Escambia County School District

A. K. Suter Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

A. K. Suter Elementary School

501 PICKENS AVE, Pensacola, FL 32503

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Alicia Mathis

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2004

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	50%
2021-22 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	2021-22: A (73%) 2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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 Escambia 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

A. K. Suter Elementary School

501 PICKENS AVE, Pensacola, FL 32503

www.escambiaschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	50%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	39%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia 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.

The faculty, staff, families, and community of A.K. Suter Elementary unite to instill in our students a high standard of academic excellence and responsible behavior that will prepare them to compete in a rapidly changing and culturally diverse society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

A.K. Suter Elementary School strives to be a complete educational experience for all students, a place where all children are nurtured, educated, and loved.

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
Queen, Russell	Principal	Will use Star 360, I-Ready, and FAST assessment data to make sound decisions and monitor the learning progress of students and teacher effectiveness in the implementation of the School Improvement Plan as described. Conduct walkthroughs to determine which professional development opportunities are needed to keep teachers and staff current with best practices, and curriculum based instructional strategies. Lead regular faculty and staff data meetings and communicate with all stakeholders about our school based plans and progress.
Mathis, Alicia	Assistant Principal	Will use Star 360, I-Ready, and FAST assessment data to make sound decisions and monitor the learning progress of students and teacher effectiveness in the implementation of the School Improvement Plan as described. Conduct walkthroughs to determine which professional development opportunities are needed to keep teachers and staff current with best practices, and curriculum based instructional strategies. Lead regular faculty and staff data meetings and communicate with all stakeholders about our school based plans and progress.
Martin, Darian	Other	
Proshek, Amy	School Counselor	
Low, Kelly	Psychologist	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2004, Alicia Mathis

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.*
NA

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.*
NA

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
45

Total number of students enrolled at the school
590

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
6

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	115	109	86	94	103	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	590
Attendance below 90 percent	9	24	9	15	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	0	2	5	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	2	5	7	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	0	2	5	8	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	5	6	8	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	5	6	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	4	3	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/27/2022

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	102	70	75	95	84	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	516
Attendance below 90 percent	1	14	14	19	14	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	2	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	2	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	3	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	3	3	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	

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	102	70	75	95	84	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	516
Attendance below 90 percent	1	14	14	19	14	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	2	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	2	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	3	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	3	3	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	72%	51%	56%				75%	53%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	70%						68%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	82%						53%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	75%	46%	50%				75%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	72%						72%	60%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	66%						48%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	76%	52%	59%				69%	54%	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	76%	56%	20%	58%	18%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	72%	52%	20%	58%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2022					
	2019	76%	51%	25%	56%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

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	76%	55%	21%	62%	14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	78%	58%	20%	64%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2022					
	2019	70%	55%	15%	60%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	69%	55%	14%	53%	16%
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	41	46		59	50		67				
BLK	43	67	76	49	70	76	44				
HSP	82			82							
MUL	82	90		82	80						
WHT	80	69	82	84	71	56	82				
FRL	61	65	80	64	72	67	59				
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	64	35		74	63	58	33				
BLK	59	47		61	57		40				
MUL	73			87							
WHT	82	61	54	86	73	82	77				
FRL	70	44	43	72	62	56	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
SWD	55	55	40	48	60						
BLK	64	63	67	58	63	48	47				
HSP	62			77							
MUL	82	83		88	83						
WHT	79	68	44	80	72	48	74				
FRL	69	63	59	67	64	44	53				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	73
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	513
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	53
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	61
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	82
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	84
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	75
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	67
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?

Our students with disabilities showed a decrease in Math achievement from the previous year, from 74% in Math in 2021 to 59% in 2022. Our SWD also showed a decrease in ELA achievement from 64% in 2021 to 41% in 2022. Our SWD also showed significant increases with their learning gains, from 35% to 67% in ELA. Students with Disabilities subgroup demonstrated proficiency at a lower level in all subject areas when compared to their non-disabled peers. We saw a decrease in both ELA and Math in 3rd grade, with ELA declining 26% and Math declining 18%. Fourth grade increased in learning gains in both ELA (20 points) and Math (15 points.) Fifth grade also showed growth with learning gains in both ELA (65 points) and Math (57 points.) 5th grade proficiency rate showed a decline of 7% in ELA and 8% in Math.
When looking at our black student subgroup, they showed a decline in ELA achievement from 59% to 43%, and a 16 point decrease in learning gains. In math, this subgroup showed a decline in proficiency of 61% to 49% and an increase of 13 points in learning gains.

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

Our progress monitoring and 2021 State assessment data shows that our Students with Disabilities and black subgroup demonstrate the greatest need for improvement, particularly in the ELA area. The SWD subgroup met the 41% proficiency goal, and the Black subgroup passed the goal at 43%.

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 data for the Students with Disabilities (41%) and the Black (43%) subgroups showed that in ELA the students showed a much lower overall proficiency rate when compared to their peers (72%). In order to address the discrepancy, our data team will analyze the monthly data for all subgroups and work closely with the RtI Coordinator and MTSS teams to provide appropriate classroom interventions that address the deficits.

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

Our progress monitoring and 2021 state assessments show our greatest improvement was with our lower quartile students in ELA and Math. All of the subgroups demonstrated improvement from 2021 to 2022 with all subgroups showing an average increase of 61 points in ELA and a 60 point increase in Math.

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

Our school has been focused on Math instruction for all subgroups during the past few years. The teachers analyze their data and use the district frameworks to guide instruction and to spiral skills to target interventions for our lower performers.
Our teachers were provided training last year on our new reading series, HMH, Into Reading, planned together as a grade level and used the district provided frameworks to increase rigor and address all standards across grade levels.

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

In order for all subgroups to show growth in ELA this year, progress monitoring data and classroom assessments will need to be reviewed and monitored at least monthly. Teachers will need to use the ELA Decision Tree to provide quality interventions for all students. Teachers will use the district frameworks to guide instruction using the HMH reading series, and provide strong Tier 1 instruction during the whole group reading block. Struggling students will be provided explicit sequential interventions to help close reading gaps. Our school administration, RtI coordinator and MTSS team will work together to provide the necessary support needed for all students to show growth and success in reading. We will also obtain training, such as BEST Standards, Literacy, Differentiated Instruction, and Universal Design for Learning. We will implement the use of Sonday Systems Reading Intervention, Phonics Chip Kit, and other small group research based interventions to target the deficit skills.

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.

Our teachers will be provided with training and support on implementing the HMH reading series as provided by the schoo'sl literacy team. Teachers will be provided training at our school site on using the ELA
Decision Tree for determining and monitoring interventions for struggling students. The RtI coordinator will train grade level teams on completing Tier paperwork using the SSS system in FOCUS, providing interventions, and monitoring data with fidelity to help students close reading gaps. Our ESE teachers and RtI coordinator will implement the Sonday Reading Intervention System with our students with disabilities as well as use it for a Tier 2/3 Intervention with our struggling readers. Our primary teachers will use the 95 Percent Group, Phonics Chip Kit as a tool to fill the gaps in phonics instruction.

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

Additional trainings on using our frameworks and providing systematic explicit instruction across all core content areas will be ongoing throughout this year and beyond. I-Ready trainings will also take place to assist teachers with using diagnostics, and progress monitoring data. Monthly data review sessions will continue to take place with administration and grade level teams. Additional staff will be trained on implementing Sonday Systems and the Phonics Chip Kit as an intervention tool for phonics and reading instruction.

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Achievement in ELA has exceeded 50% proficiency in all subgroups excluding the Students with Disabilities at 41%, and Black subgroup at 43%.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	ELA proficiency will go from 41% for SWD and 43% for our Black subgroup on the 2022 FSA Assessment to 47% or higher on the 2023 FAST PM3 data across all grade levels.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	1. Data from FAST and core language arts instructional materials will be collected, analyzed, and reviewed by teacher and ESSA groups. 2. School administrators will conduct weekly walkthroughs and will review school wide data twice a month. They will monitor the progress of students receiving intervention and share findings with teachers. Administration will seek district coaching support to recommend adjustments to interventions and/or to provide professional development needs to help improve the effectiveness of interventions as needed. 3. The RtI Coordinator and MTSS team will meet to analyze data and determine the effectiveness of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions for individual students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Russell Queen (rqueen@escambia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being	All classroom teachers will utilize our district-wide ELA curriculum, HMH Into Reading, and the Frameworks to focus on standards based planning and instruction. Teachers will implement these evidence-based instructional tips: *Screen all students for potential reading problems at the beginning of the year and again in the middle of the year using the FAST Progress Monitoring Assessment. *Provide intensive, systematic instruction on foundational reading skills in small groups to students who score below the benchmark score. *Teach students to use the writing process for a variety of purposes.

implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

In analyzing our ELA school-wide data for all subgroups, our SWD and black subgroups lack foundational reading skills and struggle to understand writing for a variety of purposes. According to Assisting Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Intervention (RTI) and Multi-Tier Interventions in Primary Grades on What Works Clearinghouse, universal screenings and progress monitoring are critical first steps in identifying students at risk of experiencing reading difficulties and who might need more instruction with foundational skills. Providing small group instruction to our struggling students identified on our progress monitoring screenings is also a strong recommendation. To assist our students in becoming better writers, Teaching Elementary School Students to be Effective Writers on What Works Clearinghouse recommends that students have daily opportunities to practice writing skills, strategies, and techniques. Teachers should help students develop a the ability to write well for a variety of real-life purposes and audiences.

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.

1. All teachers will participate in school based trainings on implementing best practices with HMH Into Reading curriculum and the BEST standards.
2. Seek out Professional Learning Opportunities for teachers on differentiating instruction across all core subjects and implementing the universal design for learning principles.
3. Periodically review ELA Curriculum, frameworks and standards implementation with teachers.
4. Review Quarterly District Assessments (Star 360, I-Ready)
5. Classroom walk-through with a focus in ELA.
6. Review FAST Progress Monitoring Assessment Data.

Person Responsible Alicia Mathis (amathis@ecsdfl.us)

1. All teachers will participate in school based trainings on implementing best practices with HMH Into Reading curriculum and the BEST standards.
2. Seek out Professional Learning Opportunities for teachers on differentiating instruction across all core subjects and implementing the universal design for learning principles.
3. Periodically review ELA Curriculum, frameworks and standards implementation with teachers.
4. Review Quarterly District Assessments (Star 360, I-Ready)
5. Classroom walk-through with a focus in ELA.
6. Review FAST Progress Monitoring Assessment Data.

Person Responsible Russell Queen (rqueen@escambia.k12.fl.us)

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

N/A

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

N/A

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)

N/A

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

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.

N/A

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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. §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?

N/A

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?

N/A

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

N/A

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.

The school hosts regular parental and family engagement activities throughout the year. Our active PTA networks within our community to support our students and families by providing parental workshops and/or family night out events to ensure involvement. Additionally, our PTA, with strong community support, hosts several school-wide fund-raising challenges to support our teachers and classrooms. Our special area teachers, music and art, sponsor countless student led and driven fine art events that are opened to our school community. Also, our media specialist sponsors school-wide engaging literacy based events that ensure all of our stakeholders are involved and engaged in student learning.

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

A. K. Suter teachers, staff and administration, PTA, Partners in Education, and the SAC committee will work collectively to schedule and implement family engagement activities throughout the school year to promote a positive culture and environment for our students. Teachers and staff will assess the needs of our families and students, and collaborate with our PTA and Partners in Education to provide personnel at our family events as well as financial support.