

Monroe County School District

# Gerald Adams Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Gerald Adams Elementary School

5855 COLLEGE RD, Key West, FL 33040

<https://www.keysschools.com/domain/363>

## Demographics

**Principal: Melissa Alsobrooks K**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2002

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	80%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: C (48%) 2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (52%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	ATSI

\* 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 Monroe 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Gerald Adams Elementary School

5855 COLLEGE RD, Key West, FL 33040

<https://www.keysschools.com/domain/363>

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Title I School</b></p> <p>Yes</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>80%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>80%</p>

## School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C	C	B	B

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Monroe 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.**

We are committed to working to collaboratively provide a quality learning environment in which ALL children can learn and develop to their maximum potential.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

Creating the LEADers of tomorrow!  
Learners – foster a love of learning  
Example Setters – character development  
Achievers – focused on raising academic achievement  
Dreamers – goal focused—success is possible

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Herrin, Frannie	Principal	Manage the daily operations of the school Ensure high quality, standards based instruction is taking place in every classrooms Data analysis to make student-centered decisions Hire, Support and Evaluate Staff Communicate School Improvement Plan and District Strategic Plan with Stakeholders Manage School Budget and Seek additional Grant Funding Opportunities Provide Professional Growth Opportunities for employees
Palomino, Rebecca	Assistant Principal	Teacher Evaluation Oversee Discipline and Threat Assessment Protocols Safety Drill including (ALICE, Fire Drills, Bus Evacuation Drills) Supervision of Building Work teachers and families on behavioral interventions Attendance Monitoring
Orcutt, Tammy	School Counselor	Individual and Group Counseling Classroom Lesson in conjunction with PBIS and Safer Smarter Kids Support MTSS interventions for behavior (CICO) Section 504 designee CHIPS Contact Threat Assessment Team Member Child Abuse and DCF Reporting Facilitation of Communities Resources and Support for Children and Families
Miller , Donna	Instructional Coach	
Cattieu, Maureen	Teacher, K-12	

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Monday 7/1/2002, Melissa Alsobrooks K

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

12

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

9



**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

51

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

669

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

8

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.**

9

**Demographic Data**

**Early Warning Systems**

**Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	114	101	94	81	80	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	549
Attendance below 90 percent	32	20	18	10	16	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	18	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	12	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	1	2	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

**Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":**

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	0
Students retained two or more times	6	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Monday 9/19/2022

**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	108	100	95	81	86	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	550
Attendance below 90 percent	37	29	27	27	26	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	25	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	16	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

**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	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

**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	1	0	0	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	

**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	108	100	95	81	86	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	550
Attendance below 90 percent	37	29	27	27	26	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	25	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	16	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

**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	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

**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	1	0	0	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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	49%	54%	56%				65%	70%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	50%						55%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%						47%	46%	53%
Math Achievement	53%	46%	50%				58%	71%	63%
Math Learning Gains	65%						60%	64%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%						42%	56%	51%
Science Achievement	18%	57%	59%				57%	66%	53%

**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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	77%	70%	7%	58%	19%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	61%	58%	3%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
05	2022					
	2019	52%	62%	-10%	56%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	58%	62%	-4%	62%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	56%	60%	-4%	64%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2022					
	2019	57%	66%	-9%	60%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	54%	65%	-11%	53%	1%
Cohort Comparison						

**Subgroup Data Review**

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	30	34	33	31	51	58	7				
ELL	38	48	47	41	56	42	4				
BLK	36	48	39	40	51	44	20				
HSP	53	49	55	54	70	67	15				
MUL	73										
WHT	57	50		63	76		23				
FRL	43	43	40	48	63	58	13				
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	35	17		23	30		22				
ELL	44	38		25	50		25				
BLK	39	36		29	45		42				
HSP	57	31		36	48	50	34				
WHT	76	62		50	38		77				
FRL	48	39	27	36	53	45	38				
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	52	50	62	42	49	25	52				
ELL	47	41	27	37	58	48	33				
BLK	60	54	44	43	54	33	20				
HSP	62	48	43	61	54	44	68				
WHT	80	70		70	81		80				
FRL	60	53	47	53	54	38	47				

**ESSA Data Review**

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	407
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	

<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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%	0
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	73
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
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%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	54
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### 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?

In ELA Achievement there is a 3 year decline in proficiency from 65% (2019) to 56% (2021) to 49% (2022).  
 In ELA Learning Gains, we declined from 55% (2019) to 39% (2021); however, we rebounded to 50% in 2022.  
 In ELA low quartile, a similar pattern exists, 46% (2019) to 31% (2021) to 42% (2022).  
 In Math Achievement we saw a rebound from 58% (2019) to 38% (2021) to 53% (2022).  
 In Math Learning Gains, we have our highest percentage in 2022, with scores raising from 60% (2019) to 38% (2021) to 65% (2022).  
 Our low quartile math also improved from 42% (2019) to 46% (2021) to 59% (2022).  
 The greatest area of need however, came in our science scores that showed a significant drop from 57% (2019) to 47% (2021) to 18% (2022).  
 The FAST ELA Testing for grades 3-5 shows that reading informational text is a strength in all three grade levels with Vocabulary and Reading Across Genres as the weakest strands  
 The FAST Math Testing showed the following trends: Grade 5 the highest performing strand is Operations with Whole Numbers; the lowest Geometric Reasoning; In grade 4, highest performing strand is Geometric Reasoning (still low performing); the lowest is Number Sense Operations with Decimals and Fractions. In grade 3, Highest strand is Number Sense with Additive Reasoning; the lowest is Fractional Reasoning.

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Our overall ELA proficiency declined as well as our 5th grade science scores. Overall in ELA, Math and Science, there is a need to improve rigor as our number of students scoring level 4 and 5 is below the district and state average in ELA, Science and Level 5 in Math. Our students with disabilities did not make the ESSR Threshold and we need to address proficiency and achievement gap issues with this subgroup.

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

The greatest impact on achievement were attendance issues with teachers and students due to COVID related absences. Also with our diverse population, online learning and pandemic shut-downs, were impactful as many of our students did not have access or support in the online (at-home learning environment). These gaps took two years plus to overcome and to have the improvements reflected in data. Lastly, our science proficiency rate was impacted by a vacancy created due to cost of living and lack of housing. We lost 9 teachers to the rising costs of housing in Key West.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

In ELA Learning Gains, we declined from 55% (2019) to 39% (2021); however, we rebounded to 50% in 2022.

In ELA low quartile, a similar pattern exists, 46% (2019) to 31% (2021) to 42% (2022).

In Math Achievement we saw a rebound from 58% (2019) to 38% (2021) to 53% (2022).

In Math Learning Gains, we had our highest percentage in 2022, with scores rising from 60% (2019) to 38% (2021) to 65% (2022).

Our low quartile math also improved from 42% (2019) to 46% (2021) to 59% (2022)

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

Changes in our master schedule and our reading block were pivotal. We also had district support from the District Math Coordinator who provided PD and resources to fill our outdated learning resources. We also compartmentalized in some grade levels to allow teachers time to differentiate lesson and provide meaningful center-based instruction.

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

We have placed a major emphasis on Universal Design for Learning. We believe this approach connects to our diverse group of learners. The goal is to connect students with the "What", the "How" and the "Why". Using multiple means of representation of content, multiple means of action or expression that provides varying pathways to demonstrate mastery and engage in learning. We also will implement multiple means of engagement by providing choices of content and tools to motivate learner toward authentic engagement.

As part of this model, we have also trained teachers to implement Orton Gillingham Multisensory methods and we are providing a robust after school and summer program to extend learning opportunities for students in need.

We will also implement the B.E.S.T. Standards with fidelity as well as our new instructional materials.

We are also placing an emphasis on staff and student attendance.

**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.**

We will continue to train teacher in the Orton Gillingham Method, AVID Strategies and in the new BEST Standards as well as the newly adopted instructional materials. We will continue to focus on strategies to support ELL and SWD students to include robust vocabulary development and scaffolding instruction.



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

We are offering Century 21 after school and summer school opportunities to expand the school day and year. We place an emphasis of pre-teaching for upcoming week to allow students to sharpen pre-requisite skills. The intent of this is to allow students to fully engage in instruction and classroom discussions.

**Areas of Focus**

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

**#1. -- Select below -- specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

**Area of Focus**

**Description and**

**Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Our NGSS data reflects that only 18% of our students were proficient in science. This is evident that science as a discipline is not being taught K-5 with intention or fidelity.

**Measurable Outcome:**

**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

During the 2023 school year, 55% of our tested student will score level 3 or higher on the state science test.

**Monitoring:**

**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

We will progress monitor student growth (Fall, Winter and Spring). We will work with the science teacher to raise the level of rigor and engagement of all students. Additionally, science is embedded in the new standards for all grade levels and we will monitor lesson plans, walk-throughs and observation data to fidelity and rigor.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Frannie Herrin (frannie.herrin@keysschools.com)

**Evidence-based**

**Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

We will focus on vocabulary building and implementing multiple means of representation with visuals, graphics and real-world examples to build scientific content. The intent is to scaffold instruction and provide access to all students to the content by removing instructional barriers. This may include a vocabulary wall for some students, or academic partners for others to provide a cooperative learning environment.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

This is important with our ELL and SWD students to build a connection and allow engagement in instruction. We want to allow students to engage in the learning process regardless reading level, prior knowledge or vocabulary acquisition.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Fall Progress Monitoring will be conducted and Data reviewed.

**Person Responsible** Rebecca Palomino (rebecca.palomino@keysschools.com)

Instructional Focus Calendar and Sequence Mapping will occur

**Person Responsible** Frannie Herrin (frannie.herrin@keysschools.com)

District Science Coordinator will work with the teacher on resources and instructional methodologies

**Person Responsible** Frannie Herrin (frannie.herrin@keysschools.com)

Fall Progress Monitoring will be conducted and Data reviewed.

**Person Responsible** Rebecca Palomino (rebecca.palomino@keysschools.com)

Instructional Focus Calendar and Sequence Mapping will occur

**Person Responsible** Frannie Herrin (frannie.herrin@keysschools.com)

District Science Coordinator will work with the teacher on resources and instructional methodologies

**Person Responsible** Frannie Herrin (frannie.herrin@keysschools.com)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus**

**Description and**

**Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

The FAST Testing indicates that math proficiency is below district and state averages. In grade 3, State scale score is 272, district is 273 and school is 268; In grade 4 state scale score is 285, district 284, school is 276; in grade 5 state scale score is 296, district 295 and school is 287.

**Measurable Outcome:**

**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

In the 2023 school year, 65% of students in grade 3-5 will score a Level 3 or higher on State Testing.

**Monitoring:**

**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

Progress Monitoring will be conducted three times a year. Data will be analyzed for growth. We will also give and analyze unit tests to ensure mastery of grade level standards. Classroom observations will be conducted by administration and district math coordinator.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Rebecca Palomino (rebecca.palomino@keysschools.com)

**Evidence-based**

**Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

We will implement the following evidence based strategies: Visual representations using concrete and virtual manipulatives to include counters, based ten blocks, number lines, charts, graphs, fraction blocks, geometry, measurement and algebra. Metacognitive Strategies such as UPS-Check will be implemented that allows students to systematically solve problems by U (understand) - reading the problem, decipher the problem and identify key information; P (Plan) - choose the best strategy to solve the problem; S (Solve) Solve the problem and lastly CHECK - does my answer make sense? Is it correct? Lastly, we implement Schema Instruction. Schema-based instruction is a cognitive strategy that teaches students how to identify word problems based on a given problem's underlying structure. This includes extensive vocabulary development and deciphering of what task the problem is asking for.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Our diverse population of EL and SWD students have a difficult time with word problems. Teaching them to break the problem down through visual representation will guide them to solving the problem and then being able to gauge if their work was reasonable.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Pre-Test skills required in a unit. Design instruction that Pre-teaches essential skills, provide vocabulary development and visual representation of the problems.

**Person Responsible** Frannie Herrin (frannie.herrin@keysschools.com)

Offer after school tutoring to ensure pre-requisite skills are reinforced prior to instruction, and then a reteaching if needed.

**Person Responsible** Lynn Gallagher (lynn.gallagher@keysschools.com)

## RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

### Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Based on our Fall STAR Reading Screening (2022-2023), our first grade scores indicate that 67% of our EL students are not on grade level. Our second grade scores indicate that 92% of EL students are performing below grade level. We are in most need of improvement with our EL students who scored below grade level. We intend to use multi-sensory instructional strategies by using the Orton-Gillingham approach that focus on multisensory phonics.

### Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Our grades 3-5 FSA Scores from 2022 indicate that our SWD subgroup is showing a 28% proficiency rate as compared to our non-SWD group which is at a 53% proficiency rate. Our area of focus is our SWD students in grades 3-5. Based on this result, we can glean that comprehension strategies need to be a focal point in our instructional process. We are going to focus on reciprocal teaching strategies to improve comprehension. Reciprocal teaching a research-based strategy that relies on collaborative groupings to enhance achievement and student engagement as students utilize comprehension strategies to predict, question, connect, clarify and summarize what they are reading in a collaborative setting. Reciprocal teaching is a well-established, research-based instructional practice that has a .74 effect size in Hattie's analysis of classroom effect sizes.

**Measurable Outcomes:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

**Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)**

Our EL students in grades 1 and 2 will show a 20% increase in proficiency by the EOY STAR testing.

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

Our SWD students will show a 20% increase in proficiency based on EOY State ELA Testing.

**Monitoring:**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

The effectiveness of the Orton-Gillingham multi-sensory phonics approach for our K-2 students will be measured through data collected throughout the school year including progress monitoring data. We expect to see incremental gains towards the 20% improvement goal. We would expect to see a 10% gain by mid-year. If progress is not occurring at the rate necessary to achieve the goal, instruction will be adjusted to accelerate progress. We will also use teacher observations to determine the frequency of targeted strategy usage targeted and walkthrough data.

The effectiveness of the Reciprocal Teaching Strategy will be monitored through lesson plan reviews. Lesson plans should include weekly examples of Reciprocal Teaching being embedded into instruction. Classroom walkthroughs should reflect frequent observations of Reciprocal Teaching being used. Student AVID folders will show examples of student work and reflections on learning activities that are reflective of Reciprocal Teaching.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Herrin, Frannie, [frannie.herrin@keysschools.com](mailto:frannie.herrin@keysschools.com)

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Students in grades 1 and 2 will be instructed using Orton-Gillingham multi-sensory strategies to develop phonemic awareness. Students will develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters. Teachers will teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. The process will ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension. These are an ESSA strategies that have strong evidence, as referred to in the IES Guide, Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten through 3rd grade. These strategies align with the B.E.S.T. Standards and the K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan.

Students in grades 3-5 will participate in reciprocal teaching. Hattie has identified reciprocal teaching as a high yield strategy with .74 effect size. This strategy is aligned with the K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan, and the B.E.S.T Standards.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

There is a need for strong background development in word level reading for students in grades 1-2. This is evidenced in their lack of word attack skills. The Orton-Gillingham process directly addresses this problem area. We have seen great progress for students who consistently score below grade level in reading and have been instructed in the Orton Gillingham approach.

Reciprocal teaching works with all students to increase reading comprehension. It has a proven effectiveness based on John Hattie's meta-analysis of effective classroom practices of .74.

**Action Steps to Implement:**

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Literacy Leadership Team meets with grade levels to review data in order to determine progress toward the goals set above. Instruction is adjusted to increase acceleration toward the goal attainment.</li> <li>2. The Literacy Coach provides professional development in the most impactful strategies the Literacy Leadership team determines are less frequently seen during walkthroughs.</li> <li>3. Fidelity Checks in each grade level with artifact and exemplar collection. The artifacts and exemplars are a reflection of the steps toward goal attainment. Assessment data can be included in the collection.</li> <li>4. District will be notified to provide professional development related to core program implementation and impactful strategy training. The Literacy Leadership Team reports to the district.</li> </ol>	<p>Herrin, Frannie, frannie.herrin@keysschools.com</p>

Step 2	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teachers will conference with students to set rigorous reading goals with students.</li> <li>2. Teachers will provide comprehension Checks for students in grades 3-5. This is an integral part of their daily reading block using the Benchmark Advance program.</li> <li>3. Teachers will help students build length of passage and students' time on task. Reading stamina is necessary for student acceleration. The goal setting process is vital to improve fluency and stamina in student reading.</li> </ol>	<p>Herrin, Frannie, frannie.herrin@keysschools.com</p>

### 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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

#### Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

We are PBIS School and we have implemented the I-Believe Core Values throughout the building. We teach the rules and practice them with our students. We also involve our SAC, Title I Parent Events and grade level activities to make parents knowledgeable of the expectations. We celebrate our success with Pep Rallies, Kickball tournaments and honor roll celebrations.

For the staff, we have our Dolphin Cove Relaxation Room and we offer numerous events such as luncheons, snack cart and social events to let teachers know they are valued and appreciated.

We communicate staff and student success as well as numerous school events on social media, our website and through Class Dojo. Our district has created a parent portal and an app to increase parental engagement.



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

School Administration - set expectations, communication and discipline

Counselor - teach Safer, Smarter Kids, oversee PBIS Program, faculty wellness

Teachers - implement PBIS, and I-Believe Programs, communicate the "good" and provide a nurturing environment for students

Parents - Get involved with school events and reinforce expectations and rewards to students