Pinellas County Schools

# Shore Acres Elementary School


## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

# Table of Contents

# Shore Acres Elementary School

1800 62ND AVE NE, St Petersburg, FL 33702

http://www.shoreacres-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us

## Demographics

## Principal: Kristen Sulte G

Start Date for this Principal: 7/24/2021

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2018-19 Title I School** | No |
| **2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 52% |
| **2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: A (62%)<br>2017-18: C (49%)<br>2016-17: B (59%)<br>2015-16: B (55%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Southwest |
| **Regional Executive Director** | Lucinda Thompson |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | |
| **ESSA Status** | |

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pinellas County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the “Date Modified” listed in the footer.

# Part I: School Information

## School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

To provide a rigorous educational program to prepare students to be life-long learners and productive citizens.

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

Succeed Achieve Educate
100% Student Success

## School Leadership Team

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

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Sulte, Kristen | Principal | | Leader of the school - oversees all aspects of the school |
| Waechter, Kristin | Assistant Principal | | Leader of the school and oversees all aspects |
| Every , Melanie | Guidance Counselor | | SIP analysis and development |
| Holman, Stacy | Teacher, K-12 | | SIP analysis and development |
| DeCresie, Robyn | Teacher, K-12 | | SIP analysis and development |
| Kiefel, Mariel | Teacher, K-12 | | sip analysis and development |
| Winner, Christine | Teacher, K-12 | | SIP analysis and development |
| Johnson, Laura | Other | Art Teacher | SIP analysis and development |
| Byler, Pati | Teacher, ESE | | SIP analysis and development |
| Rasmussen, Courtney | Teacher, K-12 | | sip analysis and development |
| Luckey, Shannon | Teacher, K-12 | | sip analysis and development |
| Fields, Diane | Teacher, K-12 | | SIP development and analysis |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Saturday 7/24/2021, Kristen Sulte G

**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.*

3

**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.*

10

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

35

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**
625

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.**
2

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.**
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 | 110 | 93 | 87 | 101 | 81 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 555 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 9 | 13 | 9 | 13 | 10 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 15 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 2 | 11 | 14 | 11 | 14 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 |

**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 | 9 | 20 | 12 | 18 | 39 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 128 |

**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 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| 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**
Thursday 6/24/2021

## 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 | 107 | 89 | 117 | 95 | 88 | 94 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 590 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 22 | 20 | 25 | 18 | 17 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 116 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 7 | 11 | 25 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 1 | 6 | 20 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |

**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 | 48 | 61 | 60 | 72 | 60 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 358 |

**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 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 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 | 107 | 89 | 117 | 95 | 88 | 94 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 590 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 22 | 20 | 25 | 18 | 17 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 116 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 7 | 11 | 25 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 1 | 6 | 20 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |

**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 | 48 | 61 | 60 | 72 | 60 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 358 |

**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 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 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).

**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 | 63% | 56% | 7% | 58% | 5% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 60% | 56% | 4% | 58% | 2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -63% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 53% | 54% | -1% | 56% | -3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -60% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 62% | 62% | 0% | 62% | 0% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 70% | 64% | 6% | 64% | 6% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -62% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| | 2019 | 64% | 60% | 4% | 60% | 4% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -70% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 51% | 54% | -3% | 53% | -2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

## Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

NWEA MAP assessments are used to monitor Tier 1 progress.

**Provide the 2020-21 school based progress-monitoring data by grade level below:**

| Grade PK | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 79 | 72 | 71 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 74 | 64 | 64 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 22 | 33 | 33 |
| | English Language Learners | "0" | "0" | "0" |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 83 | 73 | 81 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 75 | 65 | 72 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 42 | 42 | 58 |
| | English Language Learners | "0" | "0" | "0" |

| Grade KG | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 64 | 75 | 72 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 49 | 48 | 52 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 34 | 34 |
| | English Language Learners | 75 | 60 | 50 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 76 | 68 | 67 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 65 | 54 | 48 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 33 | 26 | 38 |
| | English Language Learners | 75 | 75 | 17 |

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 74 | 76 | 53 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 56 | 56 | 42 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 30 | 22 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 20 | 20 | 25 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 69 | 71 | 73 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 47 | 52 | 43 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 50 | 44 | 45 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 25 | 50 |

| Grade 2 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 72 | 70 | 62 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 51 | 50 | 52 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 16 | 16 | 23 |
| | English Language Learners | 56 | 50 | 44 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 68 | 73 | 72 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 63 | 63 | 69 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 23 | 23 | 30 |
| | English Language Learners | 37 | 56 | 56 |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 64 | 64 | 66 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 51 | 45 | 50 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 22 | 0 | 33 |
| | English Language Learners | 34 | 17 | 17 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 65 | 64 | 61 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 55 | 60 | 48 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 33 | 22 | 22 |
| | English Language Learners | 34 | 17 | 0 |

## 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 |

| 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 | 50 | 64 | 50 | 55 | 75 | 60 | 47 | | | | |
| ELL | 20 | 64 | | 27 | 50 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 46 | 46 | | 41 | 59 | 44 | 36 | | | | |
| HSP | 39 | 59 | | 54 | 56 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 83 | | | 67 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 66 | 58 | 56 | 74 | 82 | 65 | 58 | | | | |
| FRL | 49 | 55 | 60 | 54 | 64 | 50 | 40 | | | | |

| 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 | 36 | 24 | 6 | 34 | 40 | 41 | 39 | | | | |
| ELL | 11 | 38 | | 33 | 67 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 70 | | | 70 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 36 | 34 | 13 | 39 | 39 | 14 | 25 | | | | |
| HSP | 44 | 37 | | 42 | 54 | 45 | 73 | | | | |
| MUL | 63 | 50 | | 75 | 67 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 59 | 45 | 31 | 70 | 70 | 50 | 61 | | | | |
| FRL | 42 | 36 | 27 | 50 | 54 | 35 | 49 | | | | |

## ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 61 |
| 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 | 56 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 488 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 57 |
| 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 | 43 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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 | 45 |
| 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 | 54 |
| 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 | 75 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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 |

| 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 | 66 |
| 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 | 53 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

## 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?**

There are gaps within all subgroups when comparing them to our white students when looking at proficiency on state assessments. Our subgroups do make learning gains commiserate with their peers. When examining progress monitoring data students perform better in the fall then spring. When we looked closer at this data we did determine that student were making good gains from fall to winter.

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

There is a need to improve our SWD and ELL students with access to the Core curriculum.

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

Students reading 2 grade levels are below and not enough time on task and scaffolding with core curriculum are contributing factors that need to be improved. Utilizing a push in for SWD and ELL during core instruction and adjusting resource teachers schedules so the can attend PLC and collaborative planning are actions that may impact student achievement.

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

The learning gains of our lowest 25% in both ELA and Math show the most improvement.

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

A focused effort on data analysis and action planning were contributing factors. Identification of L25 students and placement into Reading Intervention groups during and after school are actions to take for the 21-22 school year.

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

A focused effort on data analysis with our MAP data and aligning skill groups to core instruction for each ELA module and Math Unit. A more fluid grouping of students will help to accelerate all student's learning. We are also piloting Gifted Differentiation

project in 4th grade which has a focus on grouping students to positively impact teacher's ability to groups students for remediation and enrichment

**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.**

Identified 4th grade teachers will receiving a full year of PD on differentiation to implement in the classroom. All teachers will work with ELA Champion and Ready Math consultant. Teacher's Professional Development Plans will be directly related to the action steps outlined in ELA and /or Math goals.

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

Extended Learning during and after school
ESE services during the school day
ELL- hired a credentialed teacher assigned to our identified students
Gifted Differentiation Project

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Our current level of performance for the 18-19 school year shows 63% if all students at proficiency on the ELA FSA. On the 20-21 ELA FSA -55% of third grade students were at proficiency. Learning gains have increased from the previous year. All grade levels analyzed district grade level assessment data and determined an area of focus and action step for the upcoming school. |
| **Measureable Outcome:** | The percent of students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 62% to 70 % as measured by FSA.<br>The percent of students making a learning gain will increase form 56% to 65% as measured by FSA.<br>The percent of students in the lowest 25% making a learning gain on ELA will increase form 57% to 65% as measured by FSA.<br>Grade level Goals: The percent of all students achieving ELA proficiency (50% or above) on Winter or Spring MAP will be :<br>1- 85%<br>2- 75%<br>3- 80%<br>4- 80%<br>5- 70%<br><br>K- Teachers will get baseline data on running record and the goal will be to increase a minimum of 4 levels in 100% of students by May. |
| **Monitoring:** | Grade levels will analyze MAP data 3 times a year to monitor progress. Kindergarten teachers will monitor RR every other month during PLC. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Kristen Sulte (sultek@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Using problem solving process each grade level identified an evidenced based strategy aligned to their data and agreed upon barrier. The specific strategies are listed as action steps below. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Grade levels determined strategy based on MAP data. Data from Fall and Winter MAP from the last two years was used. |

**Action Steps to Implement**

K- Use the SAE created document to assess students regularly on K standards and have more frequent PLC to look at data and plan for remediation and enrichment. Enrichment and remediation will occur in daily small groups.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Robyn DeCresie (decresier@pcsb.org) |

1- Using the Learning Continuum report on MAP with team to disaggregate data as it related to standards(skills) pinpointing deficit areas and using collaborative planning time to develop lessons to be used during core instruction or in small groups.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Mariel Kiefel (kiefelm@pcsb.org) |

2- Using the Learning Continuum report on MAP with team to disaggregate data as it related to standards(skills) pinpointing deficit areas and using collaborative planning time to develop lessons to be used during core instruction or in small groups. Ensure that classroom process have been taught and practiced to eliminate class distractions and implementation of accommodations for ESE with fidelity.

**Person Responsible** Diane Fields (fieldsd@pcsb.org)

3-Using the Learning Continuum report on MAP with team to disaggregate data as it related to standards(skills) pinpointing deficit areas and using collaborative planning time to develop lessons to be used during core instruction or in small groups with a focus on phonics, fluency and to support core instruction.

**Person Responsible** Christine Winner (winnerc@pcsb.org)

4- Utilizing a consistent vocabulary routine and the ELL Vocabulary project in support of all learners during core instruction and independence.

**Person Responsible** Courtney Rasmussen (rasmussenc@pcsb.org)

5- Provide time for Collaborative Planning where the focus will be to pull out standards within modules to calendar, plan for instruction with a focus on student accountability through exit tickets and application of skills during independent reading with teacher feedback.

**Person Responsible** Stacy Holman (holmans@pcsb.org)

Library Media- Provide times for book checkout opportunities to increase student literacy and maintenance and utilization of Makerspace area with engaging, standards based challenges and activities for our first and second grade classrooms.

**Person Responsible** Stacey Barnard (barnards@pcsb.org)

ESE- When planning schedule, block time to plan with 5th grade teachers to understand standards and support the core instruction through push in support model.

**Person Responsible** Julia Quinn (quinnju@pcsb.org)

ELL- Create a schedule for Reading Intervention Teacher that directly supports standards-based instruction for ELs.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Lyver (lyvern@pcsb.org)

| #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Our current level of performance is 68% of all students at proficiency on Math as measured by FSA using 18-19 data. On the 20-21 FSA-<br>When analyzing MAP data by grade level students score higher in Fall than Spring, but the number of student making gains is high. We still have our low performing students not making gains. Our SWD and ELL students are not performing as well as their white peers. All grade levels analyzed district grade level assessment data and determined an area of focus and action step for the upcoming school. |
| **Measureable Outcome:** | The percentage of all students achieving Math proficiency will increase form 68% to 74% as measured by FSA.<br>The percentage of students making a learning gain in Math will increase from 75% to 80% as measured by FSA.<br>The percentage of students in the lowest 25% making a learning gain in Math will increase from 57% to 62% as measured by FSA.<br>Grade level Goals- The percentage of student achieving Math Proficiency on Winter or Spring MAP will be:<br>K- 90%<br>1- 90%<br>2- 80%<br>3- 75%<br>4- 70%<br>5- 70% |
| **Monitoring:** | Grade levels will analyze MAP data 3 times a year to monitor progress. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Kristin Waechter (waechterk@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Using problem solving process each grade level identified an evidenced based strategy aligned to their data and agreed upon barrier. The specific strategies are listed as action steps below. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Grade levels determined strategy based on MAP data. Data from Fall and Winter MAP from the last two years was used. |

| Action Steps to Implement | |
|---|---|
| Use the SAE created document to assess students regularly on K standards and have more frequent PLC to analyze and plan for remediation and enrichment through small groups. | |
| **Person Responsible** | Robyn DeCresie (decresier@pcsb.org) |
| 1- Using the Learning Continuum report on MAP with team to disaggregate data as it related to standards(skills) pinpointing deficit areas and using collaborative planning time to develop lessons to be used during core instruction or in small groups. | |
| **Person Responsible** | Mariel Kiefel (kiefelm@pcsb.org) |

2- Teachers will collaborate to unpack the Unit Math Standards and analyze MAP data three times a year to focus remediation on foundational skills. Teachers will work to standardize their way of work with word problems.

**Person Responsible** Diane Fields (fieldsd@pcsb.org)

3- Teachers will collaboratively plan with a focus on Math warmup to include front loading skills, math vocabulary and remediation.

**Person Responsible** Christine Winner (winnerc@pcsb.org)

4- Teachers will collaboratively plan with emphasis on spiral review based on standards and data.

**Person Responsible** Courtney Rasmussen (rasmussenc@pcsb.org)

5- Focused collaborative planning on the compilation of a spiral review that includes front loading and review of standards based using MAP data as a guide.

**Person Responsible** Stacy Holman (holmans@pcsb.org)

ESE- Plan with 5th grade teachers to understand which standards will be the focus of review and front loading to support students. Continue to scaffold students on 2 step word problem.

**Person Responsible** Julia Quinn (quinnju@pcsb.org)

| #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Currently 54% of 5th grades are at proficiency in Science based on the 18-19 SSA. On the 20-21 SSA -<br>The problem/gap is occurring because a strong monitored data driven review plan of all 3rd and 4th grade standards is not utilized. |
| **Measureable Outcome:** | The percentage of all student achieving Science proficiency will increase from 54% to 62% as measured by the 21-22 SSA. |
| **Monitoring:** | The school will monitor progress using District beginning and middle diagnostic assessments as well as Science Cycle 1 and 2 assessments and Mock SSA assessment. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Kristen Sulte (sultek@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Utilizing diagnostic data to identify instructional resources to support the on-going review and expansion of learning with an emphasis on information text and academic vocabulary. Utilize systemic documents to effectively plan for science units that incorporate the 3-I instructional routine. (Ignite- Investigate- Inform Instruction) |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Teachers use data to plan for instruction in the lower grades and a review for those in 5th grade us needed to increase student achievement. A better understanding and implementation of the 3- I Instructional routine is needed to attain our goal. |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Analysis and utilization of 5th grade diagnostic science data to plan for instruction and development of review plan for 5th grade during PLC and Collaborative Planning. Plan shared with administration after each PLC.
2. Monitor for consistent and effective instruction that promotes student centered rigor utilizing the 3-I instructional routine.
3. Instructional walkthroughs with feedback to monitor implementation of the 3-I routine.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Kristen Sulte (sultek@pcsb.org) |

| #4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Our current school data illustrates that while our black student meet the ESSA requirement at 46% in ELA, there is a gap of 20% behind our white students. In Math they are at 41% with a gap of 33%. |
| **Measureable Outcome:** | Our Black student proficiency will increase from 46% to 56 % in ELA and from 41% to 51% as measured by Spring 2022 FSA. |
| **Monitoring:** | Grade levels will analyze MAP data 3 times a year to monitor progress. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Kristen Sulte (sultek@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | The school will use AVID Culturally Relevant Teaching Strategies to address: Building Relational Capacity, Empowering Student Voice, Holding High Student Expectations and Equitable Outcomes and Respecting Experiences. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | If curriculum was more engaging and culturally relevant, the problem would be reduced and Black student performance would increase by 10%. The specific focus will impact all students positively by providing more engaging instruction as well as building cultural competency. |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Develop a cross functional team to include members from all grade levels that have attended the AVID CRT Professional Development to develop schoolwide PD calendar with a goal of 4 trainings during the school year utilizing the AVID Culturally Relevant book and PD.
2. Identify a minimum of 5 staff members to attend AVID CRT during the school year.
3. Continue to update all staff on upcoming Equity Professional Development Opportunities through the district.
4. Leadership team walkthroughs will focus on the implementation of strategies learned.
5. Share schoolwide trend data to determine next steps and future PD.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Kristen Sulte (sultek@pcsb.org) |

| #5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Based upon feedback from all stakeholders (staff, students and families), we determined that our PBIS focus needed to be more student driven and represent the needs and wants of all of our students. We did not have the buy in or participation in our previous PBIS plan that we had desired to have. |
| **Measureable Outcome:** | Shore Acres Elementary stakeholders will have 100% awareness and participation in the 2021-2022 schoolwide PBIS plan throughout the school year as measured by data collected monthly by the PBIS team. |
| **Monitoring:** | The PBIS team members will meet monthly to discuss the "state of the PBIS plan"<br>Prior to these monthly meetings we will randomly survey staff, students and families to get their feedback on how the plan is going. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Kristin Waechter (waechterk@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Our strategy is to increase engagement and voice of all stakeholders. By doing so we believe that this will not only increase the awareness and support of the PBIS plan amongst our stakeholders, but it will reinforce the importance and value of PBIS within our school. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | In the past we feel that our plan has not allowed for the voice of all stakeholders to be heard. Our plans in the past were merely created by a PBIS team and really did not involve the voices of our diverse staff, students or families. |

| Action Steps to Implement | |
|---|---|
| 1. Survey students, staff and families regarding PBIS practices and improvements | |
| **Person Responsible** | Kristin Waechter (waechterk@pcsb.org) |
| 2. PBIS team will come together with representatives from all the stakeholder groups to redevelop the PBIS plan. PBIS team will meet monthly as needed to develop any professional development needed for staff. | |
| **Person Responsible** | Kristin Waechter (waechterk@pcsb.org) |
| 3. PBIS team will develop a way in which to share the final plan with all stakeholders. They will also establish a communication system for stakeholders to provide feedback throughout the year. | |
| **Person Responsible** | Kristin Waechter (waechterk@pcsb.org) |
| 4. A minimum of 3 faculty meetings will have a focus on the PBIS plan and it's implementation. | |
| **Person Responsible** | Kristin Waechter (waechterk@pcsb.org) |

| #6. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Using data from 20-21 school year 18% or 102 students missed 10% or more of school. This is an increase of 3% from previous years. There is a tiered plan in place to address all students that miss 10% or more. |
| **Measureable Outcome:** | The percentage of students missing 10% or more of school will be 10% as measured by attendance data. |
| **Monitoring:** | Monthly Child Study Team meetings are held and student attendance is monitored. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Melanie Every (everyme@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Strengthen the attendance problem solving process to address and support the needs of students across all tiers on an on-going basis. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Through the problem solving process it was determined that teacher and student relationships play an integral part in attendance. Addressing relationships as it relates to attendance for all and specifically tier 2 students will positively impact student attendance and achievement. |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Child Study Team surveyed and uses feedback to develop Schoolwide Attendance Plan. Plan addresses all tiers and includes student and adult relationships.
2. Preschool training on attendance plan
3. Review and problem solve Tier One plan three times a year an implement changes.
4. Review attendance data twice a month for effectiveness of strategies and implementation of tier 2 and 3 plans.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Melanie Every (everyme@pcsb.org) |

| #7. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Community Involvement | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Shore Acres has a visible and strong Parent Teacher Association who works in collaboration with staff to build positive family and community relationships though engagement efforts. Efforts include both family and curriculum events. There is no formal way to collect data and survey parents to determine effectiveness of strategies. If parents were surveyed and data used a more comprehensive and focused engagement plan would be developed and implemented. |
| **Measureable Outcome:** | Shore Acres Family Engagement Team will develop survey/needs assessment to gather input from stakeholders and use data to plan family involvement activities to get a baseline on the percentage of families participating in involvement activities. |
| **Monitoring:** | Family Engagement Team will meet monthly as needed to review data from engagement activities. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Kristen Sulte (sultek@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Family Engagement Plan developed with input from families will increase participation and engagement. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | A comprehensive family engagement plan based on the data that includes input from all stakeholders will positively impact engagement of families. We have learned from the 19-20 school year that engagement looks differently for all families and that engagement can happen from home. |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Develop cross functional team of staff for Engagement Team
2. Review 19-20 family survey
3. Develop Engagement Plan in conjunction with PTA
4. Develop survey after each event to gather participation data and effectiveness

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Kristen Sulte (sultek@pcsb.org) |

## Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**When reviewing the discipline data across the state and district using Safe Schools for Alex, Shore Acres is ranked 'very low" in all school incidents including suspensions.**
**As a school Shore Acres collects data on: behavior calls, minor behavior incidents, behavior referrals and restorative circles. This data is problem solved during School Based Leadership Team and shared with all staff a minimum of 3 times a year. Action plans may be developed for the entire school, teacher or individual student based on the data. When looking at SAE's data over a 5 year period behavior incidents including OSS have declined.**

## 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.**

Shore Acres prides itself on the family atmosphere it was cultivated over the years. The front office staff has been trained on customer relations. There is a very visible PTA who works to engage families in monthly activities at various times. The Engagement Team surveys stakeholders in development of the engagement plan. Teachers communicate with families daily through the agenda book, Class Dojo or emails. The monthly newsletter is done in conjunction with PTA and shares positive things happening around school. The Shore Acres School Advisory Council provides input and guidance in the writing of the SIP. The school Equity Team meets monthly to develop professional learning opportunities for all staff with a focus on building classroom culture and culturally relevant teaching strategies. Staff and families are surveyed at the end of the year to gather input on opportunities where the school can improve.

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

Kris Sulte- Principal- Oversees equity and family engagement committees and works with PTA in development of family engagement activities.
Kristin Waechter- Assistant Principal- Oversees Behavior committee with a focus on Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports and the utilization of Restorative Practices including circles and affective language in the classroom.
Melanie Every- Guidance- oversees Child Study Team to work with families and attendance
SAE PTA- Plan activities and recruits new families to the PTA. They all maintain PAT Facebook page communicating with all families.

## Part V: Budget

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1** | **III.A.** | **Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA** | | | | **$0.00** |
| **2** | **III.A.** | **Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math** | | | | **$1,000.00** |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | 1382 | 519-Technology-Related Supplies | 4021 - Shore Acres Elementary School | School Improvement Funds | | $1,000.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Purchase computer software Reflex for number fluency* | | | |
| **3** | **III.A.** | **Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science** | | | | **$0.00** |
| **4** | **III.A.** | **Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity** | | | | **$0.00** |
| **5** | **III.A.** | **Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports** | | | | **$1,000.00** |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | | | 4021 - Shore Acres Elementary School | School Improvement Funds | | $1,000.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Student incentives aligned to PBIS plan.* | | | |
| **6** | **III.A.** | **Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance** | | | | **$0.00** |
| **7** | **III.A.** | **Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Community Involvement** | | | | **$0.00** |
| | | | | | **Total:** | **$2,000.00** |