

District School Board of Madison County

# Lee Elementary School



## 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>16</b>

# Lee Elementary School

7731 US 90, Lee, FL 32059

<http://les.madison.k12.fl.us/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Christi Minor**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (51%) 2014-15: A (65%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I

\* 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 Madison County School Board.

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>16</b>

## Lee Elementary School

7731 US 90, Lee, FL 32059

<http://les.madison.k12.fl.us/>

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	Yes	87%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	32%

### School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	C	C

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

Inspired Learning! We believe if we inspire our students, all of them will learn. Inspiration comes through establishing a warm, creative environment where students feel not only physically safe and secure, but confident enough to aim for high expectations. All staff members participate in the cultivation of our positive atmosphere with encouraging words and constant support for our students.

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

We want students to leave Lee Elementary with the academic skills as well as the character traits that will make them successful in life.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Brown, Amanda	Principal	
Phillips, Susan	School Counselor	
Gonzalez, Rebecca	Teacher, ESE	
Maultsby, Susan	Teacher, ESE	
Smith, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	
Mabardy, Delores	Teacher, K-12	

### 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	33	33	36	28	38	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	188
Attendance below 90 percent	1	18	6	6	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	6	5	5	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	12	3	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	4	1	2	6	4	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	4	5	2	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**

14

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

Friday 8/30/2019

**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	
Attendance below 90 percent	8	7	4	2	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	1	4	6	13	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	10	5	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

**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	4	3	1	3	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

**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	
Attendance below 90 percent	8	7	4	2	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	1	4	6	13	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	10	5	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

**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	4	3	1	3	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

**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	60%	52%	57%	52%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	50%	58%	48%	47%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	49%	53%	38%	47%	52%
Math Achievement	65%	57%	63%	66%	72%	61%
Math Learning Gains	50%	49%	62%	43%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	43%	51%	38%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	60%	56%	53%	39%	48%	51%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Number of students enrolled	33 (0)	33 (0)	36 (0)	28 (0)	38 (0)	20 (0)	0 (0)	188 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	1 (8)	18 (7)	6 (4)	6 (2)	8 (8)	2 (2)	0 (0)	41 (31)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (1)	1 (4)	1 (6)	3 (13)	3 (4)	0 (0)	8 (28)
Course failure in ELA or Math	4 (5)	6 (10)	5 (5)	5 (4)	8 (3)	2 (2)	0 (0)	30 (29)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (7)	12 (11)	3 (6)	0 (0)	17 (24)

### Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	64%	40%	24%	58%	6%
	2018	56%	55%	1%	57%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	50%	6%	58%	-2%
	2018	63%	48%	15%	56%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	60%	46%	14%	56%	4%
	2018	47%	38%	9%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
06	2019					
	2018					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	75%	45%	30%	62%	13%
	2018	75%	60%	15%	62%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	79%	51%	28%	64%	15%
	2018	76%	56%	20%	62%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	34%	44%	-10%	60%	-26%
	2018	59%	44%	15%	61%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-25%				
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	57%	42%	15%	53%	4%
	2018	56%	38%	18%	55%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	57	50		57	60						
BLK	29	64		41	27						
HSP	55			64							
WHT	68	59	60	71	54		62				
FRL	54	53	50	58	40		47				

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	53			65							
HSP	57	60		86	60						
WHT	62	57	60	71	55	42	76				
FRL	51	55	55	72	58		63				
2017 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	43			64							
HSP	56	62		89	38						
WHT	55	47	18	63	43	31	30				
FRL	49	41		60	42		29				

### 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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	397
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	56
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	62
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	

## 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.**

The lowest performance was the Math Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%. Statistically, this component has been the lowest performing area. These are generally students that have performed poorly in math since the early grades. Math fluency, learning the new math curriculum, and poor reading skills contribute to these scores.

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

Math Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% showed the greatest decline from the prior year. There was a 17% drop from '17-'18 to '18-'19. These are generally students that have performed poorly in math since the early grades. Math fluency, learning the new math curriculum, and poor reading skills contribute to these scores.

**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.**

The greatest gap was the Math Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%. The school component was 18% below the state average in this area. These are generally students that have performed poorly in math since the early grades. Math fluency, learning the new math curriculum, and poor reading skills contribute to these scores.

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

ELA Gains showed the most improvement with a 6% point increase from the previous year. The school, as a whole, put an increased emphasis on reading fluency in all grades. We continued with the daily designated intervention time to focus on specific skills prescribed by iReady diagnostic.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

Attendance - too many students with attendance below 90%.

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

1. Math achievement increase
2. Math Learning gains increase
3. Math Lower 25% gains increase
4. Attendance increase
5. Achievement of black students increase

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#1	
<b>Title</b>	Math Achievement and Gains
<b>Rationale</b>	This past year, the math achievement and gains dropped. The most noticeable drop was in 5th grade math.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	The goals we have set for math are: Math Proficiency - 75% Math Gains - 60% Math Lower 25% Gains - 60%
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Amanda Brown (amanda.brown@mcsbfl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	iReady toolbox Math Fluency - Eureka Math Reflex Math Zearn Math Prodigy Math
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	The iReady toolbox provides resources that targets specific skills prescribed by the iReady diagnostic. The Eureka Math curriculum has a fluency component in the program (fluency sprints). Students work on fluency and growth of that fluency. Reflex Math uses game-based software to build math fluency.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	1. TEAM time (designated daily intervention time) to target specific skills. 2. Fluency Sprints 3. Reflex Math 4. 5.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Amanda Brown (amanda.brown@mcsbfl.us)

#### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).**

Improve school attendance - Incentive program to reward students for exemplary attendance

## Part IV: Title I Requirements

### Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.**

LES will hold Parent Universities throughout the year. One goal of this initiative is to bring parents in to meet with the teachers to discuss ways that parents can become involved with helping with their child's academic progress at home. The school feels that by providing instruction to the parents on strategies they can use to help their child, it will build a positive relationship between the school and home. At the Parent University, parents will be provided with instruction and tools to use at home with their children. These items include individual dry erase boards, markers, erasers, kitchen timers, fluency binders, and other activities that parents can do at home that will benefit the classroom.

#### **PFEP Link**

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

#### **Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.**

Teachers refer students who may need mentoring or counseling to the MTSS team. The team meets with parents and the teacher to determine possible solutions. If parents are in agreement, the team refers the students to the appropriate entity for support. Parents are informed of the services of Mr. Glen Graves - child counselor.

All staff members have been trained in Youth Mental First Aid.

#### **Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.**

Lee Elementary School serves 18 Pre-K students. Pre-K teacher, Heather Douglas, has been a Pre-K teacher for 18 years, and keeps well informed on procedures and changes in Pre-K instruction. Our community has a local Pre-K which also stays in regular communication with our school, especially at the end of the school year and beginning of the school year, helping with transitions for specific students into our kindergarten program. All incoming kindergarten students complete a kindergarten screener with the Principal. This screener helps to determine a "snapshot" look at the incoming students. This also gives the Principal an opportunity to make a connection with the new students and parents. This time allows the parents to ask questions. This provides the foundation for building relationships with the new families and students.

At the end of the year, the 5th grade students go on a guided tour of MCCS. On this tour, they are able to see the different areas of the school, as well as hear about special programs that the students will be able to participate in as 6th graders.

#### **Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.**

Teachers use a "Class Snapshot" sheet at the beginning of the year to identify students in their classroom who may already have or need special services (ELL, 504, etc.)

Our MTSS/RTI packet begins with a "Request for Assistance" when the teacher realizes a student is not being successful. A parent conference is held and a plan is outlined for small group, individualized and/or after-school help for the student. Progress is monitored monthly.

Title 1 - Our school uses Title 1 funds for instructional supplementary materials, after-school tutoring, and parental involvement activities.

Part C Migrant - Migrant funds are used for instructional materials such as bi-lingual library books, after-school tutoring, and extended year summer program for migrant students.

Title X Homeless - Homeless funds are used for assisting students needing school supplies, school clothes, and tutoring.

Supplemental Academic Instruction - SAI Funds have been used to provide extended school year activities for students not meeting expectations.

Nutrition - Our school receives funds for universal breakfast and lunch for all students. Both meals are available for any and every student. The school also works with the local extension office to provide nutrition education to students in Pre-K, Kindergarten, and 1st grade. Once a year, the school hosts the Madison Farm Bureau for Ag Literacy Day. Volunteers come in and go to each class to teach the students about farm-raised foods that provide good nutrition.

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.**

LES provides opportunities for our students to observe community helpers by hosting a K-9 presentation by local law enforcement. Specific grade levels travel to the fire department, post office, and courthouse to learn about the various areas of community helpers and the service they provide to the community. At various times throughout the year, community members come in and volunteer their time to read to our students and discuss their careers and how their careers affect the community.

## Part V: Budget

**The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.**

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Achievement and Gains	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00