

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Anderson 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>13</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

# Anderson Elementary School

3910 W FAIR OAKS AVE, Tampa, FL 33611

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Lydia Sierra**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/24/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<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)	80%
<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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: B (61%)
<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, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](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>13</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

## Anderson Elementary School

3910 W FAIR OAKS AVE, Tampa, FL 33611

[ no web address on file ]

### 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)
Elementary School PK-5	No	63%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	60%

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

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

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

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

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

To provide a safe learning environment that will empower students to become life-long learners and productive citizens.

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

Inspiring all students to reach their full potential.

### 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
Behrens, Brian	SAC Member	<p>The Leadership team meets regularly (e.g., bi-weekly/monthly).  The purpose of the core Leadership Team is to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the RtI/MTSS process: at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels.</li> <li>2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels.</li> <li>3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains.</li> </ol> <p>Hillsborough - 0121 - Anderson Elementary School - 2018-19 SIP  Anderson Elementary School  Last Modified: 1/20/2019 Page 4 <a href="https://www.floridacims.org">https://www.floridacims.org</a></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams.</li> </ol> <p>A collaborative culture of shared responsibility is established through Leadership Team Meetings and PLCs.</p> <p>Research consistently bears out that the school leader is the most important element in teachers choosing to go to, and then remain at, a school site. To that end, HCPS works to ensure that principals are selected and placed with great care. HCPS works to develop strong leaders through the Hillsborough Principal Pipeline. As stated above, The Hillsborough Principal Pipeline offers unique and valuable opportunities for teachers to experience and prepare for a school leadership position by helping them gain the skills, experience and confidence that are crucial to becoming a high-performing leader.</p> <p>Pursuing school leadership provides the opportunity to make a direct impact on school culture and positively influence instructional quality, which will result in improved outcomes and higher long-term success rates for students in Hillsborough County.</p> <p>HCPS' vision for instructional improvement is to have a highly effective teacher in every classroom and a highly effective principal in every school. This vision is founded in the research-based tenet that teacher quality has a larger impact on student achievement</p>



Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>than any other schooling factor. Further research demonstrates the impact of a principal's leadership on outcomes for students and teachers. Over the past decade, HCPS has developed a Human Capital Management System (HCMS) to further the district's vision of instructional improvement. Several Teacher Interview Days and Recruitment Fairs occur throughout the summer months, under the oversight of Human Resources. All applicants must be pre-approved by the District to attend these events. Certified teachers with an Effective or Highly Effective performance evaluation, teaching in field, at our highest needs schools are eligible for salary differential. This program was established with the purpose of helping to create stability and equity in harder to staff schools, recruiting and retaining highly qualified instructional staff, increasing student achievement, and promoting a culture of ongoing professional development. Compensation is grounded in a performance-based salary structure that explicitly ties salary increases to sustained high-level performance, while career ladder positions, such as Instructional Mentors, are available to effective educators. The base teacher salary schedule is designed to provide substantial increases in compensation to teachers who have demonstrated positive student impact. Once hired, teacher induction and teacher retention are supported through fully-released instructional mentors assigned to every new educator for up to two years to increase effectiveness and decrease recidivism. Educator effectiveness ratings that differentiate educator quality are used to assist principals in determining teachers' transfer options and promotion into leadership positions. HCPS has linked PD opportunities to HR functions so that school-level and district-level trainings are developed and deployed in response to areas of need identified by educator evaluations. Training course completions can also be tracked by HR Partners to inform human capital decisions.</p>
Foushee-Winfield, Tracey	Assistant Principal	

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Wednesday 6/24/2020, Lydia Sierra

**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.*

20

**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.*

5

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

27

### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<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)	80%
<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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: B (61%)
<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, <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	54	57	43	54	50	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	311
Attendance below 90 percent	1	7	4	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	15	15	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	22	9	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Thursday 8/27/2020

### 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	57	62	79	67	58	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	385
Attendance below 90 percent	8	6	9	4	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

**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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	57	62	79	67	58	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	385
Attendance below 90 percent	8	6	9	4	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

**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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	67%	52%	57%	63%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	55%	58%	52%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	50%	53%	57%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	65%	54%	63%	69%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	68%	57%	62%	43%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	46%	51%	32%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	70%	50%	53%	59%	48%	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	53%	52%	1%	58%	-5%
	2018	63%	53%	10%	57%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	69%	55%	14%	58%	11%
	2018	75%	55%	20%	56%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	74%	54%	20%	56%	18%
	2018	41%	51%	-10%	55%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		33%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	56%	54%	2%	62%	-6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	54%	55%	-1%	62%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	57%	14%	64%	7%
	2018	66%	57%	9%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				
05	2019	61%	54%	7%	60%	1%
	2018	56%	54%	2%	61%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	70%	51%	19%	53%	17%
	2018	43%	52%	-9%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		27%				
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	35	40	30	43	67						
ELL	64			64							
BLK	50			50							
HSP	67	65		57	65	75	75				
MUL	79	75		75	70		64				
WHT	66	56	46	67	67	40	73				
FRL	64	63	43	62	70	61	63				
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	31	33	42	36	38	20	21				
ELL	50	60		57	50						
ASN	64	70		73	70						
BLK	28	38		33	38						
HSP	62	64		39	50						
MUL	64	47		72	60						
WHT	67	45	45	69	65	40	54				
FRL	52	43	40	53	53	46	31				

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	30	43		50	46						
ELL	50			58							
ASN	70			70							
BLK	46	47		54	40						
HSP	58	38		62	29		50				
MUL	68			74							
WHT	69	54	80	77	55		63				
FRL	59	54	53	68	42	47	52				

### 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	62
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	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	498
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
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	63
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	50
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	67
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	73
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	59
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	61
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.**

ELA grade 3 proficiency showed the lowest performance of all the school grade data points. SWD subgroup ELA all components (proficiency, learning gains, learning gains L25) was also low performance out of all subgroups.

Data trends also indicate Language and Editing is one of the lowest strands which correlates to students performance in the text-based writing domain. The students in grade 3 as a group were lower performing compared to previous years even when they were in primary grades. Instructional choice that may have been successful with past cohorts of students appear to not leverage comparable student achievement with the current cohort and thus instruction needs to be tweaked to directly respond to what students need to make more academic gains.

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

Gr. 3 ELA Proficiency showed the greatest decline with a 10% decrease from the previous year. The grade level had a high number of students receiving tier 2 and tier 3 support; many required support in the area of systematic explicit phonics/decoding. Data trends also indicate Language and Editing is one of the lowest strands.

**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.**

While ELA L25 had a school increase of 3%, the district and state were 3% and 6% higher respectively.

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

Science Learning Gains L25 had a 25% increase. Math Learning Gains L25 had a 20% increase. Focus last year school wide was in the area of Numbers and Operations and intentional lesson planning with a focus on standards based instruction supported through common planning. ELA Learning Gains L25 had a 3% increase. Focus on balanced literacy with emphasis standard based lesson planning supported through common planning; strengthening independent reading with 1:1 teacher conferring.

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

One area of concern is the number of students in grades 3-5 that fall into the level two category of achievement. Attendance below 90% and Level 1 FSA (Reading/Math)

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

1. Standards based planning within PLC's, driven by ILT to address achievement gap trends and instruction based on data.
2. Small group instruction across all grade levels.
3. Vocabulary development within small group and whole group in ELA, Math and Science.
4. Progress monitor using Look-For priorities and diagnostic data to drive instructional adjustments.
5. Content and grade level specific professional development.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

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

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Our school wide improvement priorities will be to continue to focus on standards based planning with an emphasis on differentiation.  Rationale: Standards based planning assist teachers in providing rigorous instruction for all students.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Grade 3 proficiency will increase by 5%; Learning gains of the bottom quartile will increase in both reading by 3%. Cohorts that failed to maintain or improve will increase its proficiency by 10%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Tracey Foushee-Winfield (tracey.foushee-winfield@sdhc.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Differentiation in classroom instruction utilizing standards based instruction and Marzano taxonomy.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Rationale: Maintaining standards-based planning will provides rigorous instruction, as well as targeting instruction for all students. Maintaing our focus on differentiation ensures instruction is focused on meeting the needs of all learners.

#### Action Steps to Implement

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities****Area of Focus**

**Description and Rationale:** Our SWD decreased in their achievement level in ELA from 42% to 30%.

**Measurable Outcome:** Our intended outcome is to raise the achievement level of our students with disabilities (SWD) specifically in ELA from 30% to 45%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Tracey Foushee-Winfield (tracey.foushee-winfield@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Intensive and targeted interventions will be a priority. Summative and formative assessments and iReady data will be utilized to drive instructional decisions regarding classroom instruction and targeted interventions. Supplemental lessons will be taught by our ESE, and classroom teacher in small groups. Instructional support will be provided by our reading coach and our district resource teacher/coach to identify instructional strategies that specifically target our students with disabilities. Both ESE and classroom teachers will track the progress of their SWDs and participate in administrative led data discussions on a monthly basis. Both the ESE and general education teachers will plan collaboratively to create standards based instruction that meets the needs of our students in the SWD subgroup.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

By providing resources, data discussion, and collaborative planning opportunities, teachers will be able to identify targeted students with disabilities and closely monitor their progress. Appropriate instruction and interventions necessary for academic gains will be determined as part of our collaborative work between ESE, general education, ELA district teacher/coach and our school based ELA coach. Teachers will be provided opportunities to participate in professional development and support specifically designed to inform and strengthen instruction. Our multi-facet approach to closely monitor our SWD, and engage in collaborative practices for their teachers will increase the likelihood of learning gains and proficiency for students.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Identify SWDs at each grade level (3-5) and determine the growth necessary to yield learning gain and/or proficiency.
2. Identify ELA standards SWD had the least achievement in on the FSA.
3. Develop targeted interventions.
4. ESE and general education teachers will work collaborate with our instructional coaches to design and monitor instruction.
5. Teachers will meet with administration to disaggregate data on a regular basis.

**Person Responsible** Tracey Foushee-Winfield (tracey.foushee-winfield@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

**#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:****Measurable Outcome:****Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** [no one identified]**Evidence-based Strategy:****Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:****Action Steps to Implement***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***#4. -- Select below -- specifically relating to****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:****Measurable Outcome:****Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** [no one identified]**Evidence-based Strategy:****Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:****Action Steps to Implement***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**The leadership team will regularly utilize the school improvement priorities and instructional priorities/look for to provide prompt and specific feedback to teachers.**

**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.

The School Advisory Council (SAC) meets every month and is responsible for the planning, review, and making suggestions to assist with instructional improvement. All parents, staff, and community are invited

to be members of Anderson's SAC. SAC members including all stakeholders can provide input on the Parent and Family Engagement. Parent Teacher Student Compact as well as all other plans related to school improvement are solicited, welcomed and valued. Parent surveys are also used to solicit parent input. Comments from parents and all other stakeholder are documented on SAC meeting minutes.

Information about our school events, programs, and meetings are provided via our newsletters, Curriculum and assessment information is shared by teachers at Open House, during parent teacher conferences, through newsletters and through our parent link communication platform. Assessment information is sent home in a timely matter many through electronic options. Input from parents can be shared directly with teachers, admin or via, SAC or PTA. Interim/progress reports, conferences, and climate survey are provided to parents. All stakeholders can access information via the school web site and social media channels.

#### **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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00