
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	23

Sherwood Elementary School

501 CHEROKEE TRL, Pensacola, FL 32506

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Tammy Douglas L

Start Date for this Principal: 7/26/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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: C (45%) 2017-18: D (36%) 2016-17: C (41%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Sherwood Elementary School

501 CHEROKEE TRL, Pensacola, FL 32506

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 PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	72%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	D

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 mission at Sherwood Elementary School is to educate and grow excited, self-sufficient learners. We are to assist and support learning to help students fulfill their academic goals. We also provide students the tools necessary to develop appropriate social interaction skills.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is that children leave our school embodying our arrows of excellence which are to be respectful, responsible, honest, and active learners.

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
Danley, Kristen	Principal	Responsible for leading school staff and students with a clear vision Collaborates with stakeholders to establish a positive and safe environment Provides instructional data to school leaders providing a focus for student success Manages operations and organization of the school
Collins, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Monitors Attendance Reviews Disciplinary Codes and ensures student adherence / safety Communicate with parents to promote student success Academic Evaluation
Phillips, Debbi	Other	Provides teachers with instructional strategies to promote student academic success Coaches and mentors teachers to review data and make instructional decisions Communicates with parents to ensure safety and academic success
Herren, Adrienne	Other	Provides pertinent data to review to guide conversations that influence school based decisions Participates in development and implementation of school goals
Wyrick, Tamika	Other	Creation and implementation of school wide reading plan Collaborate with staff to provide literacy resources and data for establishing school goals

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/26/2021, Tammy Douglas L

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

30

Total number of students enrolled at the school

490

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

13

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	91	70	70	89	63	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	451
Attendance below 90 percent	12	25	28	36	26	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	154
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	7	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA	0	2	11	20	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Course failure in Math	0	1	4	16	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	17	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	20	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	6	21	37	11	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

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	11	19	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/26/2021

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	37	70	87	66	68	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	406
Attendance below 90 percent	6	22	17	17	14	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	1	4	3	8	5	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in ELA	0	3	6	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	0	2	1	5	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	1	3	3	8	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	37	70	87	66	68	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	406
Attendance below 90 percent	6	22	17	17	14	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	1	4	3	8	5	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in ELA	0	3	6	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	0	2	1	5	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	1	3	3	8	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				33%	53%	57%	31%	49%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				47%	55%	58%	30%	46%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	52%	53%	35%	40%	48%
Math Achievement				38%	57%	63%	35%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				51%	60%	62%	38%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	52%	51%	35%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				48%	54%	53%	49%	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	37%	56%	-19%	58%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	22%	52%	-30%	58%	-36%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
05	2021					
	2019	37%	51%	-14%	56%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-22%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	30%	55%	-25%	62%	-32%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	32%	58%	-26%	64%	-32%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	55%	-7%	60%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	49%	55%	-6%	53%	-4%
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				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	55/26%	57/47%	63/43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	44/25%	46/50%	50/44%
	Students With Disabilities	6/17%	6/17%	7/29%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	52/35%	57/53%	62/44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	41/37%	47/51%	50/48%
	Students With Disabilities	6/50%	6/50%	7/57%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	75/24%	80/34%	89/39%
	Economically Disadvantaged	60/23%	63/33%	70/33%
	Students With Disabilities	11/9%	13/31%	16/44%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	63/21%	80/29%	88/50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	48/21%	62/29%	69/48%
	Students With Disabilities	10/30%	13/15%	15/33%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	60/17%	60/35%	53/34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	49/20%	46/35%	40/40%
	Students With Disabilities	16/0	15/13%	13/8%
	English Language Learners	1/0	1/100%	1/100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	57/30%	60/35%	53/43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	46/35%	46/33%	40/43%
	Students With Disabilities	15/7%	15/20%	13/39%
	English Language Learners	1/100%	1/100%	1/100%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	68/21%	70/24%	67/28%
	Economically Disadvantaged	54/17%	54/19%	52/21%
	Students With Disabilities	22/14%	21/10%	21/19%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	67/22%	70/26%	67/33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	53/17%	54/20%	52/25%
	Students With Disabilities	22/23%	21/29%	21/33%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	72/18.1%	75/25%	72 / 27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	56/14%	55 / 20%	52/23%
	Students With Disabilities	13/0	15/0	14/14%
	English Language Learners	1/0	1/100%	1/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	68/10%	75/25%	71/31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	53/11%	55/20%	51/26%
	Students With Disabilities	11/0	16/6%	14/14%
	English Language Learners	1/0	1/100%	1/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	60/40%	1/100%	63/33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	45/38%	1/100%	46/33%
	Students With Disabilities	10/0	NA	12/0
	English Language Learners	1/100	NA	1/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

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	20	35		22	16		6				
BLK	20	23		22	23	27	20				
HSP	32			37							
MUL	30	30		27							
WHT	54	50		49	41		50				
FRL	26	25	31	28	24	25	28				
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	19	47	58	24	55	56	38				
BLK	21	37	55	26	47	35	28				
HSP	52	71		48	36						
MUL	25	35		58	47						

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	46	58		44	62	60	61				
FRL	29	45	60	36	49	42	48				
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	10	23	29	20	29	44	30				
BLK	19	25	29	22	35	30	30				
HSP	48	29		52	40						
MUL	30	30		48							
WHT	40	36		44	40	42	70				
FRL	30	28	30	32	36	34	36				

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	31
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	220
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	20
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 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	23
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	35
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	29
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	49
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	27
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

Students with disabilities tend to perform at or below the 3-5 average for the school, and underperforms the district.

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

Students with disabilities show the greatest need for improvement in both ELA and Math scores in progress monitoring and 2019 assessments.

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

Attendance and Course Failures - Our low attendance rates and course failures strongly correlated for this subgroup. New and inexperienced teachers, with some teachers leaving during the school year. Limited remedial instructional materials.

New START teachers for our first year teachers, including mentors for new/inexperienced teachers. Reading Intervention teacher was hired to work with some struggling students. New reading series purchased by the district that includes intervention components.

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

Economically disadvantaged students showed the most growth based off of progress monitoring data.

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

Departmentalized structure in 5th grade

AIM time school wide (Always Improving Myself) - 30 minutes daily of tasks targeted to student needs.

Next Steps Forward in Guided Reading - book study and implementation

Kids Deserve It! book study on increasing student engagement

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

Hold parent and family engagement activities to encourage at home learning that corresponds with what students are learning in school.

Differentiated Instructions throughout the school day and subjects.

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.

Extended planning time once a week for teachers to analyze data and plan for instruction.

Leader In Me 1st year implementation to encourage good habits.

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

We will continue with extended planning where teachers have an hour and 20 minutes once a week to disaggregate data and plan for instruction. We will continue the Leader In Me training where will use leadership notebooks in which students will maintain data towards their goals and celebrations. Through the Leader in Me we will continue to work on the culture, leadership and academics of our school.

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: Economically Disadvantaged (25.7%), Students with Disabilities (18.8%), Black (18.9%), Hispanic (31.6%), Multiracial (31.8%), and Overall school (31.2%)

On the spring STAR ELA assessment:
 1st grade ELA proficiency rate was 43%
 2nd grade ELA proficiency rate was 39%

On 2021 FSA assessment:
 3rd grade ELA proficiency rate was 34%
 4th grade ELA proficiency rate was 28%
 5th grade ELA proficiency rate was 27%

ELA proficiency and learning gains will go from 31.2% / 32% LG on the 2021 FSA to be greater than or equal to 5% on the 2022 FSA school wide and for Black and Economically Disadvantaged students.

The achievement gap in proficiency between SWD and overall students will decrease by 50%, going from 18.8% on the 2021 ELA FSA to 25% or higher on the 2022 ELA FSA.

Measurable Outcome:

The achievement gap in proficiency between Black students and overall students will decrease by 50%, going from 18.8% on the 2021 ELA FSA to 25% or higher on the 2022 ELA FSA.

Black students will perform at or above the learning gain percentage of overall students.

Kg proficiency was above 50% last year, so Kg will reach 75% proficiency on spring 2022 ELA STAR.

1st - 2nd grade will reach 50% proficiency or higher on spring 2022 STAR

3rd-5th grade will reach 50% proficiency or higher on spring 2022 FSA

Data from STAR360 and core language arts instructional materials will be collected, analyzed, and reviewed and broken down by teacher and ESSA groups.

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.

Monitoring:

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.

The Rtl Coordinator and MTSS team will meet to analyze data and determine the effectiveness of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions for individual students.

STAR360 Data is used to progress monitor proficiency for all grade levels.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristen Danley (kdanley@ecsdfl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:	Sonday Systems Accelerated Reader Leveled Readers / Guided Reading
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Sonday Systems offers structured systematic multi-sensory reading intervention. Uses proven methods to provide effective intervention in small group settings. Accelerated Reader has personalized goals for reading growth. Program helps students monitor progress and provides feedback. Guided reading is designed to provide differentiated instruction in developing reading proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will be trained on Sonday System for use with our struggling readers-District training
Accelerated Reader strategies will be utilized in the classroom where teachers will work with students to set goals and will monitor progress.
Guided Reading with leveled text comprehension strategies will be taught in small group by instructional personnel. Students will progress through the texts at their instructional level.
Progress Monitoring of STAR proficiency levels will be done after each STAR assessments. Curriculum Coordinator, Assistant Principal or Principal will meet with grade levels after each assessment period to review data. Interventions will be reviewed and possibly changed for students not on track to reach their proficiency goal. Data spreadsheets will be kept for school, grade levels, classes and individual students.

Person Responsible Kristen Danley (kdanley@ecsdfi.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of****Focus**

Achievement in math has not reached 41% proficiency in all sub groups: Economically Disadvantaged (32.5%), Students with Disabilities (20.4%), Black (21.7%), Hispanic (36.8%), Multiracial (27.3%), and Overall school (32.4%)

Description and**Rationale:**

Math proficiency and learning gains will go from 32.4% / 32% LG on the 2021 FSA to be greater than or equal to 5% on the 2022 FSA school wide and for Black and Economically Disadvantaged students.

Measurable Outcome:

The achievement gap in proficiency between SWD and overall students will decrease by 50%, going from 18.8% on the 2021 ELA FSA to 25% or higher on the 2022 ELA FSA.

The achievement gap in proficiency between Black students and overall students will decrease by 50%, going from 18.8% on the 2021 ELA FSA to 25% or higher on the 2022 ELA FSA.

Black students will perform at or above the learning gain percentage of overall students.

Data from STAR360 and Reflex Math will be collected, analyzed, and reviewed and broken down by teacher and ESSA groups.

Monitoring:

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.

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:

Jennifer Collins (jcollins@ecsdfl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

iReady
Reflex Math - for fluency

Rationale for

Reflex Math uses innovative technology to provide effective math fact fluency solutions. Students need the foundational skills of fluency in order to complete higher level math skills.

Evidence-based Strategy:

iReady is an online program that provides students with differentiated instruction and supports them on an individual learning path.

Action Steps to Implement

Monitor implementation of standards based instruction to include Reflex math and iReady.

Monitor the use of Collaborative planning protocols.

Receive ongoing support from district math department personnel

Person Responsible

Jennifer Collins (jcollins@ecsdfl.us)

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

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.

Sherwood Elementary School reported 0.2 incidents per 100 students. When compared to all elementary schools statewide, it falls into the low category.

Primary areas of concern are number of Out of School Suspensions as it compares to the state and district.

Secondary areas of concern are number of In School Suspensions as it compares to the state and district.

We have on staff a behavior coach and aide to assist teachers in managing discipline through observations, coaching and assistance with students where needed. Data is reviewed often and discussions held to determine next steps and ways to improve. This year we have started a Student Care Team that meets bi-weekly to review students in the MTSS process for behavior and/or other at risk students. The Student Care team consists of our principal, assistant principal, MTSS Coordinator, guidance counselor, Navigator School Counselor, District School Social Worker, Behavior Coach and Trauma Informed Counselor.

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.

Sherwood School has implemented the Leader In Me program for the 2021-2022 school year. The entire faculty and staff of the school have been trained on the 7 Habits of Highly Effective People and the instructional staff have been trained on Leader in Me Core 1. In Core 1, the culture of the school is addressed and the 7 Habits are taught to the students in PreK-5. We have instituted a Friday Celebration where the students, faculty, and staff will be recognized for being leaders and accomplishing set goals. We are aligning our systems, PBIS and LIM, so that we are creating a culture of student leadership and citizenship in our school.

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

As we are implementing the LIM, we have partnered with The Home Depot, Phil Hall and Associates P.A., Navy Federal Credit Union, Fishbein Orthodontics, and Anderson Subaru to establish our positive school culture. Our partners have donated supplies to spruce up the curb appeal and overall image of our school, provided student materials for student learning, provided manpower for work day campus clean up, and have volunteered to participate in student activities. If volunteers are able to return to schools, these stakeholders are ready to volunteer their time to work with students.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00