A. K. Suter Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

A. K. Suter Elementary School

501 PICKENS AVE, Pensacola, FL 32503

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Alicia Mathis

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2004

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	50%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (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
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

A. K. Suter Elementary School

501 PICKENS AVE, Pensacola, FL 32503

www.escambiaschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	44%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	32%

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 Escambia 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 faculty, staff, families, and community of A.K. Suter Elementary unite to instill in our students a high standard of academic excellence and responsible behavior that will prepare them to compete in a rapidly changing and culturally diverse society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

A.K. Suter Elementary School strives to be a complete educational experience for all students, a place where all children are nurtured, educated, and loved.

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
Queen, Russell	Principal	Will use Star 360 assessment data to make sound decisions and monitor the learning progress of students and teacher effectiveness in the implementation of the School Improvement Plan as described. Conduct walk-throughs to determine which professional development opportunities are needed to keep teachers and staff current with best practices, and curriculum based instructional strategies. Lead regular faculty and staff data meetings and communicate with all stakeholders about our school based plans and progress
Mathis, Alicia	Assistant Principal	Will use Star 360 assessment data to make sound decisions and monitor the learning progress of students and teacher effectiveness in the implementation of the School Improvement Plan as described. Conduct walk-throughs to determine which professional development opportunities are needed to keep teachers and staff current with best practices, and curriculum based instructional strategies. Lead regular faculty and staff data meetings and communicate with all stakeholders about our school based plans and progress
Martin, Darian		
Smith, Rebecca	Teacher, ESE	
Proshek, Amy	School Counselor	
Low, Kelly	Psychologist	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2004, Alicia Mathis

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.*

3

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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

Total number of students enrolled at the school

516

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.

5

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	102	70	75	95	84	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	516
Attendance below 90 percent	1	14	14	19	14	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	2	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	2	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	3	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	3	3	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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 8/19/2021

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	52	71	92	73	93	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	477
Attendance below 90 percent	1	9	3	9	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	6	4	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	52	71	92	73	93	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	477
Attendance below 90 percent	1	9	3	9	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	4	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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				75%	53%	57%	73%	49%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				68%	55%	58%	55%	46%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	52%	53%	48%	40%	48%
Math Achievement				75%	57%	63%	75%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				72%	60%	62%	60%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	52%	51%	58%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				69%	54%	53%	75%	55%	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	76%	56%	20%	58%	18%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	72%	52%	20%	58%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2021					
	2019	76%	51%	25%	56%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	76%	55%	21%	62%	14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	78%	58%	20%	64%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2021					
	2019	70%	55%	15%	60%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	69%	55%	14%	53%	16%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

STAR was utilized for Fall, Winter, and Spring ELA and Math progress monitoring. The science district quarterly assessment was used for science progress monitoring. The numbers reflect the membership, students tied to the school during both survey 2 and 3.

Grade 1			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	66/63%	69/74%	71/80%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32/56%	34/59%	34/79%
	Students With Disabilities	7/43%	7/43%	7/57%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	66/56%	68/80%	69/75%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32/44%	33/72%	33/67%
	Students With Disabilities	7/29%	7/43%	7/43%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	83/47%	82/55%	86/61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	37/32%	36/33%	39/39%
	Students With Disabilities	13/23%	13/15%	13/15%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	78/2%	81/57%	85/61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32/28%	35/46%	38/45%
	Students With Disabilities	11/9%	13/23%	13/31%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	63/57%	64/72%	62/82%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33/55%	34/59%	32/69%
	Students With Disabilities	6/33%	5/80%	5/80%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	61/51%	63/67%	62/79%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33/42%	33/52%	32/72%
	Students With Disabilities	6/33%	5/80%	5/100%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	76/50%	78/62%	76/61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32/38%	33/52%	31/72%
	Students With Disabilities	11/33%	11/80%	10/100%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	75/52%	78/58%	77/70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32/41%	33/49%	32/63%
	Students With Disabilities	11/9%	11/36%	11/64%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	54/57%	85/54%	85/59%
	Economically Disadvantaged	27/44%	42/41%	43/40%
	Students With Disabilities	12/38%	13/0%	13/15%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	58/43%	82/60%	80/68%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29/24%	38/40%	40/58%
	Students With Disabilities	12/8%	14/14%	13/39%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	80/38%	80/61%	75/59%
	Economically Disadvantaged	39/23%	37/46%	35/46%
	Students With Disabilities	12/8%	13/15%	11/0%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

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	64	35		74	63	58	33				
BLK	59	47		61	57		40				
MUL	73			87							
WHT	82	61	54	86	73	82	77				
FRL	70	44	43	72	62	56	50				
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	55	55	40	48	60						
BLK	64	63	67	58	63	48	47				
HSP	62			77							
MUL	82	83		88	83						
WHT	79	68	44	80	72	48	74				

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
FRL	69	63	59	67	64	44	53				

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	43	42	55	49	44		36				
BLK	59	42	44	60	39	53	39				
HSP	63	33		75	33						
MUL	78	77		89	62						
WHT	78	58	55	79	70	61	87				
FRL	66	51	45	67	56	55	62				

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	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	454
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	55
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	53
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	80
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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	74
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	57
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?

Our 5th grade Science Scores showed the greatest decline from the previous year, to 69% in 2019 from 80% in 2018. We also saw a decrease in both ELA and Math in 3rd grade, with ELA declining 4% and Math declining 1%. Our Students with Disabilities demonstrated proficiency at a lower level in all subject areas when compared to thier non-disabled peers. ELA showed a 32 point gap, math a 29 point gap and science showed a 56 point difference. When looking at our economically disadvantaged students, they also demonstrated lower proficiency rates in all academic areas. ELA had a 15 point gap, Math 20 point difference and science showed a 33 point difference. When comparing the proficiency rate of our white students compared to our black students, our white students showed a 29 point advantage in ELA, a 28 point advantage in Math and a 36 point advantage in science.

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

Our progress monitoring and 2019 State assessment data shows that our Students with Disabilities demonstrate the greatest need for improvement, particularly in the ELA area. They did not meet the goal of 41% proficient, SWD were 37% proficient.

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

The data for the Students with Disabilities subgroup showed that in ELA the students showed a much lower overall proficiency rate (47%) when compared to their nondisabled peers (79%). In order to address the discrepency, our data team will analyze the monthly data for all subgroups and work closely with the RtI Coordinator and MTSS teams to provide appropriate classroom interventions that address the deficits.

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

Our progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments show our greatest improvement in Math, particularly with our Math learning gains. All of the subgroups demonstrated improvement from 2018 to 2019 with our Black subgroup showing a 24 point increase, our SWD demonstrated a 16 point increase, and our Multiracial subgroup showed a 21 point increase.

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

Our school has been focused on Math instruction for all subgroups during the past few years. The teachers were provided extensive training last year on our new math series, Pearson Envision, and also put a strong emphasis on math problem solving techniques. Teachers planned together as a grade level and used the district provided frameworks to increase rigor and address all standards across grade levels. Data was also analyzed quarterly to help guide instruction and target interventions for students who required spiraling of skills.

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

In order for all subgroups to show growth in ELA this year, progress monitoring data and classroom assessments will need to be reviewed and monitored at least monthly. Teachers will need to use the ELA Decision Tree to provide quality interventions for all students. Teachers will use the district frameworks to guide instruction using the new HMH reading series, and provide strong Tier 1 intstruction during the whole group reading block. Stuggling students will be provided explicit sequential interventions to help close the reading gaps. Our school administration, RtI coordinator and MTSS team will work together to provide the neccessary support needed for all students to show growth and success in reading.

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.

Our school will be provided with training and support on implementing the new HMH reading series as provided by the district. Teachers will be provided training at our school sight on using the ELA decision tree for determining and monitoring interventions for struggling students. The RtI ccordinator will train grade level teams on completing Tier paperwork, providing interventions and monitoring data with fidelity to help students close the reading gaps. Our ESE teachers and RtI coordinator will attend district trainings on the implementation of the Sonday Reading Intervention System, to begin implementation with our students with disabilities as well as using it for a Tier 2/3 Intervention with our struggling readers. Our primary teachers will also be trained and begin using the 95% group, Phonics Chip Kit as a tool to fill the gaps in phonics instruction.

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

Additional trainings on using our frameworks and providing systematic explicit instruction across all core content areas will be ongoing throughout this year and beyond. I-Ready trainings will also take place to assist teachers with using diagnostic, progress monitoring data. Monthly data review sessions will continue to take place with administration and grade level teams. Additional staff will be trained on implementing Sonday Systems and the Phonics Chip Kit as an intervention tool for phonics and reading instruction.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Achievement in ELA has not reached 41% proficiency in all sub groups. The only subgroup at AK Suter below 41% proficiency is our Students with Disabilities (37.0%).
Measurable Outcome:	ELA proficiency will go from 37% on the 2021 Star AP3 data to 41% or higher on the 2022 Star AP3 data across all grade levels for our Students with Disabilities subgroup.
Monitoring:	1. Data from STAR 360 and core language arts instructional materials will be collected, analyzed, and reviewed by teacher and ESSA groups. 2. School administrators will conduct weekly walkthroughs and will review school wide data twice a month. They will monitor the progress of students receiving intervention and share findings with teachers. Administration will seek district coaching support to recommend adjustments to interventions and/or to provide professional development needs to help improve the effectiveness of intervention as needed. 3. The RtI Coordinator and MTSS team will meet to analyze data and determine the effectiveness of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions for individual students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Russell Queen (rqueen@escambia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilizing our district-wide ELA curriculum, HMH Into Reading, all classrooms will utilize the Frameworks to focus on standards based planning and instruction. Teachers will implement these evidence-based instructional tips: *Screen all students for potential reading problems at the beginning of the year and again in the middle of the year. *Provide intensive, systematic instruction on up to three foundational reading skills in small groups to students who score below the benchmark score on universal screening. *Teach students to use the writing process for a variety of purposes.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In analyzing our ELA school-wide data for all subgroups, our students with disabilities appear to be lacking foundational reading skills and struggle to understand writing for a variety of purposes. According to Assisting Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Intervention (RTI) and Multi-Tier Interventions in Primary Grades, found on What Works Clearinghouse, universal screenings are a critical first step in identifying students who are at risk for experiencing reading difficulties and who might need more instruction on foundational skills. Providing small group instruction to our struggling students identified on our screenings is also a strong recommendation. To assist our students to become better writers, Teaching Elementary School Students to be Effective Writers on What Works Clearinghouse recommends that students have daily opportunities to learn and practice writing skills, strategies, and techniques. Writing also is a form of communication with many purposes, teachers should help students develop an understanding of these purposes and learn to write well for a variety of real-life

purposes
and audiences.

Action Steps to Implement

1. All teachers will participate in district-wide training on implementing best practices with HMH Into Reading curriculum.
2. Periodically review ELA Curriculum and standards implementation with teachers.
3. Review Quarterly District Assessments (Star 360, I-Ready)
4. Classroom walk-through with a focus in ELA.
5. FSA Assessment Data

Person Responsible   Alicia Mathis (amathis@ecsdfl.us)

1. All teachers will participate in district-wide training on implementing best practices with HMH Into Reading curriculum.
2. Periodically review ELA Curriculum and standards implementation with teachers.
3. Review Quarterly District Assessments (Star 360, I-Ready)
4. Classroom walk-through with a focus in ELA.
5. FSA Assessment Data

Person Responsible   Russell Queen (rqueen@escambia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

AK Suter Elementary had no reported incidents to the state during the 2020-2021 school year. This year we will continue to monitor for any areas of concern. We currently have a school wide behavior program which involves all teachers and staff rewarding appropriate student behavior which helps to create a positive school culture and environment.

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 school host regular parental and family engagement activities throughout the year. Our active PTA networks within our community to support our students and families by providing parental workshops and/or family night out events to ensure involvement. Additionally, our PTA, with strong community support, hosts several school-wide fund-raising challenges to support our teachers and classrooms. Our special area teachers, music and art, sponsor countless student lead and driven fine art events that are opened to our school-wide community. Also, our media specialist sponsors school-wide engaging literacy based events that ensure all of our stakeholders are involved and engaged in student learning.

* A. K. Suter is designated as a non-Title i school for the 2020-2021 school term.

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

AK Suter teachers, staff and administration, PTA, Partners in Education, and the SAC committee will work collectively to schedule and implement family engagement activities throughout the school year to promote a positive culture and environment for our students. Teachers and staff will assess the needs of our families and students, and collaborate with our PTA and Partners in Education to provide personnel at our family events as well as financial support..

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
		Total:	$0.00