

Monroe County School District

# Stanley Switlik 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>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>24</b>

# Stanley Switlik Elementary School

3400 OVERSEAS HWY, Marathon, FL 33050

<https://www.keysschools.com/domain/1375>

## Demographics

**Principal: Linda Diaz C**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	74%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (59%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<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 Monroe County School Board.

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>24</b>

# Stanley Switlik Elementary School

3400 OVERSEAS HWY, Marathon, FL 33050

<https://www.keysschools.com/domain/1375>

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">62%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">62%</p>

## School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

Stanley Switlik Elementary School will empower our diverse population of students to attain an educational foundation that enables them to be persistent learners who are prepared for success in college and careers in an ever changing global society.

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

The Stanley Switlik school community fosters individual determination in a learning environment that emphasizes social/emotional well-being and academic goal setting to enable student citizens to act for the betterment of themselves and their community.

### 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
Paul, Christine	Principal	Provide leadership, guidance, and supervision of all aspects of academic and extracurricular programming.
Adams, Sarah	Assistant Principal	To perform those tasks assigned by the building principal and assist in the development and continuous implementation of an elementary school program which meets the needs and promotes the well-being of all students in the school.
Willis, Chris	School Counselor	To advise the BLPT about social/emotional curriculum, student needs, and positive behavior interventions and supports.
Meier, Christy	Instructional Coach	The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE & special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Christy Meier is an at-large member.
Sly, Tanya	Reading Coach	The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE & special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Tanya Sly is an at-large member.
Hendrix, Heather	Teacher, K-12	The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE & special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Heather Hendrix is the kindergarten chair.
Collins, Gayzel	Teacher, K-12	The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE & special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Gayzel Collins is the first grade chair.
Vals, Kat	Teacher, K-12	The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE & special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Kat Vals is the second grade chair.



Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Francisco, Bailey	Teacher, K-12	The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE & special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Bailey Francisco is the third grade chair.
Collinet, Randi	Teacher, K-12	The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE & special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Randi Collinet is the fourth grade chair.
Wert, Jeannette	Teacher, K-12	The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE & special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Jeanette Wert is the fifth grade chair.
Lall, Tisa	Teacher, K-12	The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE & special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Tisa Lall is the specials department chair.
Licause, Michele	Teacher, ESE	The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE & special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Michele Licause is the ESE department chair.

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Wednesday 7/15/2020, Linda Diaz C

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

2

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

4

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

52

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

566

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

6

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

7

**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	77	69	87	88	94	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	527
Attendance below 90 percent	34	20	21	29	31	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	15	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	16	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	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	2	1	11	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

**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	0
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**

Wednesday 9/1/2021

**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	60	77	83	77	104	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	469
Attendance below 90 percent	11	20	15	14	17	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

**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	3	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

**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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	60	77	83	77	104	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	469
Attendance below 90 percent	11	20	15	14	17	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

**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	3	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

**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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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				67%	70%	57%	70%	68%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				47%	55%	58%	58%	58%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				29%	46%	53%	46%	49%	48%
Math Achievement				73%	71%	63%	71%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				66%	64%	62%	67%	50%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	56%	51%	56%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				66%	66%	53%	70%	67%	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	83%	70%	13%	58%	25%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	55%	58%	-3%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
05	2021					
	2019	58%	62%	-4%	56%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	73%	62%	11%	62%	11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	67%	60%	7%	64%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2021					
	2019	74%	66%	8%	60%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	64%	65%	-1%	53%	11%
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 Reading & Math progress monitoring was used for all grade levels. In addition to STAR reading and math, fifth grade used the Monroe County Science Progress Monitoring.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	44	43	61
	Economically Disadvantaged	47	41	68
	Students With Disabilities	33	25	33
	English Language Learners	29	19	41
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	82	77	84
	Economically Disadvantaged	80	76	85
	Students With Disabilities	50	50	33
	English Language Learners	71	41	71

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	55	60	73
	Economically Disadvantaged	58	56	69
	Students With Disabilities	11	11	11
	English Language Learners	19	19	27
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	46	63	79
	Economically Disadvantaged	47	63	78
	Students With Disabilities	11	22	44
	English Language Learners	19	38	53

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	54	62	67
	Economically Disadvantaged	50	51	55
	Students With Disabilities	0	20	33
	English Language Learners	13	27	20
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	77	76	78
	Economically Disadvantaged	77	76	79
	Students With Disabilities	36	20	18
	English Language Learners	53	73	73

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	52	51	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	48	40	46
	Students With Disabilities	10	14	5
	English Language Learners	6	5	5
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	60	58	63
	Economically Disadvantaged	50	47	54
	Students With Disabilities	38	40	23
	English Language Learners	24	21	21

Grade 5					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		59	58	57
	Economically Disadvantaged		49	46	42
	Students With Disabilities		14	20	13
	English Language Learners		0	0	0
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		71	72	65
	Economically Disadvantaged		69	66	58
	Students With Disabilities		21	36	33
	English Language Learners		25	50	0
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students		10%	44%	
	Economically Disadvantaged		9%	32%	
	Students With Disabilities		0%	20%	
	English Language Learners		8.3%	31%	
		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	40	23		37	31		38				
ELL	32	70		30	90		30				
HSP	53	52		49	65		61				
MUL	55			73							
WHT	68	42		68	52		60				
FRL	53	38		50	62		55				
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	36	29	21	47	64	65	50				
ELL	44	46	45	69	62		60				
HSP	61	47	31	70	66	58	60				
WHT	75	47	27	77	69	64	81				



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	61	47	35	69	68	67	60				
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	32	39	35	36	50	38	33				
ELL	64	69		64	74						
HSP	64	56	46	68	70	67	61				
WHT	79	58		78	62	20	85				
FRL	68	57	45	69	67	54	67				

**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	54
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	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	434
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
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	64
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	58
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	52
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?**

According to 2020-21 STAR Math progress monitoring, the percent of students demonstrating high growth doubled during the spring administration. Students showing low growth shrunk from 52% to 36% between the fall and spring administrations. The 2021 school grade calculation showed a 18 point drop in overall math performance, a 9 point drop in overall learning gains, and a 5 point increase in the lowest quartile. 2020-21 STAR Reading progress monitoring demonstrated minimal change in the growth categories from fall to spring. 2021 school grade calculations showed an increase in both ELA Learning Gains categories and a 9 point drop in overall performance. Science performance dropped 6 points.

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

According to the 2021 school grade calculation, although both ELA learning gains categories showed improvement, both scores are still below 50. It is critical these components score at least 50 to ensure the educational program is meeting the needs of all learners. ELA and Math overall percent of level 3 or higher dropped 9 percentage points in both categories. In particular grade 4 demonstrates a need for improvement in both ELA and Math and the subsequent cohort of students will be prioritized to achieve gains.

#### **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 contribute to this need for improvement include the Tier 1 curriculum and the consistency and effectiveness of Tier 2/3 supports. Differentiated and small group instruction during the ELA and Math core periods of instruction and Tier 2/3 supports will be monitored regularly and adjusted to meet the needs of all learners.

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

ELA for both learning gains categories and Math lowest quartile learning gains showed improvement.

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

Strategies that led to this improvement include the WIN intervention period redesign, regular assessment of Tier 2/3 supports, and allocation of resources based on specific needs.

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

Teachers will use formative assessment and provide evidence-based interventions and strategies using high quality instructional materials and MTSS to ensure all learners are making gains in ELA and Math.

#### **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.**

1. Evidence-based Interventions
2. Supportive classrooms & Collaborative Teaching
3. Job-embedded PD to support rigorous Tier I curriculum

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

1. Weekly monitoring by leadership team through learning walks, data analysis, and grade level/ department teams
2. Monthly Internal View to provide opportunities for teachers to observe effective practices
3. Monthly data presentation to the Building Level Planning Team
4. Regular engagement of BLPT in the design, implementation, and monitoring of literacy and math initiatives

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** ELA learning gains components provide a focus on overall improvement and especially students in the lowest quartile. Scores of at least 50 in both of these components demonstrate that the educational program is meeting the needs of learners. Although improvement in these components was demonstrated in 2021, they are still below 50 in both ELA categories.

**Measurable Outcome:** Our goal for ELA Lowest Quartile is to improve from 36% to 50% and overall learning gains to improve from 48% to 50% of students in these categories.

**Monitoring:** Monitoring will be provided through a multipronged approach to ensure all dimensions needed to increase learning gains are effectively engaged. STAR PM and ISIP monthly assessments will be monitored at the school, grade, and classroom level. APM will be used in grades 3-5 strategically. The literacy, academic, and data coach will review assessment results and work with teams to support a rigorous tier 1 curriculum that provides differentiated instruction as well as work with interventionists and homeroom teachers to ensure tier 2/3 supports are in place and monitored for effectiveness. Data will be reported monthly to the leadership and BLPT teams.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Christine Paul (christine.paul@keysschools.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Using the Monroe County School District Instructional Vision to guide our approach, we have selected the following priorities rooted in evidence-based strategies/programs to ensure the majority of students are making learning gains in all grade levels. They are: Broad Access to Rigor, AVID, Relationships, Goals/Scales, Differentiated Instruction, and MTSS.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Improving instructional practices through a rigorous Tier I core curriculum, implementing effective interventions using the MTSS framework, and fully engaging our students in the learning process through relationships, AVID, and goal setting will positively impact student learning and ensure scores in these components show that a majority of our students are making gains.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Rigorous Core/Tier 1 curriculum with differentiated instruction following B.E.S.T. Standards and AVID. Grade level and department teams meet regularly with the academic and literacy coach to review standards, align resources, and plan for differentiated instruction.
2. Monitor tier 2/3 supports and modify plans as needed.
3. Students set individualized goals, teachers use learning goals and scales to gauge progress, and the school monitors overall achievement through monthly reports using progress monitoring (STAR, ISIP, & APM) as well as anecdotal data.
4. Positive relationships are prioritized with the understanding that they form the foundation for learning.

**Person Responsible:** Christine Paul (christine.paul@keysschools.com)

**#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** The need to enhance Social Emotional Learning (SEL) efforts became evident through last year's SEL screenings, specifically surrounding emotional regulation, grit, sense of belonging, self-efficacy, and teacher-student relationships.

**Measurable Outcome:** Based on Panorama screenings, Stanley Switlik Elementary will see a 5% points increase in positive school climate for students in positive school climate specifically surrounding emotional regulation, grit, sense of belonging, self-efficacy, and teacher-student relationships as specific targeted areas.

**Monitoring:**

- Panorama screener administered twice per year for students and staff; results of the spring 2021 screener will be used to determine impact of efforts.
- o Artifacts will be collected each month which demonstrate implementation and provide feedback regarding school climate efforts.
- Progress monitoring will occur monthly; school counselors will enter Tier 2 data and school social workers will enter Tier 3 data into Panorama. The BLPT team will review each month towards goal attainments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Sarah Adams (sarah.adams@keysstudents.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Classroom Champions is an evidence-based SEL and mentorship program that will be taught weekly which connects Olympians, Para-Olympians and professional athletes to classrooms. Second Step is an additional evidenced-based SEL program that is taught daily.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The curriculum selected is aligned to the deficit areas. The District Action Planning and Problem Solving Team (Multi-Tiered Systems of Support Leadership team) vetting many SEL curriculums for alignment and ease of use.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Assign one of the eight themes for each month of the school year from August through April. The themes are strategically matched with month and time of year.

**Person Responsible** Sarah Adams (sarah.adams@keysstudents.net)

Disseminate a district-wide web linked newsletter each month defining the theme and include learning activities, teacher challenges and student challenges throughout the month. These are supported through videos and direct contact from Olympic, Para-Olympic and professional athletes.

- a. The web linked newsletter will also include resources for parents and school district staff to support the themes at home and professionally.
- b. Classroom teachers and students will complete the activities and challenges, while videos and other Classroom Champion support materials are presented school-wide.
- c. Our PBIS team will link their activities to the monthly themes.

**Person Responsible** Chris Willis (chris.willis@keysschools.com)

Mental Health support staff will have access to the Classroom Champions platform to access additional materials for students identified as needing additional support through MTSS at the Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 level throughout the school year.

**Person Responsible** Sarah Adams (sarah.adams@keysstudents.net)

Teachers will teach Second Step Curriculum each day and Classroom Champions weekly. The remaining weeks to provide SEL curriculum (12 weeks) will be created using evidence-based programs such as Second Step, Overcoming Obstacles, and Stanford Harmony based on the results from the Fall SEL screening,

**Person Responsible** Sarah Adams (sarah.adams@keysschools.com)

### 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.

**According to the SafeSchoolsforAlex website, Stanley Switlik did not report any incidents in the 2019-20 school year.**

**Discipline data is monitored regularly at the school level through the Building Level Planning Team and Tier 2/3 Behavior Data Chat meetings. Teachers, staff, and admin work collaboratively to identify areas of concern and address behavior using proactive strategies to improve culture and maintain a supportive learning environment. Tier 1 social emotional curriculum from Second Step is provided to all students. Small group social emotional lessons are provided to Tier 2/3 students. All instructional and support staff are trained in the iBElieve behavior management system, Mental Health First Aid, ALERT school safety, & PBIS.**

### 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.

At Stanley Switlik Elementary School we utilize several methods to engage all stakeholders:

1. School Advisory Council/Parent Teacher Organization Meetings
2. Building Level Planning Team
3. Back to School Task Force (District/School) & School Leadership Team
4. School Newsletter, DOJO, Website, Facebook, Social Media, & EdConnect
5. Title I Parent Engagement Nights
6. Meet the Teacher, Open House & Parent/Teacher Conferences
7. Parent Feedback Surveys
8. School and Community Events

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

1. Teachers- promote and implement PBIS strategies
2. BLPT & PBIS teams- Monitor SEL data and implement SEL curriculum and PBIS initiatives to support
3. Parents are engaged in SEL curriculum through the district website
4. Students participate in the design and implementation of PBIS and SEL strategies and incentives
5. Community is invited to learn more about PBIS and SEL initiatives and provide support where appropriate
6. School administration serves to model and promote a positive school culture and environment and continue to seek out ways to improve

**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: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>