Sugarloaf School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sugarloaf School

255 CRANE BLVD, Summerland Key, FL 33042

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Brett Unke A

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	*[Data Not Available]*
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	[LaShawn Russ-Porterfield](#)
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 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.

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.

Sugarloaf School's mission places its primary emphasis on respect for the individual, quality programs, and high teacher and student expectations. Our positive climate promotes growth in integrity, individuality, and self-esteem. We promote opportunities for building leadership, a relevant curriculum, and an ongoing student evaluation program. Maintaining effective discipline which focuses on positive reinforcement is a high priority. Our objectives focus on the infusion of communication skills, problem-solving skills, cooperative effort, the application of critical thinking skills, and the use of individual learning styles to develop each student's unique strengths. We will prepare our students to move into our complex technological society through the development of student vision, interpersonal skills, and clear career goals.

Provide the school's vision statement.

FINS:
Focused Innovative Networked Scholars

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
Unke, Brett	Principal	The principal provides leadership to the school staff, defines and clarifies objectives, and stimulates high levels of job performance. The principal plans, directs, implements, and evaluates the instructional program in the school, including responsibility for implementing the state's curriculum in accordance with the needs of the school. He/She is responsible for hiring, evaluating, and training staff. Including teacher supervision, such as classroom walk-throughs and observations of teaching strategies. Spearheads the development of the school plan with appropriate district personnel. Supervises custodial personnel assigned to the school and inspects the school's plant and premises regularly to ensure safety, health, sanitation, security, appearance, and effective operation. Sugarloaf is currently undergoing construction, the principal is responsible for overseeing the construction is completed in a manner that is safe and enhances the educational experience of the students. Consults with the appropriate staff members on such matters. As the instructional leader, the principal coordinates encourages, and provides in-service growth opportunities for teachers and other personnel within the school. Along with PD for teachers, the principal develops and implements plans for the safety of students as well as maintaining appropriate discipline and conduct, including initiating and attending hearings on these matters. Assists teachers with programs and problems relating to pupils and instruction. Confers and counsels pupils, staff, parents, and other community members. Assists with transportation issues and problems. Ensures proper maintenance, operation, and safety of the school plant and site. Establishes and maintains cooperative relationships with parents and community groups, including supervising and coordinating the use of school facilities by outside groups. Identifies community resources and agencies that may provide services to the school, and establishes relationships as appropriate with these resources and agencies. Along with daily operations, the principal Is responsible for the allocation and control of school budgets. This includes the preparation and submittal of reports

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		required for the management of the district. Maintains professional knowledge through professional organizations and an examination of professional literature as to innovative practices in other schools and other changes in educational practice. Sees that the policies and rules and regulations of the Board of Education, and administrative regulations of the Superintendent, are made effective in the school.
Holmes, Leslie	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal's duties include but are not limited to supporting and assisting the vision and mission of the principal. The AP supports the school staff in maintaining safe and effective behavior management through the use of PBIS, counseling with students, communicating with parents and other stakeholders.
Klessens, Tabitha	Guidance Counselor	As a School Counselor and member of the Building Level Planning Team, the role of the counselor is to maintain a safe school climate through counseling students, parents, and stakeholders. The use of PBIS and implementation of the program is a key component of the school counselor, along with DESA, COVI, and any EWS indicators.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 8/1/2020, Brett Unke A

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.*

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

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
46

Total number of students enrolled at the school
627

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

11

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

11

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	41	54	59	57	70	55	88	81	73	0	0	0	0	578
Attendance below 90 percent	1	12	8	13	8	15	6	11	17	0	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	11	9	17	13	13	0	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	16	13	27	28	19	0	0	0	0	104
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	1	3	8	5	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/30/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	45	52	45	70	56	57	76	69	78	0	0	0	0	548
Attendance below 90 percent	11	11	11	15	17	13	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	7	12	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	9	14	6	13	0	0	0	0	43

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4	6	0	0	0	0	23

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	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	45	52	45	70	56	57	76	69	78	0	0	0	0	548
Attendance below 90 percent	11	11	11	15	17	13	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	7	12	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	9	14	6	13	0	0	0	0	43

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4	6	0	0	0	0	23

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	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	70%	70%	0%	58%	12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	46%	58%	-12%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
05	2021					
	2019	67%	62%	5%	56%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
06	2021					
	2019	52%	57%	-5%	54%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
07	2021					
	2019	70%	58%	12%	52%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
08	2021					
	2019	69%	60%	9%	56%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	59%	62%	-3%	62%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	52%	60%	-8%	64%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2021					
	2019	69%	66%	3%	60%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
06	2021					
	2019	25%	53%	-28%	55%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
07	2021					
	2019	73%	61%	12%	54%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-25%				
08	2021					
	2019	79%	61%	18%	46%	33%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	69%	65%	4%	53%	16%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	75%	56%	19%	48%	27%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	95%	80%	15%	71%	24%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	70%	30%	61%	39%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	69%	31%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Sugarloaf School uses STAR Reading and Math Enterprise Assessment three times a year to monitor student progress. Science and Social Studies are progress monitored thought the Illuminate Program and during the 2020-2021 School year this assessment was administered two times.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34%	39%	60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	40%	38%	69%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	0%	40%
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	82%	79%	68%
	Economically Disadvantaged	80%	82%	63%
	Students With Disabilities	33%	50%	60%
	English Language Learners	n/a	0%	n/a

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	58%	64%	63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	36%	50%	50%
	Students With Disabilities	20%	30%	20%
	English Language Learners	0%	20%	33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	60%	75%	76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	42%	62%	62%
	Students With Disabilities	45%	56%	40%
	English Language Learners	40%	20%	50%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	53%	64%	72%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31%	47%	28%
	Students With Disabilities	22%	22%	22%
	English Language Learners	33%	50%	33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	83%	78%	80%
	Economically Disadvantaged	63%	60%	57%
	Students With Disabilities	33%	33%	44%
	English Language Learners	100%	100%	100%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	68%	67%	64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	65%	63%	63%
	Students With Disabilities	30%	40%	50%
	English Language Learners	50%	50%	33%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	74%	85%	79%
	Economically Disadvantaged	71%	75%	75%
	Students With Disabilities	60%	80%	60%
	English Language Learners	63%	66%	83%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	56%	53%	57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	43%	17%	33%
	Students With Disabilities	38%	40%	27%
	English Language Learners	40%	25%	20%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	54%	73%	64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14%	50%	50%
	Students With Disabilities	31%	53%	36%
	English Language Learners	40%	50%	40%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	37%	72%	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	16%	25%	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	6%	60 %	n/a
	English Language Learners	0%	60%	n/a

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	54%	51%	47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	50%	43%	36%
	Students With Disabilities	12%	6%	18%
	English Language Learners	100%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	62%	59%	53%
	Economically Disadvantaged	70%	57%	63%
	Students With Disabilities	24%	29%	24%
	English Language Learners	100%	50%	0%

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	56%	56%	52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	45%	43%	38%
	Students With Disabilities	11%	22%	22%
	English Language Learners	11%	11%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	69%	58%	58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	42%	43%	38%
	Students With Disabilities	56%	44%	44%
	English Language Learners	33%	33%	10%
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16%	28%	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	10%	23%	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	0%	16%	n/a
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	n/a

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	53%	42%	52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	28%	22%	40%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	13%	21%
	English Language Learners	33%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50%	42%	42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	47%	22%	40%
	Students With Disabilities	29%	13%	29%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27%	26%	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	24%	20%	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	7%	7%	n/a
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	n/a

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	32	52	53	38	62	55	33	83			
ELL	31	38	40	44	65						
HSP	56	55	54	51	70	70	63	94	92		
WHT	69	61	54	75	70	49	83	96	79		
FRL	53	57	50	53	65	60	67	100	79		

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	25	34	31	44	55	46	25	60			
ELL		40			80						
HSP	54	48	23	57	61	52	68	80	73		
WHT	63	53	37	74	65	48	67	92	79		
FRL	58	50	24	67	63	54	68	81	84		

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	69
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	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	686
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	51
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	46
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	66
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	71
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	63
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?

Progress Monitoring data does not predict FSA outcomes in all categories.

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

ESE Proficiency across all grade levels is disproportionally low.

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 started the school year on Virtual Instruction then moved into an A/B day. For Middle school students remained on a Split Schedule for three quarters of the school year. COVID restrictions hampered the success of small group instruction. ESE instructional programing was negatively effected by the reduction in staff.

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

Civics demonstrated great improvement.

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

Exceptional instruction in Civics and parent/student relationships.

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

Redesigned intervention programing. Small group instruction using data to address the specific needs of students.

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.

Professional Development opportunities will be offered monthly during faculty meetings with a variety of topics to enhance teaching and learning. Teachers are being trained on the BEST standards

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

Targeted instructional for Tier 2 and 3 Students. Ongoing Professional Development for teacher differentiation and data analysis.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to the 2020 FSA data, Sugarloaf Students in grades 6-8 performed below proficiency in Math. Grade 6, scored 7% proficient; grade 7, 50% proficient; grade 8, 29% proficient, and Algebra, 32% proficient.

Measureable Outcome:	Sugarloaf students will generate the following gains on the 2022 Math FSA; grade 6, 55% proficiency, grade 7, 55% proficiency; grade 8, 50% proficiency, and Algebra 50% proficiency.
Monitoring:	In order to monitor the progression of student achievement in Math for grades 6-8, students will be given three progress monitoring assessments utilizing STAR Math on Renaissance Place. Teachers may also utilize Stufy Island as a means of monitoring student progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Leslie Holmes (leslie.holmes@keysschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will be trained in the new B.E.S.T standards, with Amy Stanton the District Math Coordinator, as well as engage in training on implementation of AVID strategies through "Centers for Big Kids" to ensure differentiation is taking place to meet the needs of students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows that differentiation, as well as station work, assists teachers in closing student achievement gaps, in this case, specifically in math.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Common planning/Department Meetings K-8
2. Partnership with District Math Coordinator
3. Administration walk-throughs
4. After school tutoring

Person Responsible	Brett Unke (brett.unke@keysschools.com)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The 2020-2021 data from the Covitality screener for the middle school students in the Fall was the following: Tier One 67.2%; Tier Two 17.8%; and Tier Three 10.4%. The Winter Covitality screener data was the following: Tier One 64%; Tier Two 22.25; and Tier Three 8.4%. Although our students in Tier Three decreased, our Tier Two students increased. This data suggests that our school's Tier One is underrepresented and that our data is not indicative of a functional Tier system. Sugarloaf needs to move more students into Tier One and decrease Tier Two and Three to reflect a more appropriately proportioned school population.
Measureable Outcome:	Data from the Fall and Spring administration of the Social/Emotional screener will show a decrease the percentage of students categorized as Tier Two and Three in order to reflect a more typical Tier distribution of students consisting of 80% of students considered Tier One, 15 % of students considered Tier Two, and 5% of students considered Tier Three.
Monitoring:	Behavioral social/emotional screeners are administered twice a year. These screeners will be monitored to reflect changes in the social/emotional health of our student body and to develop interventions to address areas of need. Attendance data, EWS data, MTSS data, and data related to discipline will also be monitored and utilized to develop appropriate interventions to address the students' areas of need. The Panorama program will be used to develop student groups in order to monitor individual student's progress across multiple variables and measures.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tabitha Klessens (tabitha.klessens@keysschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students social/emotional learning will be addressed through the Second Step program and the Purpose Prep lessons with fidelity. Brief Solution Focused interventions and the Why Try program will be utilized to address student needs by the school counselor. The PBIS program will work to develop more elements of inclusion and belongingness for students through school wide PBIS activities. The school social worker and outside agencies will be accessed to meet the needs of students and to provide students with more individualized support and services. Small groups to address student need will be increased
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Through examining the Covitality data, our students scored low in the areas of belonging, zest, and optimism. The programs of Second Step, Purpose Prep, Brief Solution Focused Therapeutic interventions, and PBIS are all evidence-based and are best practices within our district. Small groups are an effective method of delivering services to the maximum amount of students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. The PBIS program is committed to expanding and developing methods of engaging and improving students and student climate without the previous year's restrictions due to Covid. The PBIS team was changed from the BLPT to every grade level represented on the PBIS team to increase the staff "buy-in" and to expand the feedback and input to a more global school wide level.
2. PBIS activities and initiatives will be more engaging to students to interact differently and

plan different types of events from the previous year.
3. Relationship development is a focus of the faculty in order to increase student connection and feelings of belonging and connectedness.
4. Purpose Prep and Second Step lessons will be monitored to ensure fidelity.
5.The Pandora program will be used to monitor students needs.
6. Brief Solution Focused Therapeutic interventions and the Why Try program will be utilized by the school counselor.

Person Responsible	Tabitha Klessens (tabitha.klessens@keysschools.com)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA learning gains components provide a focus on overall improvement and especially students in the lowest quartile. Scores of at least 50 in both of these components demonstrate that the educational program is meeting the needs of learners. Although improvement in some areas of these components was demonstrated in 2021, they are still below 50 in both ELA categories
Measureable Outcome:	Our goal for ELA Proficiency with a focus on Middle School. During the 20-21 school year 45% of the students in grades 6 and 7 were proficient and 42% of students in grade 8 were proficient. The goal is to have 55% of the students proficient in each grade level.
Monitoring:	Monitoring will be provided through a multipronged approach to ensure all dimensions needed to increase learning gains are effectively engaged. STAR PM and ISIP monthly assessments will be monitored at the school, grade, and classroom levels. APM will be used in grades 3-5 strategically. The Literacy, Academic, and data coach will review assessment results and work with teams to support a rigorous tier 1 curriculum that provides differentiated instruction as well as work with interventionists and homeroom teachers to ensure Tier 2/3 supports are in place and monitored for effectiveness. Data will be reported monthly to the leadership and BLPT teams.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Using the Monroe County School District Instructional Vision to guide our approach, we have selected the following priorities rooted in evidence-based strategies/programs to ensure the majority of students are making learning gains in all grade levels. These include but are not limited to; AVID, Relationships, Goals/Scales, differentiated instruction, and MTSS.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Improving instructional practices through a rigorous Tier I core curriculum, implementing effective interventions using the MTSS framework, and fully engaging our students in the learning process through relationships, AVID, and goal setting will positively impact student learning and ensure scores in these components show that a majority of our students are making gains.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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.

Sugarloaf reported 1.0 incidents per 100 students. When compared to all combination schools statewide, it falls into the moderate category. The highest indicator was for drug/public order incidents, which was 0.82 per 100 students. The SRO will have a more active presence on campus, as well as limiting the number of students in the hallways at one time between and during classes. Students will need to sign out to use the restroom and put a time stamp on when they leave and return to the classroom.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

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

We will establish a "Shiver of Sharks" to build student collaboration across grade levels and to promote friendly competition. The overall Tier 1 school-wide PBIS efforts build a positive school culture and climate by implementing weekly and monthly accolades for both teachers and students. In addition, grade-level clusters will meet weekly to discuss the effectiveness of student/teacher relationships.

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

SLS stakeholders include PBIS Committee, BLPT, SAC, PTO, community members (Winn Dixie/ Centennial/BSHH). Relationships with stakeholders are harnessed by information nights, quarterly parent-teacher conferences, and athletic events. Communication is key to ensuring all stakeholders are involved in daily school happenings, this is achieved through the use of DOJO, FaceBook, Blackboard Connect Communications.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00