# Alfred Adler Elementary School

## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# 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**<br>(per MSID File) | Closed: 2023-06-30 |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Combination School<br>KG-8 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2020-21 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2020-21 Economically<br>Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 96% |
| **2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: A (62%)<br><br>2017-18: C (46%)<br><br>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

# Alfred Adler Elementary School

## 4515 38TH AVE N, St Petersburg, FL 33713

## www.alfredadlerschool.com

## 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) |
|---|---|---|
| Combination School KG-8 | Yes | 95% |

| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 29% |

## 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 | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 | |

## 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 | | 0% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 70% | 54% | 16% | 56% | 14% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -53% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 51% | -51% | 54% | -54% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -70% | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 51% | -51% | 52% | -52% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 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 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | 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 |
| **Mathematics** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 2 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | 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 |
| **Mathematics** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | 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 |

| 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 | | | |

| 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 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 | | | |
| Science | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | 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<br>65% of 3rd Grade students will score above grade level on SuccessMaker skills testing throughout continuos testing model. |
| **Monitoring:** | This desired outcome will be monitored through review of each of the three MAPs assessment administration.<br>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.<br>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.<br>In short, the SuccessMaker adaptive engine:<br>• Determines an individual student's current grade-level mastery of skills.<br>• Builds on current level by presenting sequential skills.<br>• Determines if newly presented skills are mastered. If yes, present next skill level. If not, present scaffolded remediation.<br>• If remediation is successful, proceeds to next skill, if not, alerts teacher for further intensive remediation.<br>The SuccessMaker software:<br>• Tracks student progress and areas of difficulty.<br>• Tracks and graphs gap between trend line and aim line.(See Below)<br>• Calculates simple Rate of Improvement and predicts/extrapolates future student performance based on current progress.<br>• Maps to Best Standards. (See Appendices B and C)<br>• Shows Strong Correlation to FSA scores.<br>• 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, 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 |