

Pinellas County Schools

# Anona Elementary School



## 2021-22 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>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>29</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>30</b> |

# Anona Elementary School

12301 INDIAN ROCKS RD, Largo, FL 33774

<http://www.anona-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us>

## Demographics

**Principal: Denise Ballard**

Start Date for this Principal: 3/15/2015

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <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>2020-21 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 73%   |
| <b>2020-21 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>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: A (79%)<br>2017-18: A (64%)<br>2016-17: A (70%)  |
| <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>   |   |
| * 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 Pinellas County School Board.

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Table of Contents

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>30</b> |

## Anona Elementary School

12301 INDIAN ROCKS RD, Largo, FL 33774

<http://www.anona-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us>

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | Yes                    | 75%  |
| 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                     | 33%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade |         | A       | A       | A       |

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

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

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

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

The Anona community will unite and maintain a quality academic and safe learning environment enabling each student to succeed 100%.

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

100% Student Success – Each student at Anona earns at least a 1-year learning gain

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

| Name                  | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Welsh, Ann            | Principal           | Principal                       |
| Huey, Holly           | Assistant Principal | Assistnat Principal             |
| Adikes, Kathryn       | Teacher, K-12       | 4th grade teacher               |
| Bellack, Mary         | Teacher, K-12       | 1st grade teacher               |
| Black, Bill           | Teacher, K-12       | 5th grade teacher               |
| Carneiro, Daniel      | Behavior Specialist | Behavior Specialist             |
| Kanellopoulos, Sophia | Teacher, K-12       | 3rd grade teacher               |
| Ledbetter, Kristen    | Teacher, ESE        | 3-5 ASD teacher                 |
| McCord, Karen         | Teacher, K-12       | Kindergarten teacher            |
| McNamee, Carolyn      | School Counselor    | School counselor                |
| Mello, Leah           | Teacher, K-12       | 2nd grade teacher               |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Sunday 3/15/2015, Denise Ballard

**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.*

7

**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.*

7

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

23

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

460

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.**

2

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.**

2

**Demographic Data****Early Warning Systems****2021-22**

**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                              | 37          | 70 | 72 | 89 | 85 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 417   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 1           | 12 | 6  | 13 | 11 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 53    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0  | 5  | 9  | 0  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 18    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0  | 5  | 9  | 0  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 18    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 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 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |

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

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

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

Wednesday 6/16/2021

**2020-21 - 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               | 36          | 74 | 88 | 82 | 69 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 421   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 15 | 17 | 12 | 8  | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 59    |
| 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  | 2  | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7     |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6  | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 9  | 6  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 9  | 7  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 18    |

**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 | 1 | 4 | 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           | 1 | 1 | 0 | 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  |       |

**2020-21 - 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               | 36          | 74 | 88 | 82 | 69 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 421   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 15 | 17 | 12 | 8  | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 59    |
| 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  | 2  | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7     |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6  | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 9  | 6  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 9  | 7  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 18    |

**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 | 1 | 4 | 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           | 1 | 1 | 0 | 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 Review

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      | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       | 2018   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             |        |          |       | 69%    | 54%      | 57%   | 63%    | 50%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 77%    | 59%      | 58%   | 55%    | 47%      | 55%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 74%    | 54%      | 53%   | 36%    | 40%      | 48%   |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 79%    | 61%      | 63%   | 75%    | 61%      | 62%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 90%    | 61%      | 62%   | 78%    | 56%      | 59%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 84%    | 48%      | 51%   | 66%    | 42%      | 47%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 82%    | 53%      | 53%   | 77%    | 57%      | 55%   |

### Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

**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                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 59%    | 56%      | 3%                         | 58%   | 1%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 65%    | 56%      | 9%                         | 58%   | 7%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -59%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 79%    | 54%      | 25%                        | 56%   | 23%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -65%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 74%    | 62%      | 12%                        | 62%   | 12%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 77%    | 64%      | 13%                        | 64%   | 13%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -74%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 87%    | 60%      | 27%                        | 60%   | 27%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -77%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 82%    | 54%      | 28%                        | 53%   | 29%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

### Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

**Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.**

The monitoring tool used in each grade level was NWEA MAP proficiency rates. Note for Spring ELA in grades 3, 4, and 5 students' FSA proficiency rates are used. In grade 5 Cycle 1 and 2 district science assessments were used for Fall and Winter science proficiency data and SSA was used for Spring. Students counted as proficient in ELA, Math, and Science when reviewing MAP data were clustered in the yellow, green and blue areas.

| Grade 1               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 66   | 70     | 71     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 54   | 46     | 46     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0    | 0      | 0      |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 69   | 66     | 73     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 38   | 46     | 38     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0    | 0      | 33     |
| Grade 2               |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 48   | 40     | 40     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 22   | 28     | 26     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 33   | 0      | 0      |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 59   | 55     | 60     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 28   | 39     | 26     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 33   | 0      | 0      |

| Grade 3               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 76   | 78     | 70     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 64   | 71     | 40     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 100  | 100    | 50     |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 76   | 80     | 81     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 43   | 50     | 50     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 50   | 100    | 100    |
| Grade 4               |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 68   | 73     |        |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 30   | 55     |        |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0    | 0      |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 68   | 52     | 67     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 40   | 27     | 64     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0    | 0      | 0      |

| Grade 5               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 52   | 59     |        |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 21   | 29     |        |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0    | 0      |        |
| Mathematics           | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 52   | 56     | 57     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 21   | 36     | 36     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 50   | 0      | 0      |
| Science               | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 91   | 95     |        |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 78   | 64     |        |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 40   | 100    |        |

## Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 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 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD                                       | 33       | 33     |             | 56        | 42      |              | 21       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 40       |        |             | 60        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 69       |        |             | 69        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 73       |        |             | 80        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 69       | 65     | 38          | 83        | 86      | 69           | 72       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 61       | 62     |             | 71        | 66      |              | 62       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 48       | 69     | 65          | 57        | 76      | 76           | 45       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 25       |        |             | 42        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 55       | 53     |             | 80        | 73      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 53       |        |             | 80        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |

| 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                                       | 75       | 82     | 83          | 82        | 91      | 94           | 87       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 61       | 76     | 71          | 73        | 88      | 81           | 68       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 36       | 38     | 40          | 40        | 48      | 42           | 33       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 55       | 68     | 50          | 69        | 77      |              | 69       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 53       |        |             | 80        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 68       | 54     | 30          | 77        | 79      | 65           | 77       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 55       | 53     | 39          | 66        | 75      | 70           | 74       |         |           |                   |                     |

### ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index  |     |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  |     |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 68  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 1   |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency |     |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 478 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 7   |
| Percent Tested  | 99% |
| Subgroup Data   |     |
| Students With Disabilities  |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 37  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       |     |
| English Language Learners   |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       |     |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%        |     |
| Native American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Native American Students  |     |

| 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%            |     |
| 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%                      |     |
| 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%     |     |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 69  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%                   |     |
| Multiracial Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 77  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                       | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%                |     |
| 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%           |     |
| White Students   |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   | 69  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      |     |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 64  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |

## Analysis

### Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

#### What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

When considering progress monitoring data through the year at Anona during the 2020-21 school year, student proficiency rates grew across all grades and content areas.

Although overall student proficiency across grade levels maintained or increased proficiency levels when comparing the start of the year to the end of the year proficiency rates, there were significant gaps in the proficiency rates of students with disabilities when compared to the proficiency rates of students overall. This trend was noted across all grade levels and in both the areas of mathematics and ELA.

Grade 2 in particular has significantly lower proficiency rates this year when compared to previous years.

Third-grade ELA FSA proficiency rates climbed to 70% which represents an 11 point gain when compared with scores earned in the 2018-19 school year.

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Data components that demonstrate the greatest need for improvement are the ESE proficiency rates and the economically disadvantaged student proficiency rates. This is true within the content areas of math, ELA, and 5th-grade science.

Spring MAP proficiency rates in ELA for 2nd-grade students demonstrate a need for improvement. The rates of proficiency for 2nd-grade students in ELA were lower by approximately 10 points compared with previous years' data. Spring MAP proficiency rates in mathematics for 2nd-grade students also demonstrate a need for improvement. The proficiency rates lag behind previous years by approximately 14 points.

Although FSA proficiency rates increased by 11 points in ELA for 3rd-grade students, when compared to proficiency rates in 2018-19, there is an 8 point gap between proficiency rates for economically disadvantaged students and 28 point gap for ESE students when these groups are compared to the overall level of 3rd-grade students. These gaps represent a need for improvement.

#### What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Factors that contributed to this need for improvement include the temporary adjustments to the processes put in place on campus to address the COVID 19 virus. Families who chose to enroll in online platforms during the school year experienced slower and lower levels of growth and ESE students were more significantly impacted by the lack of face-face instruction from their teachers.

Teachers new to Anona this school year did not experience the level of face-to-face professional development or the opportunity to visit model classrooms due to COVID 19. Collaborative efforts were more limited even though teachers had more opportunities to participate virtually in PD.

### **What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

Data components that showed the greatest improvements were the overall proficiency rates of third-grade students. Compared to the most recent 3 years of FSA data, the 2020-21 FSA scores showed the greatest proficiency rates.

When looking at across the year at MAP proficiency rates, Anona experienced growth in proficiency when comparing proficiency rates at the beginning to the end of the year in both ELA and math.

According to 2019 State assessment scores, Anona showed gains in all 7 school grade calculation components/cell. Specifically, learning gains in Math showed the most improvement with a 12%age point gain increasing gains from 78% in 2018 to 90% in 2019.

### **What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

Improvements are attributed to significant efforts over the past two years to address the challenges faced by students with dyslexia like challenges. 80% of teachers received professional development over several weeks to better understand and plan for these needs. Book studies using the work of Dr. David Kilpatrick were conducted, 1st - 3rd-grade teachers were trained in using a multi-sensory directed and repeated approach to reading interventions, and model instruction was identified with the strongest reading teachers videoed during their instruction. Teachers were identified and supported to offer peer coaching to new, novice, and teachers needing support in the area of reading intervention instruction.

### **What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?**

Strategies to be put in place to accelerate learning are:

- \* Comprehensive extended learning program to provide opportunities for targeted students to receive targeted small group instruction for an additional one to two hours each week
- \* The use of ixl and Class Kick in 3rd - 5th grades to increase the rate of actionable feedback provided to students by teachers - in the moment feedback
- \* Laptops in all 3rd - 5th-grade classrooms to provide additional opportunities for students to practice skills.

### **Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

School-based professional development to be included at Anona this year which addresses accelerating the learning of all students:

- \*For teachers new to Anona during the last two years - Killpatrick Book Study and PD in teaching multi-sensory direct repeated reading interventions specifically targeting the lowest readers in 1st - 3rd grades.
- \*Technology PD for teachers in the use of Ixl and Class Kick - grades 3-5
- \*Increased instruction and focus on vocabulary in reading for grades 3- 5 using the Wordly Wise materials.
- \*Training for teachers instructing students with hyperlexic challenges.

### **Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.**

New student laptops, and professional development for teachers on how to incorporate Canvas, and other new tech solutions and enhancements will be infused into training during the school year. Equity training will continue to be embedded into faculty and SBLT meetings during the year to

ensure the sustainability of improvement.

Title 1 funds will be targeted to enhance human and instructional resources - hourly reading teachers, early literacy and reading intervention materials and additional technology.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

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

##### Area of

##### Focus

##### Description

##### and

##### Rationale:

Based on FSA proficiency rates in 2019, the proficiency rate was 79%. In light of the 2019-20 COVID pandemic, our goal is maintain a 79% proficiency rate by May 2022.

##### Measurable Outcome:

The percent of students proficient in mathematics measured by FSA will maintain the 2019 score of 79%

##### Monitoring:

Proficiency levels in every classroom will be monitored using MAP data 3 times a year, Unit assessments, formative assessments, and standard-based teacher-made assessments.

##### Person

##### responsible

##### for

##### monitoring

##### outcome:

Ann Welsh (welsha@pcsb.org)

##### Evidence-based

##### Strategy:

Building off the work that began in the previous year, empower STEM leadership teachers to create and sustain a culture of feedback and openness, including ongoing teacher to teacher feedback, using the coached observation protocol & learning walks. In addition, STEM leadership teachers will differentiate their feedback based on the experiences and needs of teachers and students.

##### Rationale for

##### Evidence-based

##### Strategy:

As a result of the development of a cohort of STEM leadership teachers at Anona and the implementation of the cognitive coaching model, mathematical instructional practices will improve for all teachers. Effective collaboration and coaching will encourage ongoing observation/ feedback among colleagues where a culture of professional sharing, dialogue, experimentation, and critique becomes commonplace.

#### Action Steps to Implement

1. Transition MTLI teachers to STEM leadership academy and engage in all training opportunities
2. Identify additional peer coaches
2. Schedule for necessary coverage of classrooms and coaching sessions based on the design of the instructional calendar.
5. Train grades 3 through grades 5 teachers in the use of Class Kick and ixl.
6. Provide additional time for vertical articulation between grade level teachers

##### Person

##### Responsible

Ann Welsh (welsha@pcsb.org)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Based on FSA proficiency rates in 2019, the proficiency rate was 69%. In light of the 2019-20 COVID pandemic, our goal is to maintain a 69% proficiency rate by May 2022.

**Measurable Outcome:** The percent of students proficient in reading measured by FSA will maintain the 2019 score of 69%

**Monitoring:** Proficiency levels in every classroom will be monitored using MAP data 3 times a year, Unit assessments, formative assessments, and standard-based teacher-made assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** [no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Empower Literacy Leaders to develop as peer coaches and to model and coach teachers (ex. co-facilitate PD sessions alongside administrators, open classrooms for observations and feedback, coach colleagues in literacy practices and interventions).

During the 2021-22 school year, newer technology (IXL and Classkick) will be utilized to provide actionable feedback to students during instruction to grow students. Addition of targeted vocabulary instruction in grades 3-5 will be utilized to develop comprehension skills.

As a result of the development of a cohort of Literacy Leaders at Anona and the implementation of a peer coaching model, ELA instructional practices will improve.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Build a team of school based literacy leaders utilizing "Cognitive Coaching" to develop lead coaches in the area of reading. Effective collaboration and coaching will encourage ongoing observation and feedback among colleagues where a culture of professional sharing, dialogue, experimentation, and critique becomes commonplace. ELA champions and mentor teachers selected will utilize learning walk protocols, and peer observations to coach teachers in the area of ELA.

Specifically, peer coaching will focus on the following:

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

Strengthening staff ability to engage students in complex tasks.

Supporting staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners, which differentiates/scaffold.

Utilize intervention experts to coach and model targeted interventions for struggling readers.

Implementation and continuation of Teams, Canvas, IXL, Classkick, FlipGrid, and Nearpod to ensure continuity/differentiation of learning.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Identify and training of Literacy Leaders utilizing the work of Costa and Garmston – "Cognitive Coaching"
2. Schedule developed for necessary coverage of classrooms
3. Develop and Implement peer coaching cycles with teams and/or individual teachers
4. Literacy Leaders will be identified to lead PD in use of Seeing Stars, Visualizing and Verbalizing, Making Sense of Phonics, and Nemours as preferred reading intervention.

5. Utilize Seeing Stars as targeted intervention for struggling readers in grades 1-3.
6. Utilize Sounds Sensible and Nemours as targeted intervention for identified Kindergarten students
7. Utilize Kilpatrick's phonemic awareness activities in grades during ELA instruction. Repeat Book Study for new teachers.
8. Teachers in grades 3-5 will be trained to utilize Wordly Wise for vocabulary instruction.
9. Train grades 3 through 5 teachers on the use of IXL and Classkick to monitor standards based instruction.
10. Vertical articulation between grade levels.
11. Monitoring of implementation.

**Person Responsible** Ann Welsh (welsha@pcsb.org)

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Based on FSA proficiency rates in 2019, the proficiency rate was 82%. In light of the 2019-20 COVID pandemic, our goal is to maintain a 82% proficiency rate by May 2022.

**Measurable Outcome:** The percent of students proficient in science measured by FSA will maintain the 2019 score of 82%

**Monitoring:** Proficiency levels in every classroom will be monitored using unit assessments located in Performance Matters.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Ann Welsh (welsha@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Develop, implement, and monitor a data-driven 3rd- 5th-grade review plan using the 3rd, and 4th, and 5th grade Science Unit assessments located in Performance Matters.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Due to the inclusion of 3rd, 4th and 5th grade standards within the SSA a review plan is of paramount importance. In prior years data shows the gap in 3rd and 4th-grade mastery of standards.

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Administer the 3rd, 4th, and 5th Grade unit assessments located in Performance Matters
2. Analyze the data
3. Develop a review plan
4. Implement and monitor academic vocabulary gaming in grades 3 - 5
6. Monitor implementation

**Person Responsible** Ann Welsh (welsha@pcsb.org)

**#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | Our current level of performance is 25% proficiency in reading and 42% proficiency in math as evidenced in FSA 2018-2019 data. For the 2020-2021 school year, 37% of our black students in K-2 are proficient according to spring ELA MAP. In grades 3-5, we have 33% students proficient in winter. In Math, 25% of our K-2 students are proficient and 33% of students in grades 3-5 were proficient.  |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | The percent of black student students proficient will increase to 50% in ELA and Math as measured by FSA.  |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | Proficiency levels in every classroom will be monitored using MAP data 3 times a year, Unit assessments, formative assessments, and standard-based teacher-made assessments.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Ann Welsh (welsha@pcsb.org)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | Implement culturally relevant instructional practices in classrooms such as cooperative and small group settings, music, and movement, explicit vocabulary instruction, monitoring with feedback and deliberate use of cultural references in lesson plans. Teachers are expected to:<br>hold high academic expectations for all students<br>demonstrate cultural competence, the understanding that their own worldview and understandings may or may not align with those of their students, and are socio-politically aware, that is, they have a willingness to acknowledge and critique inequity. |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | In order to close the achievement gap, teachers must understand the components and examples of culturally relevant instruction. Teachers will be able to reach all students when<br>they implement practices that recognize and teach to students assets and interests, scaffold learning and provide specific feedback, and build and foster strong and positive relationships with students. Strategies such as the 6M's can be utilized into unit lesson plans to allow us to reach all students.   |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Assure all teachers attend district-level training on Culturally Relevant Teaching practices.
2. Incorporate a focus on the Culturally Relevant Teaching strategies during grade level unit planning.
3. Monitor the use of Culturally Relevant Teaching strategies during classroom visits and observations.
4. Utilize CRT strategies when conducting professional development.
5. Track subgroup data and analyze data during SBLT and grade-level data chats.
6. Develop individualized plans (with the staff member assigned to monitor) for students below grade level.
7. Throughout the school year - incorporate PD focused on increasing awareness of Black History using district modules.

**Person Responsible** Ann Welsh (welsha@pcsb.org)

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

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | The current level of performance based on 2019 FSA scores is 48% proficiency, as evidenced in FSA. We expect our performance level to be 48% by May 2022.   |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | The percent of all ESE students proficient will maintain at 48% in all content areas as measured by FSA.  |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | ESE students growth toward the goal will be monitored 3 times a year using MAP data and bi-weekly using proress monitoring tools aligned with specific interventions  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | [no one identified]   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | Ensure instructional supports are in place for all ESE (L25) students during core, differentiated and intervention instruction with a strong focus on the foundational skills in K-5.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | Enhancing staff capacity to support students through the utilization of assessments and activities based on Nanci Bell's work in Visualizing and Verbalizing and Seeing Stars.<br><br>Continued work specifically focused on the development of phonemic awareness and Fluent Word Recognition through the use of David Kilpatrick Ph. D research and work<br><br>Resources: 'Equipped for Reading' - Dr. David Kilpatrick, Visualizing and Verbalizing- Nanci Bell, Seeing Stars- Nanci Bell |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Professional Development using 'Equipped for Reading Success' book, Visualizing & Verbalizing Resources, and Seeing Stars program
2. Identify and assess students using the Phonological Awareness Screening Test and MAP data
3. Ensure all instructional staff implementing the reading interventions with specific students and are collaborating
4. Monitor progress of students at least 3 times a year (Fall, Winter, Spring) using MAP ,and in addition utilize progress monitoring tools bi-weekly.

**Person Responsible** Ann Welsh (welsha@pcsb.org)

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

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus</b>                              | At the end of 2020-2021, three students with disabilities made up 42% of the school's referrals. The gap is occurring because of additional supports/strategies in order to meet the needs of students with varying exceptionalities.  |
| <b>Description and Rationale:</b>                 |  |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | At the end of 2021-2022, our percentage of referrals for students with disabilities will be 20% or below as measured by School Profiles.   |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | After each grading period, referrals will be tracked using school profiles.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Ann Welsh (welsha@pcsb.org)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | If we embed PBIS training including Tier 2 and Tier 3 planning, the problem would be reduced by teachers having tools/strategies to create plans to meet the needs of our most challenging students.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | At Tier 2 and 3, students receive more intensive, individualized support to improve their behavioral and academic outcomes. Tier 2 and 3 strategies help support students with developmental disabilities, autism, emotional and behavioral disorders. By developing these plans in coordination with the classroom teacher, we create a proactive behavior support plan that will reduce/eliminate referrals. |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. During preschool, a PBIS overview will be provided to all staff by Behavior Specialist and School Counselor.
2. During preschool, School Counselor and School Psychologist will train all staff in MTSS processes.
2. Staff will have the support of the school Behavior Specialist in writing classroom management plan.
3. Guidelines for success will be taught to all students.
4. PBIS team will track behavior calls and referral data each grading period.
5. Behavior Specialist will work with families and teacher tier 2 and tier 3 plans for students who demonstrate additional supports.
6. Behavior Specialist will coach teachers in tools and strategies to work with students with disabilities who require tier 2 and tier 3 plans.

**Person Responsible** Ann Welsh (welsha@pcsb.org)

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

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus<br/>Description and<br/>Rationale:</b> | Develop and sustain a healthy, respectful, caring, and safe learning environment for students, staff, and community members. |
|---|--|

|                            |   |
|----------------------------|---|
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b> | We will increase the number of eligible assessment modules throughout the year and complete action plans for the Alliance for a Healthier Generation, Healthy School Program. |
|----------------------------|---|

|                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| <b>Monitoring:</b> | Growth toward this goal will be measured using pre and post Healthy Schools assessment data |
|--------------------|---|

|   |                     |
|---|---------------------|
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | [no one identified] |
|---|---------------------|

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b> | Develop and Implement Healthy School Program Action Plan |
|---------------------------------|--|

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b> | The Healthy School Action Plan will identify for areas of improvement and allow us to work toward Silver Status in the Alliance for a Healthier Generation, Healthy School Program. |
|---|---|

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Assemble a Healthy School Team made up of a minimum of four (4) individuals including, but not limited to: PE Teacher/Health Teacher, Classroom Teacher, Wellness Champion, Administrator & Cafeteria Manager.
2. Attend district-supported professional development Healthy School Team.
3. Complete Healthy Schools Program Assessment Healthy School Team.
4. Complete eligible assessment modules throughout the year.
5. Apply for recognition.

|                           |                     |
|---------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Person Responsible</b> | [no one identified] |
|---------------------------|---------------------|

**#8. Other specifically relating to Gifted Students**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | In light of the 2019-20 COVID pandemic, our goal is maintain the percent of Level 4 and 5 Gifted students at 74% in ELA and 85% math by May 2022.  |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | Maintain the percentage of Level 4 and 5 Gifted students at 74% in ELA and 85% math.   |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | FSA Scores for students in grades 3-5.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Ann Welsh (welsha@pcsb.org)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners that differentiate/scaffold instruction to meet the needs of every student as well as clustering gifted students into gifted micro-credentialed classrooms.<br>During the 2021-22 schoolyear teachers will be trained and empowered to utilize and embed technology into lessons. Examples of technology will include Canvas, Nearpod and Teams |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | Data identifying a significant number of underperforming gifted students was utilized to determine a more suitable grouping strategy for gifted learners. The work of Marcia Gentry (Vanderbilt University) was studied to support the initiative to cluster gifted students for the upcoming year.<br>Continue the implementation/usage of TEAMS, Canvas and Nearpod to ensure continuity/ differentiation of learning                |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers intentionally plan for differentiation (using MAP or FSA data) for gifted learners and administrators monitor and provide feedback
2. Teachers/Staff continue to obtain the gifted micro-credential and/or the gifted endorsement so that they can better differentiate for gifted learners.
3. Cluster group gifted and talented students so that the process of differentiating is more effective for gifted learners.
4. Allow gifted students to utilize "curriculum compacting" as a means for differentiation and/or scaffolding.
5. Pace learning for gifted learners in response to students' individual needs
6. Differentiate for gifted learners through adapting content, thinking skills, resources, and/or objectives
7. Teachers attend professional development on "differentiation for gifted learners"
8. Use collaborative structures between general education teachers and gifted teachers to better meet the needs of struggling students.
9. Continue to train all teachers in the use of Canvas, Teams and Nearpod.

**Person Responsible** Ann Welsh (welsha@pcsb.org)

**#9. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement****Area of Focus**

**Description and Rationale:** The school will build and sustain relationships with all families and the community

**Measurable Outcome:** The school will increase the number of Family and Community Engagement events throughout the school year that are focused on improving student outcomes.

**Monitoring:** Parent survey data and attendance sign-in sheets will be used to measure progress toward the goal.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Ann Welsh (welsha@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Foster a school community that builds relationships and communicates with families about their students, school processes/practices and purposefully involve families with opportunities for them to support their students.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** When families, schools, and communities work effectively together, engagement becomes a powerful tool that boosts student achievement and better prepares our children to lead healthy, happy, and productive lives.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Effectively communicate with families in using multiple tools in a variety of ways (TEAMS/Zoom, Class DoJo, agendas, partnership compact, student showcases, phone calls, email, recorded presentations etc.)
2. Provide academic resources to families in support of their students' achievement at home (such as 3rd-grade orientation to FSA)
3. Involve families in school-wide events in person and virtually
4. Utilize Student Services to provide families/parents and students with resources, tools, triage support, and outside agency referrals

**Person Responsible:** Ann Welsh (welsha@pcsb.org)

**#10. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Community Involvement****Area of Focus**

**Description and Rationale:** The school will build and sustain relationships with all families and the community

**Measurable Outcome:**

The school will increase the number of Family and Community Engagement events throughout the school year which are focused on increased partnerships within the community.

**Monitoring:**

The school will continue to track the number of community partners during the 2021-22 school year.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Ann Welsh (welsha@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Effectively communicate with community members about school processes/ practices and purposefully involve the community with opportunities to participate in school-related events or initiatives

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

When families, schools, and communities work effectively together, engagement becomes a powerful tool that boosts student achievement and better prepares our children to lead healthy, happy, and productive lives.

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

**#11. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | The current level of performance based on 2021 FSA scores is 29% proficiency in ELA, as evidenced in FSA. We expect our performance level to be 41% by May 2022.  |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | The percent of ELL students proficient will grow to 41% in ELA as measured by FSA.  |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | ELL students growth toward the goal will be monitored 3 times a year using MAP data and bi-weekly using progress monitoring tools aligned with specific interventions   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | [no one identified]   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | <p>Ensure instructional supports are in place for all ELL students during core, differentiated and intervention instruction with a strong focus on the foundational skills in K-2 and focused vocabulary instruction 3-5. Teachers will utilize the Can Do Descriptors in creating instructional plans and will incorporate ESOL strategies in their instruction.</p> <p>Enhancing staff capacity to support students through the utilization of assessments and activities based on Nanci Bell's work in Visualizing and Verbalizing and Seeing Stars.</p> |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | <p>Continued work specifically focused on the development of phonemic awareness and Fluent Word Recognition through the use of David Kilpatrick Ph. D research and work</p> <p>Focused vocabulary instruction each week to grow students vocabulary knowledge and develop strategies for determining unknown words.</p> <p>Resources: 'Equipped for Reading' - Dr. David Kilpatrick, Visualizing and Verbalizing- Nanci Bell, Seeing Stars- Nanci Bell, Wordly Wise</p>   |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Professional Development using 'Equipped for Reading Success' book, Visualizing & Verbalizing Resources, Seeing Stars, and the Wordly Wise program.
2. Identify and assess students using the Phonological Awareness Screening Test and MAP data
3. Ensure all instructional staff implementing the reading interventions with specific students and are collaborating and utilizing ESOL strategies with ELL students.
4. Monitor progress of students at least 3 times a year (Fall, Winter, Spring) using MAP ,and in addition utilize progress monitoring tools bi-weekly.

**Person Responsible** Ann Welsh (welsha@pcsb.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

**During the 2019-20 school year there were 3 substantiated bullying incidents recorded at Anona. During the 2020-21 school year there were zero substantiated bullying incidents recorded at Anona.**

**The school-based leadership team will continue to monitor discipline data monthly and report our areas of concern (locations, grade level, subject, sub-groups etc).**

**Daily circles, restorative practices, and reteach efforts will continue and be led by the school counselor and behavior specialist.**

### **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.**

The Anona Elementary staff creates emotionally supportive classrooms where students feel safe to engage in challenging tasks and have equitability of voice. The teachers design authentic and meaningful lessons where students are engaged and deeply invested in their learning while developing a positive attitude toward school. Anona staff members utilize affective statements that honor student's feelings, promote supportive relationships, and empower them to solve problems. Anona Elementary has four Guidelines for Success 1. Be Safe 2. Be Respectful 3. Be Responsible 4. Try Your Best. Our Positive Behavior Support System aligns to the GFS and correlates with student conduct grades. Students earn an E, V, S, N, or U daily, which provides consistent behavioral data school-wide. The system is utilized across all grade levels, making it easy for students and their families to understand. The criteria for earning an E, V, S, N, and U are clearly defined. At the end of each grading period, students who earn an E, V, or S 90% of the grading period or more are celebrated at the grade level celebration. Students who model the Commitment to the Character trait of the month are eligible to be honored as the monthly Character Kid. Every month a student is selected from each class as Character Kid and recognized on the morning news and in the school newsletter. We also celebrate student excellence at the end of each grading period during the school-wide celebration assembly. Expectations and GFS are communicated to parents in the school newsletter, at parent and community involvement activities, and during PTA and SAC meetings. They are also evident in the affective language utilized throughout the campus.

These supports help create a safe, secure, and healthy culture that encourages student success. Newly designed Guidelines for Success banners have been posted.

Anona Elementary teachers use restorative circles and questions in their classrooms to develop and maintain a positive community. Restorative practices are used for class meetings, positive discussions, and classroom learning.

At the end of each grading period, students who have not met expectations for conduct are provided re-teaching and goal setting opportunities with the school Behavior Specialist and School Counselor. Parents are informed of their child's participation. School-wide expectations and GFS are communicated home.

Positive student referrals are awarded on a regular basis for students who exemplify and model the GFS. Students are celebrated schoolwide and their accomplishment is shared with their family via a phone call.

Students new to Anona meet with the School Counselor and Behavior Specialist to connect with other grade-level peers new to Anona. Guidelines for Success are explained and students are given opportunities to connect with schoolwide staff. GFS are communicated home to families of students new to Anona.

### **Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.**

School Counselors and Behavior specialists are responsible for the design of the plan and communicating and training teachers to implement the plan.

The plan is communicated to families and students at the beginning of the school year by administrators, school counselor, behavior specialist and teachers.

## **Part V: Budget**

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

|               |        |  |               |
|---------------|--------|--|---------------|
| 1             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math                                       | \$0.00        |
| 2             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA  | \$0.00        |
| 3             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science                                    | \$0.00        |
| 4             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American                                    | \$0.00        |
| 5             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities                          | \$0.00        |
| 6             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports | \$0.00        |
| 7             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Other: Healthy Schools   | \$0.00        |
| 8             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Other: Gifted Students   | \$0.00        |
| 9             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement                          | \$0.00        |
| 10            | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Community Involvement                       | \$0.00        |
| 11            | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners                           | \$0.00        |
| <b>Total:</b> |        |  | <b>\$0.00</b> |