

Monroe County School District

Gerald Adams Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

Gerald Adams Elementary School

5855 COLLEGE RD, Key West, FL 33040

<https://www.keysschools.com/domain/363>

Demographics

Principal: Melissa Alsobrooks K

Start Date for this Principal: 9/2/2021

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)	80%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (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*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 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.

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	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Gerald Adams Elementary School

5855 COLLEGE RD, Key West, FL 33040

<https://www.keysschools.com/domain/363>

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	71%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	79%

School Grades History

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

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.

We are committed to working to collaboratively provide a quality learning environment in which ALL children can learn and develop to their maximum potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Creating the LEADers of tomorrow!
 Learners – foster a love of learning
 Example Setters – character development
 Achievers – focused on raising academic achievement
 Dreamers – goal focused—success is possible

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
Palomino, Rebecca	Assistant Principal	
Orcutt, Tammy	School Counselor	
Roberts, Heidi	Reading Coach	
Herrin, Frannie	Principal	
Taylor, Meghan	Teacher, K-12	
Jones, Maggie	ELL Compliance Specialist	
Henriquez, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	
Hogan, Elizabeth	Parent Engagement Liaison	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 9/2/2021, Melissa Alsobrooks K

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.*

0

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

Total number of students enrolled at the school

660

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

3

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

4

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	108	100	95	81	86	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	550
Attendance below 90 percent	37	29	27	27	26	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	25	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	16	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/2/2021

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	91	93	76	75	79	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	475
Attendance below 90 percent	25	23	26	20	18	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	4	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	1	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	7	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	91	93	76	75	79	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	475
Attendance below 90 percent	25	23	26	20	18	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	4	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	1	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	7	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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				65%	70%	57%	69%	68%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				55%	55%	58%	63%	58%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	46%	53%	46%	49%	48%
Math Achievement				58%	71%	63%	56%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				60%	64%	62%	36%	50%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	56%	51%	32%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				57%	66%	53%	59%	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	77%	70%	7%	58%	19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	61%	58%	3%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	62%	-10%	56%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	58%	62%	-4%	62%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	56%	60%	-4%	64%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2021					
	2019	57%	66%	-9%	60%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	54%	65%	-11%	53%	1%
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 and Math and 5th grade Science

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35%	26.7%	50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	40.6	36.5	56.25
	Students With Disabilities	14.9	19.23	22.2
	English Language Learners	43.33	29.03	57.58
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	46.9%	47.8%	63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	60.9	62.9	67.9
	Students With Disabilities	42.86	40	40.74
	English Language Learners	53.3	54.8	69.7

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	38.6%	37.1%	48/56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	53.5	69.9	67.86
	Students With Disabilities	14.29	41.47	53.33
	English Language Learners	39.29	56	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	35.2%	36.2%	81.9%
	Economically Disadvantaged	40.3	53.57	86.21
	Students With Disabilities	26.67	26.67	76.47
	English Language Learners	34.48	50	90
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34.9%	50%	55.1%
	Economically Disadvantaged	47.2	49	62.26
	Students With Disabilities	34.62	59.26	51.85
	English Language Learners	40	40	60
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	53.4%	56.4%	64.9%
	Economically Disadvantaged	52.6	65.38	69.81
	Students With Disabilities	39.29	62.96	66.67
	English Language Learners	33.33	60	100

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	29.5%	41.1%	43.9%
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	45.1	49
	Students With Disabilities	16.13	41.94	48.3
	English Language Learners	28.57	28.57	42.86
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	32.5%	32%	53.1%
	Economically Disadvantaged	34	39.22	52.83
	Students With Disabilities	29.03	30	61.29
	English Language Learners	28.57	28.57	57.14
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	38.1%	43.1%	45.9%
	Economically Disadvantaged	46.9	43.48	47.6
	Students With Disabilities	34.48	25	36
	English Language Learners	40	50	55.56
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	41.9%	40.3%	49.2%
	Economically Disadvantaged	40.82	47.8	47.6
	Students With Disabilities	20.69	25.93	36
	English Language Learners	40	44.44	66.67
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	5.7%	24.3%	46%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	6.9	14.8	
	English Language Learners	4.3	17.4	
	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	35	17		23	30		22				
ELL	44	38		25	50		25				
BLK	39	36		29	45		42				
HSP	57	31		36	48	50	34				
WHT	76	62		50	38		77				
FRL	48	39	27	36	53	45	38				
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	52	50	62	42	49	25	52				
ELL	47	41	27	37	58	48	33				
BLK	60	54	44	43	54	33	20				
HSP	62	48	43	61	54	44	68				
WHT	80	70		70	81		80				
FRL	60	53	47	53	54	38	47				
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	60	52	29	47	40	50	39				
ELL	64	65	67	47	29	27	47				
BLK	52	50	33	40	26	39	33				
HSP	76	66	56	62	40	29	72				
WHT	79	73		67	42						
FRL	66	61	47	54	37	34	53				

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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	360
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
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	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	39
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	45
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	61
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	43
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 overall math proficiency is below both state and district averages. The 2021 data shows grade 3 proficiency at 32%; grade 4 at 41%; and grade 5 at 32%. Our ELA proficiency scores also dropped in all three tested grade levels.

Subgroup data shows that current 4th grade EL students are at 40% proficiency in ELA and 10% proficiency in mathematics. Current 5th grade EL students are 55% proficient in ELA and only 27% proficient in math.

Our ESE subgroup with gifted, current 4th grade students are 48% proficient in ELA and 11% proficient in mathematics.

Our 5th grade SWD students, scored 33% proficient in ELA and math.

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

We need to focus on math and ELA proficiency and learning gains. We also need to build a stamina for reading.

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

Contributing factors include lack of equity in a virtual environment and many students lacked the educational support. Additionally the continuity of instruction was lacking due to quarantines. Additionally our robust after school program did not start until January. Overall attendance is a need area as well.

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

In ELA our student in the low 25 quartile improved from 29% making learning gains to 62% and our black subgroup improved 11 percentage points. In mathematics, overall learning gains increased 9%, EL up 29%, Black subgroup increased 28%, Hispanic 14% and our white subgroup increased 39%. We also saw increases in our 25 math gains with EL increasing by 21% and Hispanics by 15%.

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

Use of intervention blocks and Century 21 tutoring to reinforce academic vocabulary and skill building was a major contributing factor. Additionally we were able to increase EL support in all grade levels.

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

We will continue our before and after school tutoring as well as a robust summer program. We also have implemented an intervention block in all grade levels and we use our inclusion teachers and EL teachers to create smaller intervention groups.

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.

We are providing professional development in the BEST Standards in ELA and mathematics. We also purchased hands-on math manipulatives such as math stackers to reinforce number sense. We are also focusing on explicit small group teaching and center-based learning.

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

The district finance office has provided additional positions to support the unique needs of our students. Additionally we utilize Title I funds and Century 21 grant funds to enhance our educational offerings.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Our overall math proficiency is below both state and district averages. The 2021 data shows grade 3 proficiency at 32%; grade 4 at 41%; and grade 5 at 32%. Our ELA proficiency scores also dropped in all three tested grade levels.

Subgroup data shows that current 4th grade EL students are at 40% proficiency and 10% proficiency in mathematics. Current 5th grade EL students are 55% proficient in ELA and only 27% proficient in math.

Our ESE subgroup with gifted, current 4th grade students are 48% proficient in ELA and 11% proficient in mathematics.

Our 5th grade SWD students, scored 33% proficient in ELA and math.

Measurable Outcome: By May of 2021, we will increase math proficiency rates by 10 percentage points in grades 3,4 and 5.

Monitoring: We will use progress monitoring data from STAR as well as formative assessments to monitor our mathematics instruction. We will also work with our district math coordinator to conduct instructional walk throughs to monitor the implementation of small group instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Frannie Herrin (frannie.herrin@keysschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Small group instruction is essential to ensure that instruction and remediation can be delivered to address specific learning gaps. If utilized effectively teachers can reinforce whole class instruction, identify missing essential skills and remediate skills. In addition, small group instruction allows teachers to differentiate instruction to meet students' needs and learning styles.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

This strategy was chosen as our school's math data has historically not been high performing and there is a need to develop rigorous instruction that addressing learning gaps and builds in remediation as part of the instructional planning. We also have placed an emphasis on use of manipulatives and math journals to assist with conceptual understanding.

Action Steps to Implement

Center-based instructional coaching cycles.

Small group instructional strategies with use of manipulatives.

Data analysis and learning goals.

Administration will monitor classroom instruction and progress through classroom walk throughs.

Person Responsible

Frannie Herrin (frannie.herrin@keysschools.com)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We have a diverse population of students from various cultures and backgrounds that were adversely affected by the pandemic and there is a need to build self advocacy skills and encourage authentic engagement in learning.

Measurable Outcome: Students will apply decision-making skills to deal responsibly with daily academic and social responsibilities and hence students will be more academically engaged.

Monitoring: We will monitor progress toward this goal by evaluating the number of students making behavioral goals, through class walk throughs and overall discipline and academic performance data, teacher feedback and student survey feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Rebecca Palomino (rebecca.palomino@keysschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students will practice self advocacy skills and communication skills to express their learning and SEL needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Self-knowledge is the ability to understand one's own interests and strengths, as well as learning and relating styles. Self-knowledge is the starting point for all social and emotional learning. In fact, self-knowledge influences all areas of SEL including self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making. The more a student understands him or herself, the better he or she will grow and adapt in all areas of life.

Action Steps to Implement

After progress monitoring session one and student interest inventories are complete, teachers will work with students to set goals for academic learning. We will use our character education curriculum and classroom learning activities that focus on authentic student engagement in learning. We will gather data from Panorama throughout the Panorama year to see the impact on student feelings of progress and to see if they are more connected to learning. We will also continue our AVID program utilizing advancement via individual determination.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Focusing on learning gains in ELA provides a focus on overall improvement in instruction. Scores of at least 50% in gains and proficiency demonstrates that our curriculum is meeting the needs of our diverse student population. During the 2021 school year, both our learning gains and low quartile gains dropped from 2019.

Measurable Outcome: By May 2022, grades 3-5 ELA achievement will increase by 5 percentage points in each grade level scoring a 3 or higher on the FSA (grade 3 from 59% to 64%; grade 4 from 52% to 57%; and grade 5 from 47% to 52%).

Monitoring: Monitoring will be provided by utilizing STAR and ISIP data, monthly data chats and instructional walk throughs. We will utilize our inclusion teacher, EL interventionist and the literacy coach to ensure that a rigorous tier 1 instructional plan is implemented as well as effective interventions during the school day and in Century 21. Data will be reported monthly to BLPT and our leadership team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Heidi Roberts (heidi.roberts@keysschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Keeping in line with the district's Instructional Vision, we have selected evidenced based strategies to ensure the majority of students are making gains in all grade levels. These include access to a rigorous curriculum, AVID, goal setting and differentiated instruction with EL and SWD supports.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Improving instructional practice through a rigorous Tier 1 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 a majority of our students making learning gains

Action Steps to Implement

Create positive relationships between students and teachers with understanding of individual backgrounds and learning styles

Person Responsible Frannie Herrin (frannie.herrin@keysschools.com)

A rigorous tier 1 core instruction program will be offered to all students to include differentiated support.

Person Responsible Heidi Roberts (heidi.roberts@keysschools.com)

Monitor tier 2/3 supports to ensure they are meeting learning needs and modify as needed for student progress.

Person Responsible Rebecca Palomino (rebecca.palomino@keysschools.com)

Students in conjunction with their homeroom teachers will set learning goals and self monitor progress.

Person Responsible Rebecca Palomino (rebecca.palomino@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.

We are a PBIS Silver School

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.

Gerald Adams Elementary School incorporates a variety of strategies to build relationships with parents, families and other stakeholders as it relates to the school's mission and supports the needs of students such as individual and small group counseling based on the child's needs, lunch bunch groups, reading buddies, Start with Hello, and Safer Smarter Kids. We offer multicultural activities to celebrate our families heritage and cultures. We also do family movie nights, grade level shows, talent show and art shows.

We also involve parents in monthly School Advisory Meetings, Open House, Meet the Teacher, parents conferences, LEP Meetings, MTSS meetings and IEP Meetings.

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

We build a positive culture through many facets of our school including our Building Level Planning Team that is comprised of a representative from every grade level and department. Our BPIS team works to create common expectations and to provide a positive learning environment for staff and students.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00

Total:	\$0.00
--------	--------