

Alachua County Public Schools

Littlewood Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Littlewood Elementary School

812 NW 34TH ST, Gainesville, FL 32605

<https://www.sbac.edu/littlewood>

Demographics

Principal: Justin Russell

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	79%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
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 was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/6/2020.

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.

Littlewood grows together in a warm, safe, challenging environment that promotes self-pride and a lifelong respect for the love of learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Littlewood Elementary encourages the child to see himself/herself as a worthwhile individual with the qualities of character to assume a responsible place in the school and community. It creates an atmosphere for children and teachers which encourages an awareness of the joys and necessity of learning, the development of talents and skills (social, emotional, intellectual, and physical), and appreciation of cultural heritage. It is the school's responsibility to plan and propose methods and strategies that will best ensure the attainment of the overall goals and purpose. To achieve this philosophy, the school relies upon the strengths of the pupils, school staff, parents and community.

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
Russell, Justin	Principal	<p>Provides leadership and direction for students to meet national and state requirements and teachers to have the training and resources needed to increase student achievement by using effective teaching strategies; collects data on student progress towards academic and behavioral goals, analyzes data by benchmarks to ensure the concepts are being taught (lesson plans, classroom snapshots, differentiated instruction). Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI, conducts assessment of RtI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities. and participates in Educational Planning Team (EPT) meetings with parents. Assists students having difficulty adjusting to school or class requirements; meets with students, teacher, and parents to develop plans to assist with student success; implements PBS with fidelity; maintains a safe learning environment.</p>
Dingus, Nancy	Guidance Counselor	<p>Helps meet all student needs on campus. Is liaison between families and school. Provides expertise in the RtI implementation and support to the Leadership Team in areas of interventions needed to address specific student's needs; works with outside agencies to ensure student academic, emotional, behavioral, and social needs are addressed; an active participant in EPT, 504, and IEP meetings, coordinates all ESOL needs, and works closely with teachers and parents. Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. In addition to providing interventions, counselors continue to link child-serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.</p>
Gardiner, Maggie	Assistant Principal	<p>Provides expertise in both Florida State Standards; ensures that students are taught on their instructional level; provides remedial or enrichment strategies/activities to teachers based on needs; assists in the collection of assessment data from all K-5 students in the areas of language arts, math, writing, and science. Participates in interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; facilitates data-based decision making activities. Meets with students, teachers, and parents to develop plans to assist with student success.</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Siegel, Elizabeth	Instructional Coach	Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 2/3 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into instruction. Monitors school wide and individual student data. Helps lead data meetings.
Hines, Tawanna	Dean	Provides support for teachers and parents related to classroom and behavior management strategies, develops and monitors behavior plans for specific students, implements PBS with fidelity.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Justin Russell

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.*

5

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

37

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	79%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students

(subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
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 .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	74	111	90	114	95	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	578
Attendance below 90 percent	5	15	13	16	8	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	2	4	3	8	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	1	0	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	1	2	1	5	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/15/2020

Prior Year - 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	134	113	134	112	110	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	712
Attendance below 90 percent	6	21	20	12	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	8	8	5	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	24	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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	1	2	3	2	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	7	8	9	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Prior Year - 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	134	113	134	112	110	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	712
Attendance below 90 percent	6	21	20	12	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	8	8	5	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	24	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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	1	2	3	2	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year		1	7	8	9	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	63%	59%	57%	58%	58%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	57%	58%	51%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	49%	53%	47%	40%	48%
Math Achievement	61%	60%	63%	64%	64%	62%
Math Learning Gains	66%	61%	62%	62%	58%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	49%	51%	42%	45%	47%
Science Achievement	56%	57%	53%	58%	55%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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	2019	64%	57%	7%	58%	6%
	2018	60%	56%	4%	57%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	60%	55%	5%	58%	2%
	2018	52%	54%	-2%	56%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	64%	55%	9%	56%	8%
	2018	63%	55%	8%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	48%	58%	-10%	62%	-14%
	2018	56%	60%	-4%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	77%	60%	17%	64%	13%
	2018	79%	60%	19%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		21%				
05	2019	60%	57%	3%	60%	0%
	2018	63%	61%	2%	61%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	56%	55%	1%	53%	3%
	2018	59%	55%	4%	55%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	38	45	70	32	61	71					
ELL	45	47		60	73						
BLK	43	46	54	36	52	52	30				
HSP	57	67	33	59	67	50	57				
MUL	63	74		50	63						
WHT	82	71		83	81		81				
FRL	49	58	53	43	60	47	35				

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	26	44	54	27	41	53	27				
ELL	43			64							
ASN	80			80							
BLK	30	40	52	37	36	30	33				
HSP	59	63		71	83		64				
MUL	77	58		68	42						
WHT	73	52	40	79	74	54	64				
FRL	46	46	45	52	56	46	48				

ESSA Data

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	58
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	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	462
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	56
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	56
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	63
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	80
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	50
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Of all the reporting categories, our lowest was certainly the Lowest Quartile Gains for both ELA (50%) and Math (50%). I think this is potentially due to our school having a higher population of students with disabilities, many of whom fall into the Lowest Quartile. Our model for serving ESE students (mostly through Support Facilitation in the General Education classroom) is new to the teachers and staff so it will take time for them to refine it. However, even though these were our lowest categories, we showed great improvements in both areas when compared to the prior school year. LQ Gains for ELA increased by 3% while LQ Gains for Math increased by 8%.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Overall Math achievement declined by 3%. Of the 7 reporting categories it was just 1 of 2 that did not increase. The other category that declined was Science which was by 2%. The main decline was due a sharp decrease in 3rd grade Math scores. The main factor is unknown but one theory for this trend is because of the heavy focus on ELA in 3rd grade due to the high stakes of the 3rd grade ELA FSA. Our year-long professional development also focused on ELA achievement so it is possible this took away some focus from the Math instruction/planning. If you look at the comparison, the same group of 3rd grade students achieved at a rate of 64% in ELA vs 48% in math.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

ELA LQ Gains is the category where our gap is greatest when compared to the state average. As stated above, I think this is potentially due to our school having a higher population of students with disabilities, many of whom fall into the Lowest Quartile. Our model for serving ESE students (mostly through Support Facilitation in the General Education classroom) is new to the teachers and staff so it will take time for them to refine it.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Our greatest improvement from the prior school year was ELA Overall Learning Gains (increase of 10%). I believe this can be attributed to our year-long Backwards Design planning/professional development that all grade levels participated in. Each grade level,

working with a member of the leadership team, would meet every other week to look at upcoming standards, unpack the standard, and plan a mini assessment. Then, after the mini assessment was given, the teams would look at individual and class data to drive instruction. This process resulted in improvement of all ELA data across the board.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

The main area of concern from our EWS data is Attendance. Approximately 13% of Littlewood students missed at least 10% of the school days.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Math Achievement
2. Attendance
3. Social Emotional Learning
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

The first Area of Focus will be improving Math Instruction. In our most recent FSA testing session, we made great progress in our lowest quartile Math gains, which increased from 42% to 50%. However, overall math achievement showed the greatest drop, which was by 3%. In addition, we went the wrong way in regards to closing the Achievement Gap. White students passed at a rate of 83% while Black students passed at a rate of 36%. This resulted in an Achievement Gap of 47%. During the prior school year, the gap was 41%. It is for these reasons that we began an initiative to address student mastery of math during the 19-20 school year with the adoption of a new curriculum and the implementation of the Backwards Design planning/professional development process. While the student data seemed to be tracking in a positive way, we did not get to see this process through nor did we see how it translated into student achievement as measured by the FSA due to the school closure related to COVID-19. We will once again utilize this curriculum and this process in efforts to improve student mastery. We realize that this will be difficult due to students being forced into distance learning for the final quarter of the 19-20 school year. We will begin with heavy remediation based on the standards that were not covered in the traditional format and then progress with the remaining standards set forth by the pacing guide.

Measureable Outcome:

Lowest Quartile FSA Math gains will increase from 50% to 53%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Justin Russell (russellje@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Strategy:

The main curriculum that will be used is Big Ideas Math which is based on the Florida Standards. In addition, we will participate in a Backwards Design Process throughout the year using the math standards. Grade level teams, working with a member of the leadership team, will meet regularly to look at the upcoming standards, unpack the standards, and plan a mini assessment to measure student mastery. Then, after the mini assessment is given, the teams will look at individual and class data to drive future instruction. This process has shown to be effective in guaranteeing that the instruction is standards-focused and driven by individual student data. Additionally, all teachers will fully participate in the district-wide progress monitoring using ISIP monthly and AIMS assessments twice quarterly. Finally, lower performing students will be offered after-school tutoring free of charge.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

We used the same Backwards Design strategy during the 18-19 school year, but with the ELA standards. Using this process, we experienced a 5% increase in ELA achievement, a 10% increase in ELA gains, and a 3% increase in ELA LQ gains. We also closed the achievement gap from 45% to 43%. We are hopeful that we will experience similar results with math. Research shows that frequent progress monitoring and reteaching and remediation informed by formative assessments that are based on standards lead to student growth. Additionally, we believe that providing more contact time with a teacher after school will increase achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide high quality instruction that is standards based and at the level of rigor that will be assessed on the FSA.
2. Teams will participate in Backwards Design Planning model for Math as well as frequent progress monitoring.
3. Data will be analyzed regularly and will drive instruction.

Person Responsible Justin Russell (russellje@gm.sbac.edu)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We will focus on improving ELA instruction. We made great progress in this area using our Backwards Design Model during the last testing year but our lowest quartile gains are still our weakest category overall, with 50% of our students making gains.

Measureable Outcome: Lowest Quartile FSA Reading Gains will increase from 50% to 53%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Justin Russell (russellje@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Strategy: To increase achievement and gains, we will provide high quality instruction that is standards based and at the level of rigor that will be assessed on the FSA. We will use a combination of the adopted Board curriculum as well as supplemental research based resources purchased through Title 1 funds, including online software programs. We will use Title 1 personnel to assist in many areas. First, we use it to reduce class size in both 3rd and 5th grade. This allows all students to get more individualized instruction. Next, we use Title 1 personnel to push into classes to support struggling learners and provide small group instruction.

Additionally, all teachers will full participate in district-wide progress monitoring, which includes monthly ISIP assessments and twice quarterly AIMS assessments. Teachers will use this data to drive their instruction.

Finally, lower performing students will be offered after-school tutoring free of charge.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We elect to use the vast majority of our Title 1 money on personnel resources. Research shows that smaller class sizes overall as well as small group instruction increases student achievement. Research also shows that frequent progress monitoring and reteaching and remediation informed by formative assessments that are based on standards lead to student growth. Additionally, we believe that providing more contact time with a teacher after school will increase achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide high quality instruction that is standards based and at the level of rigor that will be assessed on the FSA.
2. Identify students who could most benefit from extra support using EWS and achievement data.
3. Deploy Title 1 personnel to these areas.
4. Continually monitor student data and adjust Title 1 personnel assignments as needed.

Person Responsible Justin Russell (russellje@gm.sbac.edu)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Unfortunately Alachua County had the highest achievement gap in the state of Florida. It has been a focus for our district and school to reduce this gap over the past several years. During the 18-19 school year, our White achievement was 86% while our African American achievement was 43% (ELA). While this represented a closing of the gap by 2%, we still have a long way to go. Littlewood had an achievement gap of 47% in Math and 43% in ELA. After FSA testing in 18-19, our achievement gap improved slightly in ELA but widened in Math. We will continue to work towards closing the achievement gap in both areas.

Measurable Outcome: Math: African American achievement will increase to at least 40% from 36% while White achievement will increase to at least 84% from 83%. This will close the achievement gap by 3%.

ELA: African American achievement will increase to at least 47% from 43% while White achievement will increase to at least 83% from 82%. This will close the achievement gap by 3%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Justin Russell (russellje@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Strategy: In addition to aforementioned academic strategies, we will work for all faculty to increase cultural competency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will learn strategies to more effectively teach our diverse population. A book study in Culturally Responsive teaching will help bridge the cultural divide between our faculty and students. School wide professional development will focus on cultural competency.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Complete "A Guide for White Women Who Teach Black Boys" book study that was cut short last year.
2. Offer White Fragility book to all faculty.
3. Meet monthly to debrief assigned reading and discuss ways to apply principles of book to daily practice.
4. Participate in profesional development related to cultural competency.

Person Responsible Justin Russell (russellje@gm.sbac.edu)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Our additional goal will be to focus on attendance. Last year, we had 97 students (this represents approximately 13% of our school population) who missed at least 10% or more days of school. This number may have ended up even higher if attendance recording wasn't so relaxed during the COVID-19 school closure.

We will closely monitor student attendance and contact families directly for truancy meetings if students begin to show a pattern of absenteeism. Due to COVID-19, we do not want to overly emphasize attendance for Brick and Mortar students. Therefore, our focus will be on student attendance in the Digital Academy. The administration will send out the Attendance Policy for Digital Academy and remind them that the truancy procedures still apply to Digital Academy students. Also, parents will be reminded that they can monitor their child's attendance in real time on Skyward.

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Littlewood believes in building positive relationships between school and home in order to improve student achievement. The school aims to increase family engagement by having students grades 1-5 use planners daily to facilitate home-school communication and increase dialogue between teachers, administrators and parents. Multiple family engagement activities will be held throughout the year to teach parents how to help their child achieve academic success. Littlewood also values the community/business partnerships established with local businesses near the school. These partners, as well as parents, are encouraged to attend PTA and SAC meetings, plus school and family events. Business partners provide both monetary and material donations. In return, the school recognizes and supports them in public ways, such as in our newsletter, at school events, and on the marquee. We also collaborate with non-profits such as local churches and UF service organizations to provide mentoring and tutoring for our students, plus projects to improve facilities.

The School Advisory Council provides input that relates to the School Improvement Plan and improving academic performance throughout the year.

Finally, Littlewood is a Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) school. We have

been recognized as a model school by the state of Florida for the past two years. PBiS is a three tiered, data driven approach designed to reduce poor behavior school-wide through the encouragement of positive behaviors. This program is led by the Behavior Resource Teacher, Tawanna Hines, who works with community partners to provide rewards and incentives to students. The philosophy behind the program is that focusing on and highlighting the behaviors and expectations that we want is more powerful than focusing on negative behaviors.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

Part V: Budget						
1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$12,136.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0091 - Littlewood Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$5,000.00
<i>Notes: iXL Math web-based program</i>						
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0091 - Littlewood Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$2,000.00
<i>Notes: Imagine Math Facts web-based program</i>						
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0091 - Littlewood Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$2,636.00
<i>Notes: Reflex Math web-based program</i>						
	5100		0091 - Littlewood Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$2,500.00
<i>Notes: Math Stations</i>						
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$316,423.50
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0091 - Littlewood Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$274,817.18
<i>Notes: Supplemental Personnel</i>						
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0091 - Littlewood Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$1,960.32
<i>Notes: Title I Lead Teacher Supplement</i>						
	5100	310-Professional and Technical Services	0091 - Littlewood Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$2,000.00
<i>Notes: Substitutes for Class-size reduction units</i>						
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0091 - Littlewood Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$6,646.00

			<i>Notes: Achieve 3000 web-based program</i>			
	5100		0091 - Littlewood Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$7,500.00
			<i>Notes: Ready Florida</i>			
	5100		0091 - Littlewood Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$2,500.00
			<i>Notes: Literacy Stations</i>			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0091 - Littlewood Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$21,000.00
			<i>Notes: Extended Day Intervention</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity				\$4,890.50
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6300		0091 - Littlewood Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$1,800.00
			<i>Notes: Professional Development PLC</i>			
			0091 - Littlewood Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$3,090.50
			<i>Notes: Additional supplemental activities</i>			
					Total:	\$333,450.00