

Pasco County Schools

Anclore Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	0

Anclote Elementary School

3610 MADISON ST, New Port Richey, FL 34652

<https://aes.pasco.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Ellen Thomas

Start Date for this Principal: 4/16/2018

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)	82%
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: D (40%) 2016-17: C (49%)
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	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Anclore Elementary School

3610 MADISON ST, New Port Richey, FL 34652

<https://aes.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	74%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	46%

School Grades History

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

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.

Anclote Sailors - Dream, Believe and Achieve.

Dream - With all of our minds

Believe - With all of our hearts

Achieve - With all our might

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students will be proficient leaders, readers and mathematicians by 3rd grade and maintain or improve every year thereafter.

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
Thomas, Ellen	Principal	The administration leads the guiding coalition, a team of leaders wanting to promote excellence and lead change throughout the building. This will be accomplished through identifying best practices and building upon them, problem solving issues, to come up with innovative, practical responses to improve or correct the problems and building a culture of community by modeling personal dedication to students, faculty, parents and the community at large. The undertone of all decisions will be made by answering the question - Is this best for students?
Pitkoff, Jessica	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 4/16/2018, Ellen Thomas

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.*

6

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

23

Total number of students enrolled at the school

402

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

7

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

7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/28/2021

2020-21 - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	70	71	69	79	69	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	432
Attendance below 90 percent	21	6	10	12	12	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	1	2	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	10	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	34	20	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	4	1	1	4	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	

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	70	71	69	79	69	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	432
Attendance below 90 percent	21	6	10	12	12	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	1	2	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	10	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	34	20	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	4	1	1	4	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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				46%	58%	57%	45%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				57%	56%	58%	45%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				60%	54%	53%	30%	45%	48%
Math Achievement				46%	60%	63%	42%	59%	62%
Math Learning Gains				60%	61%	62%	41%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	50%	51%	30%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				41%	53%	53%	44%	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	32%	60%	-28%	58%	-26%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	60%	59%	1%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				
05	2021					
	2019	44%	55%	-11%	56%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	36%	59%	-23%	62%	-26%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	62%	-11%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				
05	2021					
	2019	49%	57%	-8%	60%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	41%	53%	-12%	53%	-12%
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	17	19		27	44		15				
ELL	14	15		32	31		15				
BLK	29			33							

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
HSP	29	11		35	30		14				
WHT	41	27		43	33		35				
FRL	31	17	8	34	26	23	17				
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	22	38	57	26	48	43	7				
ELL	32	56		32	43	45	30				
ASN	73			64							
BLK	31			13							
HSP	41	56	50	39	45	55	50				
MUL	70	90		80	80						
WHT	45	53	65	48	63	42	38				
FRL	41	57	62	42	56	42	34				
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	29	29	27	29	18	19				
ELL	35	31		31	25						
ASN	67			50							
BLK	24	43		10	21						
HSP	38	36	20	39	35	36	32				
MUL	56	25		56	50						
WHT	47	49	29	46	44	25	55				
FRL	44	46	30	40	40	31	41				

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	34
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	269
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
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	29
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	31
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	24
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	36
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	28
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

Sub Group data in grades 3-5, especially Economically Disadvantaged, Black and ELL underperform counterparts in Language Arts and Math.

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

Language Arts and Math in all tested grade levels are in great need of improvement. Sub group data is not available at this time to indicate which are underperforming. As combined data all tested grade levels are underperforming.

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

Many students were effected by the COVID Virus and the Trauma associated with this pandemic. Students rate of attendance was low, many were unable to connect with the curriculum in a virtual format, and many students needed additional services that were more difficult to provide in the confines of working in a secluded environment. Initial diagnostic assessments will be given to students in the beginning of the year. Time will be scheduled for in depth interventions to close the gaps that resulted from the pandemic situation. Interventions will be monitored for fidelity and effectiveness.

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

We did not see any improvement in our data from the 2019 State Assessment level to the current level.

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

The have been no recognized improvements in data. However, training and different resources will be made available for interventions moving forward.

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

Highly effective Tier I instruction, Grade level materials utilized for Tier I and II instruction. Consistent monitoring of Intervention execution and data to ensure response is positive and closing gaps.

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.

District Level PD will be provided for new ELA curriculum, and jump starting Eureka Math Curriculum. In addition a framework for teaching and learning in ELA has been established with the designated approved resources indicated. Schoolwide, PD will be provided for Intervention processes as well as using curriculum resources and AVID engagement strategies for Tier I.

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

We will be implementing research based interventions such as Hegerty, SIPP and monitoring Fluency with Dibels assessments. In addition an Interventionist will be available to support our most needy students. We will also be utilizing look for walkthrough tools to ensure teacher needs for PD are identified and delivered in a timely manner.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Data Driven Decisions- Tier 1 Instruction - At this time, few grade level teams deliver core instruction that meets the standard of 80 percent proficiency in Tier 1. We will continue to build on our knowledge of identifying students that require tier 2 and tier 3 instruction, but we must improve the proficiency in Tier 1. For the 19/20 school year the focus was on the Tiers of support and interventions. The number of students requiring intervention was too high. We cannot Tier 2 and 3 ourselves out of an ineffective Tier 1.
Measurable Outcome:	Student proficiency will increase by 5% in ELA and Math by providing effective tier 1 instruction and then follow it up with dynamic tiered levels of support. Student subgroups performing below the 41st percentile will increase their overall proficiency to at least 41 percent.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through Common Formative Assessment data, Progress monitoring data, Scheduled walkthrough data and Data analysis in PLC's.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ellen Thomas (ethomas@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Dedicated intervention time for differentiating instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Engaging Instruction targeted at providing students instruction at the level they need to be proficient. The instruction will be differentiated to provide levels of support in Tier I,II, and III.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Develop a Master Schedule including multiple interventions times for tiers of support. Provide PD on analyzing data, and responding to data.
2. PLC teams will Identify priority standards by Unit/Module of Study.
3. Unpack the Standards (answer the questions, what do we expect students to learn, how do we know they are learning it, how do we respond when they do not learn, how do we respond when they have already learned?)
4. Develop Common Formative Assessments to measure our Tier 1 progress.
5. Implement the Teach Teaching-Assessing Cycle
6. Identify Students for Tier 2 Support by Student, by Standard, and Learning Target - Pay particular attention to our SWD's and Black students.
7. Monitor Progress of students receiving Tier 2 supports
8. Identify Students needing intensive (Tier 3) levels of support
9. Provide necessary supports in Tier 2 and 3 while working to improve the number of students proficient in Tier 1.

Person Responsible Ellen Thomas (ethomas@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

At this time, teachers do not have a systematic and vertical approach to building knowledge across the grade levels and content areas. Thus as a staff, we are well positioned to help teachers meet the increased rigor and expected reading-writing integration of the BEST Standards by improving students overall knowledge of content. This interdisciplinary approach to literacy recognizes that as students learn to read, write, and think critically in response to a variety of texts across the curriculum, relationships are discovered, connections become clear, and student achievement improves. As students become more knowledgeable, their vocabulary increases and therefore their understanding of reading comprehension improves.

Measurable Outcome:

Student proficiency will increase as measured by the FSA in grades 3-5. Common Formative Assessments will be utilized in grades K-5 to measure proficiency in reading and to inform instruction for writing. Both underperforming subgroups (SWD and Black) will perform at or above the 41st percentile by using the reading and writing skills and strategies and their improvement in vocabulary through knowledge based teaching.

Monitoring:

This area of focus will be monitored through Common Formative Assessment data, Progress monitoring data, Scheduled walkthrough data and Data analysis in PLC's. PD will be utilized and implementation monitored during walkthroughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ellen Thomas (ethomas@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

PD will be delivered and utilized for new Core Curriculum in ELA.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

With the addition of a new curriculum and standards, teachers must be supported with the implementation and execution of the curriculum.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Administration will inform teachers of District Wide Curriculum PD.
2. Teachers will engage in monthly PD opportunities at the school level to sharpen the practices for ELA in the classroom.
3. Admin and Coaches will provide feedback to teachers based on walkthrough formative classroom visits. (Coaching Cycles)
4. PLC's will work to home best practice and ensure that delivery of instruction is uniform and expectations remain high.

Person Responsible

Jessica Pitkoff (jpitkoff@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: Students in Grade 3-5 are less than a 50% proficient on Statewide and Maps assessments.

Measurable Outcome: All students needing Tier 2 and 3 services will receive them resulting in a proficiency increase of 10% this school year based on year end MAPS growth measures and FSA ELA scores.

Monitoring: MAPS assessment proficiency and growth data will be monitored 3x year. ELA Module data will be reviewed every 3 weeks in PLC to determine proficiency and Tiers of support. L35 student data will be tracked.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ellen Thomas (ethomas@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Weekly PLC's will be the vehicle to learn and grow about the new BEST standards as well as the new curriculum for ELA. In addition to the PLC's, PD will be developed based on the results of Core Action walk through data that will note the needs to improve practice based on engagement in the classroom.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Learning is a continuous process. With as much learning that is necessary in ELA this school year, it is important to attach the PD in bite-size chunks. We have learning in BEST Standards for ELA, Curriculum, and Core Actions for engagement in the classroom.

Action Steps to Implement

PLC Structures - Data analysis and intervention selection. PD time set aside each week for learning to support our growth in ELA schoolwide. DIBELS, NWEA, Heggerty, SIPPS - Evidence based programs to build student skills.

Person Responsible: Ellen Thomas (ethomas@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Classroom walk throughs - Core Actions and Conferences to improve practice.

Person Responsible: Jessica Pitkoff (jpitkoff@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Sailor Learning - Based on Data, Classroom walkthroughs and teacher feedback, PD will be developed and implemented to improve overall teaching practices.

Person Responsible: Ellen Thomas (ethomas@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Anclote Elementary ranked moderate on a statewide comparison of incidents. However it rated very high on the number of suspensions. We will monitor the number of suspensions being administered over the course of the upcoming school year. We will continue to implement the Leader in Me curriculum for students and teachers to improve the expectations across the campus.

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.

We are a Leader in Me School in our third year of implementation for the upcoming school, year which entails, building leadership among our students, staff, and families. As part of our goal we will be offering parenting classes utilizing the Seven Habits of Highly Effective Families. Families will be invited bi-monthly to attend digital workshops that will help build stronger relationships, supports, and understanding for one another. By utilizing the 7 habits we intend to build stronger relationships with our lower performing sub-groups to better understand and serve them.

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

Stakeholders include students, staff, families and community partners. There is a Home-School connection with the 7 habits. We will all use the language and 7 habits to guide our actions and interactions with one another.