Schrader Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Schrader Elementary School

11041 LITTLE RD, New Port Richey, FL 34654

https://ses.pasco.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Lee Anne Keith

Start Date for this Principal: 10/18/2015

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)	84%
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* Multiracial Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
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 Pasco 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

Schrader Elementary School

11041 LITTLE RD, New Port Richey, FL 34654

https://ses.pasco.k12.fl.us

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	81%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	41%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pasco 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.

Schrader Elementary: A compassionate culture with high expectations and unlimited possibilities for all. Every Raider, Every Day!

Provide the school's vision statement.

All of our students achieving success in college, career, and life.

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
Keith, Lee Anne	Principal	
Middleton, Jill	Assistant Principal	
Mularz, Shana	Instructional Coach	
Peterson, Sara	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 10/18/2015, Lee Anne Keith

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.*
4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
43

Total number of students enrolled at the school
600

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.
3

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	116	87	100	101	71	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	579
Attendance below 90 percent	14	26	24	23	18	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	6	27	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Course failure in ELA or math	3	11	6	10	8	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 in ELA or math	0	0	0	24	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	4	17	12	14	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71

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	5	9	1	10	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
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
Friday 9/24/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Number of students enrolled		
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				52%	58%	57%	48%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				56%	56%	58%	42%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	54%	53%	29%	45%	48%
Math Achievement				49%	60%	63%	50%	59%	62%
Math Learning Gains				58%	61%	62%	49%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	50%	51%	31%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				51%	53%	53%	52%	56%	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	51%	60%	-9%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	59%	-8%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2021					
	2019	49%	55%	-6%	56%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	43%	59%	-16%	62%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	62%	-11%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	57%	-9%	60%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	48%	53%	-5%	53%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						

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	16	50	64	24	27		26				
ELL	42			25							
BLK	18			8							
HSP	40	53		34	56		56				
WHT	36	38	50	45	39	25	33				
FRL	33	42	69	35	41	31	33				
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	33	53	55	25	53	50	25				
ELL	45			45							
BLK	47			35							
HSP	48	43	36	48	48	36	33				
MUL	62			38							
WHT	52	60	57	51	60	45	52				
FRL	47	52	50	44	55	41	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	26	30	26	22	39	29	38				
ELL	50	91		36	58						
BLK	41			53							
HSP	48	43	33	42	41	38	35				
MUL	53	54		53	54						
WHT	46	41	27	51	50	26	56				
FRL	44	40	30	46	47	30	50				

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)	

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	323
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	94%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	38
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	13
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	48
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
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 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	38
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	42
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?

A continued trend that we have seen is that our ESE subgroup continues to score well below other subgroups in proficiency. Our ESE subgroup did made significant learning gains from the 2018 to the 2019 school year. In core content areas, third grade overall in both math and ELA has been decreasing year after year.

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

Based off data and 2019 state assessments, the greatest need for improvement is third grade data overall.

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

Year after year, the proficiency scores in 3rd grade have continued to drop in both content areas. In regards to ELA, students are not coming in on grade level, therefore, are not scoring proficient on an end of the year 3rd grade assessment. A strong Muti Tiered System of Support (MTSS) was not in place during the 2018-2019 school year. New actions that needed to be put into place is a strong MTSS time for all of our students for ELA. This intervention time is a systemic change among all grade levels. All students receive instruction based on their exact needs.

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

The biggest improvement from the 2018 to the 2019 school year was the Lowest 25% learning gains from ELA and math. Our school, went from 29% to the 51% in ELA learning gains and 31% to 42% math learning gains.

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

In the 2018-2019 school year, our school put a Lowest 25% watch party in place. This watch party focused solely on the needs of our Lowest 25% subgroup and their priorities. The focus was on their interventions and what they were getting from classroom teachers and support facilitators. The subgroups' data was put into spreadsheet and monitored monthly. The proficiency was still low, but the learning gains were strong and consistent.

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

In order to continue to accelerate learning, we need to put in a strong intervention time into place for all students, not just our Lowest 25%. That strategy worked to help that subgroup make gains, but now we need that implemented school-wide. We also have developed an enrichment plan for those students that are higher learners, but with limited growth. These students also receive interventions based on higher order skills and strategies.

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.

In order to put a solid MTSS plan in place school-wide, professional development will need to take place in PLCs to help structure groupings, pull resources, and put a strong system in place. Professional development included Response to Intervention, Establishing Professional Learning Communities and assessment data analysis that drives intervention placements/groups.

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

A continuation of this protected intervention time will take place in years to come in order to close the significant gaps in ELA. In future years, we would like to provide additional services around math PD and interventions, as the new standards roll out. Scheduling intervention time with all grade levels will also take priority when developing the master schedule.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to our intervention walkthrough report from February 2021, only 10% of the classrooms met all quality characteristics for intervention. This data helped drive a major focus for implementation of strong ELA interventions for the 21-22 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	By February 2022, we will increase the percentage of classrooms implementing all quality characteristics for intervention from 10% to 50%.
Monitoring:	Watch Parties, MMFADs MTSS PLCs Gifted Inclusion PLCs Common Intervention Time Planning for Essential Standards ELA Curriculum Planning/B.E.S.T. Standards PD
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lee Anne Keith (lyerkey@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	SWAT (Success Will Always Triumph) Team was created to support each grade level during designated intervention time. All staff members were trained using the Quality of Characteristics data tool, along with MTSS Group trackers to collect group data. Teachers analyze assessment data to group students based on common needs. These intervention groups have an enter and exit criteria, with 4 solid weeks of targeted interventions. All of these intervention groups target needed ELA skills and strategies. All teachers, all support facilitators and all instructional assistants contribute to the intervention groups.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Back in the Spring of 2021, the district and school based MTSS team conducted an intervention walkthrough school-wide. Only one classroom out of 18 implemented high quality interventions. Along with capturing data from a teacher's needs assessment, we learned quickly that interventions and MTSS would need to be a priority focus area for the new school year. State FSA data confirmed the need for students to receive more focused, specialized instruction that met each individual's learning levels. Proficiency levels in all grade levels were significantly low, thus the reasoning behind the MTSS Intervention initiative.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional Development for all staff members on MTSS and Professional Learning Communities
Professional Development for Instructional Assistants on Interventions
Creation of master schedule for grade level intervention time
Bi-Monthly Watch Parties, with a focus on the low 25% and low achievement/low growth students
Quarterly Monitoring for Achievement Days with each grade level (data analysis, action plans, intervention groups)
Intervention Time observations/feedback to teachers

Person Responsible	Lee Anne Keith (lyerkey@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Based off the 2019-2020, Safe School for Alex data we are ranked 940 out 1,395 elementary schools statewide. Due to having 6 violent incidents it gave us an incident rate of .92 per 100 students. It is apparent that our primary area of concern is violent attacks. During the 21-22 school year, we hired a behavior inclusion specialist to assist with our SBP (social behavior program) population mainstreaming into the basic education classrooms. We have adopted the Conscious Discipline philosophy school-wide and we hope to reinforce the level system currently being used in our self-contained classroom, to prepare our SBP students for a successful transition into basic education classrooms.

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.

One of our three main guiding principles at Schrader Elementary and in Pasco County is Collaborative Culture. Our goal is that staff members collaborate to ensure the school culture is fruitful in increasing student achievement and the social emotional well-being of all. Four years ago, when two Social Behavior Programs came to our school, our staff began their learning into Trauma Informed Care and the Harmony Project. A multitude of professional development was given to develop the understanding of students with behavioral disabilities and the inclusionary movement for all students. This training was rolled out over a span of three years, along with our staff participating in our district's Socio-Emotional Early Release Days. This, along with year one of Conscious Discipline training, helped create a supportive, inclusionary culture that accepts all children. Strategies to use in morning meetings to enhance the overall school family approach also contributed to the overall culture of our school. Finally, this year, our staff developed a new mission statement along with five collective commitments that reflect our school's culture and philosophy.

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

Each year, our students in fifth grade take the annual Gallup Survey. The data represented in the Gallup poll is used to develop student-based strategies on areas such as mentoring, hope and goal-setting. Our parents complete an annual Title I survey each year. Data is analyzed and trends help build initiatives for the following school year. This data is shared at our monthly SAC meetings and placed in our school's Family Engagement Plan. Our SAC is actively involved in contributing information and requests to our

overall Family Engagement Plan each year as well. After recovering from almost a year and a half of restricted visitors, no guest speakers and no family events, due to Covid, we are gradually bringing our stakeholders back onto the campus by offering in person parent conferences, face to face SAC meetings, limited volunteers in the classrooms and programs, such as Watch Dog Dads and iMoms will be beginning at the start of semester two.