Anderson Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Anderson Elementary School

3910 W FAIR OAKS AVE, Tampa, FL 33611

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Lydia Sierra

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	80%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (54%)
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 Hillsborough 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

Anderson Elementary School

3910 W FAIR OAKS AVE, Tampa, FL 33611

[no web address on file]

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	No	56%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	58%

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 Hillsborough 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.

To provide a safe learning environment that will empower students to become life-long learners and productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Inspiring all students to reach their full potential.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Part I: School Information

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Behrens, Brian	SAC Member	The Leadership team meets regularly (e.g., bi-weekly/monthly). The purpose of the core Leadership Team is to: 1. Collaborate with SAC members and other stakeholders to identify areas of need and student progress. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams. A collaborative culture of shared responsibility is established through Leadership Team Meetings and PLCs.
Foushee-Winfield, Tracey	Assistant Principal	The Leadership team meets regularly (e.g., bi-weekly/monthly). The purpose of the core Leadership Team is to: 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the RtI/MTSS process: at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams. 5. Facilitate a culture of collaboration and shared responsibility. 6. Facilitate and monitor site base professional development. 7. Foster leadership development of teacher leaders.
Sierra, Lydia	Principal	The Leadership team meets regularly (e.g., bi-weekly/monthly). The purpose of the core Leadership Team is to: 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the RtI/MTSS process: at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams. 5. Facilitate a culture of collaboration and shared responsibility. 6. Facilitate and monitor site base professional development. 7. Foster leadership development of teacher leaders.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/29/2021, Lydia Sierra

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

0

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

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

23

Total number of students enrolled at the school

319

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

6

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

2

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	58	50	59	49	49	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	321
Attendance below 90 percent	0	6	8	6	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	14	19	15	12	11	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
Course failure in Math	8	2	7	1	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	7	16	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	14	19	15	12	11	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	78

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	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	7	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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 8/30/2021

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	54	57	43	54	50	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	311
Attendance below 90 percent	1	7	4	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	15	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	22	9	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	

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	54	57	43	54	50	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	311
Attendance below 90 percent	1	7	4	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	15	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	22	9	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				67%	52%	57%	62%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				60%	55%	58%	51%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	50%	53%	44%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				65%	54%	63%	60%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				68%	57%	62%	58%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				61%	46%	51%	41%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				70%	50%	53%	45%	51%	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	53%	52%	1%	58%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	69%	55%	14%	58%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
05	2021					
	2019	74%	54%	20%	56%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	56%	54%	2%	62%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	71%	57%	14%	64%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2021					
	2019	61%	54%	7%	60%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	70%	51%	19%	53%	17%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

K-5 ELA, Math utilized iReady
Grade 5 Science utilized science baseline, midyear assessment and NGSSS

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	16	42	60
	Economically Disadvantaged	5	28	48
	Students With Disabilities	0	33	17
	English Language Learners	0	0	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	9	41	66
	Economically Disadvantaged	4	31	51
	Students With Disabilities	0	67	50
	English Language Learners	0	0	100

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30	54	56
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	27	44
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	20
	English Language Learners	40	40	60
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14	37	61
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	37	61
	Students With Disabilities	0	20	20
	English Language Learners	20	40	60

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	44	57	63
	Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-
	Students With Disabilities	14	35	28
	English Language Learners	-	-	-
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	12	28	46
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	7	28	28
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30	22	51
	Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-
	Students With Disabilities	26	22	25
	English Language Learners	0	0	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11	34	492
	Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	34
	English Language Learners	0	25	25

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40	51	62
	Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-
	Students With Disabilities	16	26	29
	English Language Learners	34	32	67
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38	50	70
	Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-
	Students With Disabilities	0	13	38
	English Language Learners	20	40	40
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50	55	40
	Economically Disadvantaged	33.4	53.4	-
	Students With Disabilities	36	46.4	-
	English Language Learners	16	45	-

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	21			28							
ELL	53			60							
BLK	38			24							
HSP	46	76		46	47		21				
MUL	62			46							
WHT	57	80		54	67		57				
FRL	48	70		41	48		30				
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	35	40	30	43	67						
ELL	64			64							
BLK	50			50							

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
HSP	67	65		57	65	75	75				
MUL	79	75		75	70		64				
WHT	66	56	46	67	67	40	73				
FRL	64	63	43	62	70	61	63				

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	31	33	42	36	38	20	21				
ELL	50	60		57	50						
ASN	64	70		73	70						
BLK	28	38		33	38						
HSP	62	64		39	50						
MUL	64	47		72	60						
WHT	67	45	45	69	65	40	54				
FRL	52	43	40	53	53	46	31				

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	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	497
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	95%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	56
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	47
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	54
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	63
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	47
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?

Proficiency in all content areas across most groups showed lower performance. In particular, science and mathematics in grade 4 dipped significantly.

Instructional choice that may have been successful with past cohorts of students appear to not leverage comparable student achievement with the current cohort. Modification and acceleration is warranted to respond to student needs in order to make academic gains.

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

Science appears to be the area of greatest need.

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

Multiple teacher leaves, unit losses, and eLearning appear contributing factors. Acceleration in science instruction is critical is addressing the unfinished learning for the current cohorts of students.

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

SWD lowest quartile showed the most improvement.

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

These students received a ongoing support and scaffolding, in grade level standards, provided by their ESE teachers and general education teacher.

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

Identifying the most critical previous year standards to address just before this year's standard will be vital in leveraging an acceleration instructional model to address students' unfinished learning.

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.

Defining acceleration.
Planning with acceleration in mind.

Content planning.
Utilizing formative assessment to drive next steps in instruction.

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

Collaboration with Content coaches/district resource teachers to assist in our instructional initiatives.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our school wide improvement priorities will continue to focus on standards based planning with an emphasis on differentiation and scaffolding to support diverse learners with grade-level content and acceleration of unfinished learning. Rationale: Standards based planning and acceleration planning assist teachers in providing rigorous instruction for all students and addresses deficits students may have due to unfinished learning.
Measurable Outcome:	Grade 3 proficiency will increase by 5%; Learning gains of the bottom quartile will increase in both reading by 3%. Cohorts that failed to maintain or improve will increase its proficiency by 10%.
Monitoring:	Classroom walkthroughs, student performance, attending grade level planning sessions, data chats.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tracey Foushee-Winfield (tracey.foushee-winfield@sdhc.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiation in classroom instruction utilizing standards based instruction and Marzano taxonomy/learning targets.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Rationale: Maintaining standards-based planning will provide rigorous instruction, as well as targeting instruction for all students. Maintaining our focus on differentiation ensures instruction is focused on meeting the needs of all learners.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will attend weekly common planning sessions by grade level/content area. Planning will be data driven and include the development of small groups based on data. In the teacher-led small groups, teachers will plan for the use of pre-identified literacy scaffolds to accelerate identified unfinished learning.
2. Review students individual data at each grade level (3-5) and determine the growth necessary to yield learning gain and /or proficiency.
3. Develop targeted interventions.
4. General education teachers, by grade levels, will collaborate with our instructional coaches to design and monitor instruction.
5. Teachers will meet with administration to disaggregate data on a regular basis.

Person Responsible	Tracey Foushee-Winfield (tracey.foushee-winfield@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our SWD decreased in their achievement level in ELA from 42% to 30%.
Measurable Outcome:	Our intended outcome is to raise the achievement level of our students with disabilities (SWD) specifically in ELA from 30% to 45%.
Monitoring:	Data chats during progress monitoring assessment windows.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tracey Foushee-Winfield (tracey.foushee-winfield@sdhc.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Intensive and targeted interventions will be a priority. Summative and formative assessments and iReady data will be utilized to drive instructional decisions regarding classroom instruction and targeted interventions. Supplemental lessons will be taught by our ESE, and classroom teacher in small groups. Instructional support will be provided by our reading coach and our district resouce teacher/coach to identify instructional strategies that specifically target our students with disabilities. Both ESE and classroom teachers will track the progress of their SWDs and participate in administrative led data discussions on a monthly basis. Both the ESE and general education teachers will plan collaboratively to create standards based instruction that meets the needs of our students in the SWD subgroup.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By providing resources, data discussion, and collaborative planning opportunities, teachers will be able to identify targeted students with disabilities and closely monitor their progress. Appropriate instruction and interventions necessary for academic gains will be determined as part of our collaborative work between ESE, general education, ELA district teacher/ coach and our school based ELA coach. Teachers will be provided opportunities to participate in professional development and support specifically designed to inform and strengthen instruction. Our multi-facet approach to closely monitor our SWD, and engage in collaborative practices for their teachers will increase the likelihood of learning gains and proficiency for students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify SWDs at each grade level (3-5) and determine the growth necessary to yield learning gain and/or proficiency.
2. Identify ELA standards SWD had the least achievement in on the FSA.
3. Develop targeted interventions.
4. ESE and general education teachers will work collaborate with our instructional coaches to design and monitor instruction.
5. Teachers will meet with administration to disaggregate data on a regular basis.

Person Responsible	Tracey Foushee-Winfield (tracey.foushee-winfield@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The leadership team will regularly utilize the school improvement priorities and instructional priorities/look for to provide prompt and specific feedback to teachers.

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.

The School Advisory Council (SAC) meets every month and is responsible for the planning,review, and making suggestions to assist with instructional improvement . All parents, staff, and community are invited to be members of Anderson's SAC. SAC members including all stakeholders can provide input on the Parent and Family Engagement. Parent Teacher Student Compact as well as all other plans related to school improvement are solicited, welcomed and valued. Parent surveys are also used to solicit parent input. Comments from parents and all other stakeholder are documented on SAC meeting minutes.

Information about our school events, programs, and meetings are provided via our newsletters, Curriculum and assessment information is shared by teachers at Open House, during parent teacher conferences, through newsletters and through our parent link communication platform. Assessment information is sent home in a timely matter many through electronic options. Input from parents can be shared directly with teachers, admin or via, SAC or PTA. Interim/progress reports, conferences, and climate survey are provided to parents. All stakeholders can access information via the school web site and social media channels.

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

School Admin - establish school wide initiatives that establish and celebrate an expectation of positive and supportive interactions within our school community
Teachers- implement and maintain class activities that support a positive class culture and learning environment
Staff - assist class teachers in monitoring student interactions in effort to support positive student interactions

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**