

Pinellas County Schools

Alfred Adler Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	23

Alfred Adler Elementary School

4515 38TH AVE N, St Petersburg, FL 33713

www.alfredadlerschool.com

Demographics

Principal: Lori Decosmo

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2023-06-30
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
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)	96%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (42%)
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 Pinellas 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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Alfred Adler Elementary School

4515 38TH AVE N, St Petersburg, FL 33713

www.alfredadlerschool.com

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School KG-8</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>95%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>29%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pinellas 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.

Alfred Adler Charter School welcomes students who best benefit from an open ended education model integrated with and a part of a democratic community. Students are given both the choice and responsibility for their education, along with the guidance, encouragement and support from parents and teachers.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Alfred Adler School provides a learning environment that supports each individual student's learning experience and at the same time challenges them in ways that more traditional environments cannot. Mass education started during the industrial revolution, an approach that was designed to train students for factory work and one that is no longer relevant to the current needs of our society. We are the school that thinks "outside the box". We offer a choice beyond the ordinary and common approach. Looking forward we believe in moving away from long outdated models in order to provide a more relevant, innovative and joyful educational experience for our students. To be relevant and meaningful we need to tap into students' passions and creativity, as well as engage them in the process itself. Students are not passive by-standers told what to do, instead they are active participants, trusted in making important decisions and guided towards opportunities for self-directed learning and discovery. In a modern, democratic environment of freedom and order they learn to take responsibility as well as to trust their internal locus of control. Learning from trial and error, they figure out ways to adjust their course and assess their choices.

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
DeCosmo, Lori	Principal	Oversee all aspects of the school
Nordmann, Thomas	Administrative Support	Data Management, ESE and 504 compliance
DeCosmos, Greg	Administrative Support	Finance, HR, Middle School Teacher

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Lori Decosmo

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

1

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

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

5

Total number of students enrolled at the school

75

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

2

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

1

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	6	4	9	8	12	8	2	8	5	0	0	0	0	62
Attendance below 90 percent	4	2	8	6	10	7	0	6	4	0	0	0	0	47
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	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	5
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	7

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	1	1	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

Tuesday 10/12/2021

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	6	10	6	16	12	7	11	8	5	0	0	0	0	81
Attendance below 90 percent	0	4	2	8	5	5	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	29
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	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	7

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

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

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	1	1	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	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				62%	70%	61%	42%	65%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				71%	63%	59%	59%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile					56%	54%		55%	52%
Math Achievement				57%	72%	62%	38%	69%	61%
Math Learning Gains				68%	63%	59%	44%	64%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile					54%	52%		59%	52%
Science Achievement				54%	64%	56%	47%	62%	57%
Social Studies Achievement					81%	78%		82%	77%

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	0%	56%	-56%	58%	-58%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	53%	56%	-3%	58%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						
05	2021					
	2019	70%	54%	16%	56%	14%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2021					
	2019	0%	51%	-51%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	0%	51%	-51%	52%	-52%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	0%	55%	-55%	56%	-56%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	0%	62%	-62%	62%	-62%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	27%	64%	-37%	64%	-37%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2021					
	2019	60%	60%	0%	60%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				
06	2021					
	2019	0%	44%	-44%	55%	-55%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
07	2021					
	2019	0%	60%	-60%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019	0%	31%	-31%	46%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	50%	54%	-4%	53%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	0%	51%	-51%	48%	-48%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	68%	-68%	71%	-71%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	55%	-55%	61%	-61%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Grades 3-5, NWEA MAP

Grades K-2 SuccessMaker by Savvas (formerly Pearson Education)

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	6/54%	8/80%	6/54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1/50%	1/50%	1/50%
	Students With Disabilities	2/66%	2/66%	2/66%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	6/75%	3/75%	2/33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/44%	4/44%	5/55%
	Students With Disabilities	1/50%	1/50%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	8/53%	11/64%	5/45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/42%	4/57%	4/57%
	Students With Disabilities	1/100%	1/100%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7/50%	8/50%	6/37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/42%	3/42%	4/57%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	1/100%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	10/76%	9/75%	6/54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/50%	2/50%	3/75%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8/61%	5/41%	4/36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/50%	2/50%	2/50%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	6/85%	5/83%	5/83%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/50%	3/50%	3/50%
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6/85%	5/83%	5/83%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/50%	3/50%	3/50%
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	6/85%	5/83%	4/66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/50%	3/50%	4/66%
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

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
WHT	42	44		58	63						
FRL	47	53		66	67						
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
WHT	66	71		61	68		58				
FRL	50	70		54	75		50				
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
WHT	45	59		35	41		42				
FRL	38	42		38	37		45				

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	261
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	87%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
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	52
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	58
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 Grades 3-5, NWEA MAP progress scores, the third grade students are scoring lower levels on the ELA components, Especially in the Spring testing window.

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

ELA performance at the lower grade levels.

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

A lower grade teacher was not implementing the school's evidence based curriculum during the 2019-2020 and 2020-21 school years. Actions needed to address this situation were implemented in July.

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

2021 FSA Mathematics Achievement was at 55 with a Mathematics Learning Gains of 62.

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

The school implemented a Math improvement strategy in 2020-21 under it's Title 1 program. This program leveraged the capabilities of the SuccessMaker program in both assessing achievement levels, identifying specific skill areas of concern, and providing a platform for intervention. This successful program is now slated to be utilized in the same manner in the ELA domain.

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

Maintain the Math program implemented in 2020-21, and implement the same program in the ELA domain with the appropriate modifications for success in ELA scores.

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.

Additional training in using SuccessMaker data and informational reports to identify students and skill areas of concern.

Training on the translation of this data into actionable interventions in small group instruction and individual conferencing.

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

The school's Title 1 program also implemented a Math Club on campus. This club incorporated math skills acquisition into a game based presentation. It was run by students for students, and engendered a very positive environment where math skills were promoted and valued.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: ELA scores in both the 2020-21 FSA assessment and MAP progress monitoring assessments were low for 3rd Grade(over 50%). SuccessMaker monitoring assessments were low for 3rd grade ELA(45%)

Measurable Outcome: 65% of 3rd Grade students will score 3 or above on ELA MAP test for Winter and Spring administrations
 65% of 3rd Grade students will score above grade level on SuccessMaker skills testing throughout continuous testing model.

Monitoring: This desired outcome will be monitored through review of each of the three MAPs assessment administration.
 In addition, Successmaker progress will be monitored on a real time continuous basis individually and as a group at staff meetings. This data will inform remediation plans.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Greg DeCosmos (c.decosmosg@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: The school will use SuccessMaker to identify students in need of remediation and to pinpoint exact areas of struggle. The remediation can be done through SuccessMaker with prescriptive scheduling. In addition, skills identified for remediation will be addressed in teacherled small group(3-5 student) sessions.
 The advantage of SuccessMaker as a Tier 2 intervention, is that intervention can commence immediately at even a moderate level of falling short of expected grade level, and SuccessMaker can provide remediation and tracking. All students are evaluated by the program three times per year. Fall, Winter and Spring. If a student shows mastery at, or above, grade level, then they continue in Tier 1 support. If a student shows mastery at below grade level expectations, then Tier 2 interventions commence immediately. The student continues in SuccessMaker and is remediated and tracked weekly. Other supports can be put into place such as additional small group instruction and one-on-one conferencing as needed. Once the student is back on grade level, the student returns to tier 1 support.

In short, the SuccessMaker adaptive engine:

- Determines an individual student’s current grade-level mastery of skills.
- Builds on current level by presenting sequential skills.
- Determines if newly presented skills are mastered. If yes, present next skill level. If not, present scaffolded remediation.
- If remediation is successful, proceeds to next skill, if not, alerts teacher for further intensive remediation.

The SuccessMaker software:

- Tracks student progress and areas of difficulty.
- Tracks and graphs gap between trend line and aim line.(See Below)
- Calculates simple Rate of Improvement and predicts/extrapolates future student performance based on current progress.
- Maps to Best Standards. (See Appendices B and C)
- Shows Strong Correlation to FSA scores.
- Meets ESSA’s “Strong” evidence criteria in both Math and Reading(Appendices D and E)

Rationale for The rationale for selecting SuccessMaker as the strategy is that it can mon

Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

Provide access and training to instructional staff in the use and interpretation of SuccessMaker information.

Person Responsible Greg DeCosmos (c.decosmosg@pcsb.org)

Review student progress in SuccessMaker scores biweekly at full staff meeting. Conference with instructional staff on strategies to improve performance and instructional supplements for students achieving below set levels.

Person Responsible Lori DeCosmo (c.decosmoe@pcsb.org)

Review MAPs data at each administration and use this data to monitor progress toward ELA goals.

Person Responsible Thomas Nordmann (c.nordmannt@pcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safe-schools-for-alex.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.

NA

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.

- Students find their place of belonging by having the opportunity to contribute in a multitude of ways
- Learning is a choice. A joyful and fulfilling, sometimes challenging, endeavor that allows them to find their passion and interests as well as their strength and courage
- Students learn to persevere as they are encouraged and supported when engaging in new and

challenging learning experiences

- Students are able to build confidence in their ability to figure things out for themselves and by being active problem solvers
- Students learn to cooperate and be part of a team by recognizing the importance of community
- Students have choices which allows them to be self-regulated and self-guided, taking responsibility for their choices and actions
- Students learn to become adept at articulating complex questions in multiple ways, so they can develop as critical, analytical, free thinkers.
- Students have the time and space to pursue their own interests and passions
- Students gain a deeper understanding of self and others. Being themselves and accepting their differences as strengths, they focus on what they need in order to succeed, rather than what they lack in measuring up to standards imposed by others
- Students learn to understand the importance of having a balance of order and freedom in this school community, by understanding the importance of boundaries and restorative justice.

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

School Staff Expectations:

- Provide a rich and qualitative educational experience that encourages student engagement, team work and creative problem solving
- Provide a safe space in our classrooms and our school community, where students feel a sense of belonging and know they count. A caring environment that allows each individual to know they are equal in their worth and that their individual and collective contribution matters.
- Communicate with students as equal partners in their educational journey and provide relevant feedback
- Provide various ways for students to participate in their education and various ways to demonstrate their learning
- Provide ongoing training and support to parents so that they may help their students in all areas of their development and in building a community that encourages learning and connecting relationships.
- Provide opportunities for parents to participate in their student's educational journey and their school community by having monthly events, during which time students' work and accomplishments are showcased

Student Expectations:

- Engage in their education by actively participating in their ongoing learning, group projects and presentations.
- Demonstrate effort and take on new challenges
- Take responsibility for their individual and group assignments
- Use the class and school agenda and the disagreement form, as well as follow the "working it out" process to problem solving.
- Take responsibility for their actions and choices.
- Follow school agreements as well as the School Code of Conduct and the Stop/Go System.

Parent Expectations:

- Ensure their students are at school at a reasonable time and manage days absent so that students do not miss out on important opportunities at school.
- Take an active role in their student's education by staying informed via email and/or Facebook and as much as their schedule allows, participate in school wide events.
- To ensure continuity and alignment between school and home, parents are supportive of the basic Adlerian values and tenants practiced at the school (i.e. a democratic approach, the stop and go procedure, classroom and school wide meetings, working it out and the use of the agenda to mention a few).

- Parents agree to attend a minimum of three Family Education Workshops in addition to the workshop required as part of the enrollment process.
- Contribute ten hours per family per year to the school by volunteering (attendance at the family ed. workshops is counted towards volunteer hours as well)
- Parents communicate any concerns they have with the school in a respectful manner (best via email) and if the disagreement is with the core philosophy of this school, then the understanding is that this school is a choice amongst other available choices.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$22,710.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	100-Salaries	7201 - Alfred Adler Elementary School	School Improvement Funds	0.4	\$18,800.00
	5100	200-Employee Benefits	7201 - Alfred Adler Elementary School	School Improvement Funds	0.4	\$2,472.00
	5100	220-Social Security	7201 - Alfred Adler Elementary School	School Improvement Funds	0.4	\$1,438.00
					Total:	\$22,710.00