (randi.malone@keysschools.com)

Multi-sensory materials were gathered for each small intervention group, and interventions were scheduled accordingly.

Person Responsible	Marissa Means (marissa.means@keysschools.com)

Students are now receiving multi-tiered levels of support with increasing intensity and duration as prescribed. Students are progress monitored weekly or monthly according to their tier to determine effectiveness.

Person Responsible	Marissa Means (marissa.means@keysschools.com)

Intervention groups are fluid and flexible. Data chats are completed on an ongoing basis, as is professional development.

| **Person Responsible** | Randi Malone (randi.malone@keysschools.com) |

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Include regular attendance reminders in the monthly school newsletter retroactively to September 1, 2020. Teachers will call parents of students after 2 or more consecutive absences beginning September 14, 2020. Send a parent letter home to all students in grades K-8 by September 18, 2020. Post accrued attendance data at parent/student sign out by September 21, 2020. Sugarloaf School's social worker will make parent contact after 4 unexcused absences per nine-week quarter. Sugarloaf School's social worker will make a home visit after 10 unexcused absences. Truancy meetings will be held on behalf of chronically absent students.

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.

Sugarloaf School incorporates a wide arrange of programs that address a positive school environment: PBIS, Second Step (K-5), Purpose Prep (6-8), Youth Mental Health First Aid, DESSA (K-3)/COVI (4-8), Safer Smarter Kids, free lunch and breakfast, Guidance Care Center, Rising K, Keys to be the Change, school counselors and social workers, CINS/FINS and SAC/PTO.
Due to COVID-19, we have had to rely heavily on social media, DOJO, and other means to maintain constant communication with our stakeholders. The administration has implemented snack and coffee carts for professional development days to ensure teachers/staff feel appreciated. Our school continues to maintain a Single School Culture of excellence and strives to improve the climate in various ways. We continue to maintain a single school culture through PBIS quarterly celebrations and advisory sessions that discuss applicable topics based on school culture/climate and mental health. This year our teachers and Administration team are working with the Guidance counselors to provide more celebratory activities as feasible inapplicable in addition to the quarterly celebrations in efforts to build and maintain momentum and increase social and emotional support and awareness.

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: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00