# Big Cypress Elementary School

**2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan**

## Table of Contents

# Big Cypress Elementary School

## 3250 GOLDEN GATE BLVD W, Naples, FL 34120

### https://www.collierschools.com/bce

## Demographics

## Principal: Brandon Carter

Start Date for this Principal: 7/23/2020

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | No |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 89% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: B (57%)<br><br>2017-18: B (59%)<br><br>2016-17: A (65%)<br><br>2015-16: B (55%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Southwest |
| **Regional Executive Director** | |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | |
| **ESSA Status** | 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 Collier County School Board.

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Table of Contents

# Big Cypress Elementary School

## 3250 GOLDEN GATE BLVD W, Naples, FL 34120

### https://www.collierschools.com/bce

## School Demographics

| **School Type and Grades Served** (per MSID File) | **2019-20 Title I School** | **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary School PK-5 | No | 65% |

| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 59% |

## School Grades History

| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | B | B | B | A |

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Collier 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.**

Nurturing and motivating all students to achieve success.

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

The BCE family is committed to an environment where all students are empowered to explore, motivated to learn, determined to succeed, and prepared to lead.

### 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Carter, Brandon | Principal | Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities. Additionally, the Principal, in collaboration with the Leadership Team, provides professional development on purposeful differentiation both in the planning process and implementation in the classroom. Lesson plans, SSPs, and classroom application are monitored. |
| Charles, Mary | Instructional Coach | Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ program; identifies and analyzes literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis (iReady); participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment, implementation, and monitoring. |
| Green, Pam | School Counselor | Participates in student data collection, integrates behavioral intervention materials/activities into instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching, PBIS strategies and interventions. |
| Fields, Barbara | Assistant Principal | Assists the Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities. |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Thursday 7/23/2020, Brandon Carter

**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.*
2

**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.*
15

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

58

**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 |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | No |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) | 89% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented** (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: B (55%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Southwest |
| **Regional Executive Director** | |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | |
| **ESSA Status** | TS&I |
| * 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 | 79 | 138 | 117 | 139 | 154 | 161 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 788 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 4 | 7 | 5 | 8 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

**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 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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

Monday 7/27/2020

## 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 | 140 | 120 | 138 | 158 | 156 | 160 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 872 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 7 | 10 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 23 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 |

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

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

**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 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**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 | 140 | 120 | 138 | 158 | 156 | 160 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 872 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 7 | 10 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 23 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 |

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

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

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 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

**School Data**
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 | 69% | 60% | 57% | 69% | 56% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 67% | 59% | 58% | 66% | 62% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 56% | 51% | 53% | 57% | 57% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 67% | 68% | 63% | 75% | 67% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 45% | 64% | 62% | 66% | 67% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 27% | 55% | 51% | 64% | 58% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 71% | 59% | 53% | 55% | 54% | 51% |

### 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 | 65% | 61% | 4% | 58% | 7% | |
| | 2018 | 72% | 59% | 13% | 57% | 15% | |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -7% | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 66% | 58% | 8% | 58% | 8% | |
| | 2018 | 70% | 60% | 10% | 56% | 14% | |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -6% | | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 75% | 60% | 15% | 56% | 19% | |
| | 2018 | 61% | 59% | 2% | 55% | 6% | |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 14% | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 5% | | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison | |
| 03 | 2019 | 71% | 68% | 3% | 62% | 9% | |
| | 2018 | 79% | 67% | 12% | 62% | 17% | |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -8% | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 59% | 65% | -6% | 64% | -5% | |
| | 2018 | 83% | 67% | 16% | 62% | 21% | |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -24% | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -20% | | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 65% | 67% | -2% | 60% | 5% | |
| | 2018 | 66% | 68% | -2% | 61% | 5% | |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -18% | | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison | |
| 05 | 2019 | 71% | 56% | 15% | 53% | 18% | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 62% | 58% | 4% | 55% | 7% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| 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 | 25 | 46 | 47 | 41 | 38 | 43 | 27 | | | | |
| ELL | 56 | 73 | 72 | 56 | 46 | 32 | 54 | | | | |
| BLK | 68 | 62 | | 53 | 38 | 30 | 45 | | | | |
| HSP | 64 | 63 | 63 | 62 | 43 | 19 | 66 | | | | |
| MUL | 83 | 79 | | 67 | 36 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 73 | 70 | 50 | 74 | 48 | 44 | 78 | | | | |
| FRL | 64 | 61 | 50 | 60 | 44 | 25 | 65 | | | | |
| 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 | 27 | 32 | 31 | 48 | 51 | 45 | 16 | | | | |
| ELL | 58 | 67 | 47 | 68 | 72 | 61 | | | | | |
| BLK | 54 | 46 | | 59 | 57 | 58 | 36 | | | | |
| HSP | 63 | 59 | 42 | 70 | 64 | 55 | 52 | | | | |
| MUL | 87 | | | 93 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 72 | 53 | 25 | 81 | 64 | 50 | 69 | | | | |
| FRL | 62 | 53 | 43 | 70 | 60 | 53 | 55 | | | | |
| 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 | 31 | 46 | 38 | 57 | 64 | 63 | 32 | | | | |
| ELL | 40 | 54 | 47 | 59 | 72 | 64 | 18 | | | | |
| BLK | 58 | 48 | | 66 | 75 | | 40 | | | | |
| HSP | 65 | 66 | 53 | 70 | 65 | 58 | 54 | | | | |
| MUL | 90 | | | 70 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 73 | 69 | 66 | 82 | 66 | 68 | 59 | | | | |
| FRL | 62 | 63 | 51 | 70 | 65 | 66 | 35 | | | | |

## 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 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 58 |
| 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 | 59 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 461 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 38 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 |
| **Native American Students** | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Asian Students** | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Black/African American Students** | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 49 |
| 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 | 55 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

| Hispanic Students | |
|---|---|
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Multiracial Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 66 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Pacific Islander Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| White Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - White Students | 62 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

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

## Analysis

### Data 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 data component that showed the lowest performance was Math Learning Gains for the Lowest 25th percentile at 27%. A contributing factor for last year's low performance was the lack of adequate progress monitoring and differentiation for students in the lowest 25% and SWD students. Within our ESSA Subgroup data, SWD fell below the 41% mark coming in at 38%.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was Math Learning Gains for the Lowest 25th percentile which declined 26 points from the prior year. A contributing factor for last year's low performance was the lack of adequate

progress monitoring and differentiation for students in the lowest 25% which also would include our SWD as they fall into the lowest 25%. ELA achievement for our SWD went from 27% to 25%.

**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 data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Math Learning Gains for the Lowest 25th percentile which was 24 points below the state average. A contributing factor for the gap was the low performance of our Hispanic student population, our students on Free and Reduced Lunch, and our SWD.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was ELA Lowest 25th Percentile which increased to 56% from 38% the prior year. This was an 18 point increase. The school provided additional support and intervention time that targeted students in the lowest 25% in reading for grades 3-5.

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

Two potential areas of concern are Attendance below 90 percent and students who scored Level 1 on a statewide assessment.

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

1. Math Learning Gains for Lowest 25 percentile
2. Math Learning Gains Overall
3. ELA Learning Gains for Lowest 25th Percentile
4. Math Overall Achievement
5. ESSA Subgroup SWD

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| #1. Leadership specifically relating to Managing Accountability Systems | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | The majority of our school grade components were over 50%. However, our lowest 25% in Math was 27% (26 points below the prior year and 24 points below the state). We scored above the State in every grade for achievement, but the math learning gains for our lowest 25% are a concern. In addition, our overall math gains were 45% (18 points below the prior year and 17 points below the state). |

| **Measurable Outcome:** | To have at least 55% of the students in the lowest 25% meet their math learning gains for the 2020-2021 school year. To have at least 65% of the students meet their math learning gains for the 2020-2021 school year. |
|---|---|
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Brandon Carter (carteb@collierschools.com) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | The leadership team, under the guidance of the principal, will monitor data weekly during leadership meetings by reviewing the Student Success Platform and discussing students with one or more Early Warning System indicators. Leadership will attend grade level planning meetings on a rotating schedule. Teams meet informally on a consistent basis to discuss grade level formative data, and also meet with administration monthly during MTSS Data Discussion meetings with planned agenda items and talking points. During these meetings, we will review progress of students who have Student Success Plans to determine effectiveness of interventions. All teachers have quarterly data chats with administration to discuss individual students. In these chats we will have teachers bring samples of the math notebooks to ensure that data in math is being tracked by the teacher and student. In the grade level meetings grade levels will be creating grade level consistent math fluency tests, students will be able to track their accuracy and speed and aid in concept acquisition through these assessments and will keep and track the data in their data notebooks. In classroom visits administration will pull a data notebook and student to discuss the progress of math fluency. Math data will be tracked on data walls in classrooms, on grade level boards and a WIG (Wildly Important Goal) for math will be set school wide and tracked publicly. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | During planning we will discuss consistent use of math evidence-based strategies in lesson planning and the use of strategies in the classrooms by administration observations. With giving students a consistent accountability system of fluency checks, data notebooks and classroom/school wide tracking we will be able to monitor students' confident and knowledge of their own learning gains. During data chats, grade level meetings and MTSS Data Discussions we will build a staff community of consistency in common language, trackers and monitoring of student data. All stakeholders will know who the students are that need intervention, what the intervention strategy will be and the progress of the student. |

## Action Steps to Implement

1. Administration will observe math classrooms for math evidence-based strategies and monitor Canvas for matched grade level appropriate evidence based on the standards and level of complexity.

**Person Responsible**    Brandon Carter (carteb@collierschools.com)

2. Students will track pre and post tests in their math notebooks. Goals will be set and students will track the goals weekly. Administration will pull binders during classroom visits to discuss goals with students checking for the level of rigor of the mathematics standards, high-quality tracking and testing structures as well as standard aligned student work.

**Person Responsible**    Barbara Fields (fieldb@collierschools.com)

3. MTSS team will meet weekly to review data on students with SSP's to determine effectiveness of interventions.

**Person Responsible**    Brandon Carter (carteb2@collierschools.com)

4. Administration will hold Data Chats in which teachers will speak to the data of the whole class as well as specific students who are in need of intervention and about the interventions progress.

**Person Responsible**    Brandon Carter (carteb2@collierschools.com)

5. Administration will be present during math planning to help facilitate the creating of grade level consistent fluency tracking tests for tracking.

**Person Responsible**    Barbara Fields (fieldb@collierschools.com)

6. Administration will observe math classrooms for math evidence- based strategies and use of fluency trackers.

**Person Responsible**    Barbara Fields (fieldb@collierschools.com)

| #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | The majority of our school grade components were over 50%. However, our overall math gains were 45% (18 points below the prior year and 17 points below the state). We scored above the State in every grade for achievement, but the math learning gains overall are a concern. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | To have at least 65% of the students meet their math learning gains for the 2020-2021 school year. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Brandon Carter (carteb2@collierschools.com) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Systematic and explicit standard based instruction focused on increased accuracy and speed of mathematics skills based on grade level concepts will be discussed during grade level planning. During planning we will discuss consistent use of math evidence-based strategies in lesson planning and the use of strategies in the classrooms. Strategies using the Turn and Talk section from the math series will be used with each lesson. Teachers will then share how the strategy was used and how their delivery of the instruction was enhanced at the next grade level meeting. PLC's that will align teachers across all grade levels will be able to work together to identify what each rising grade level will need from the previous grade level in projection of the upcoming year as a solid math fluency base. A consistent fluency program per grade level will be created and used in the classrooms. Departmentalized high performing math teachers in 5th grade will be in place to better utilize our teacher's strengths for student success. In addition, Resource teacher will be providing additional support in the classrooms for our lowest 25% and SWD students. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Through the consistent use of explicit math strategies within the lesson across the grade levels we will be able to discuss and analyze the gains and understanding of students' math competency by analyzing the data and the instructional implications by overall school, grade level, classroom and individual student. |

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will use the Turn and Talk within the math series to enhance the understanding of math concepts through different strategies. During grade level meetings the teachers will discuss how they will use the resource to give students a deeper understanding of the mathematical concept. The strategy will then be discussed in the next grade level meeting and the effectiveness will be monitored through classwork.

| **Person Responsible** | Brandon Carter (carteb2@collierschools.com) |
|---|---|

2. PLC's that have representation from each grade level will work on a fluency program that will support the rising grades. Teams of K-5 grade teachers will research and discuss a standard based fluency instructional learning program.

| **Person Responsible** | Barbara Fields (fieldb@collierschools.com) |
|---|---|

3. Teachers will create a consistent math fluency program per grade level. This instructional practice will correlate with the standards of the grade level and will support the overall school gains of math fluency. Teachers will design the fluency program and create a consistent deliver per grade level across the school. Teachers will monitor for growth. A system of reward of gains will be created by the PLC groups and put into place.

| **Person Responsible** | Barbara Fields (fieldb@collierschools.com) |
|---|---|

### #3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | SWD ESSA Subgroup in ELA achievement went from 27% to 25%. In Math Achievement within the subgroup we went from a 48% to a 41% and in Math Learning Gains from a 51% to a 38%. A contributing factor for last year's low performance was the lack of adequate progress monitoring and differentiation for students in the lowest 25% which also would include our SWD as they fall into the lowest 25%. ELA achievement for our SWD went from 27% to 25%. |
|---|---|
| **Measurable Outcome:** | To be above the 41% Overall Federal Index for Students With Disabilities in the 2020-2021 school year. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Brandon Carter (carteb2@collierschools.com) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Departmentalized high performing math teachers in 5th grade will be in place to better utilize our teacher's strengths for student success. In addition, Resource teacher will be providing additional support in the classrooms for our lowest 25% and SWD students. Administration will meet with Resource teachers bi-weekly to discuss targeted instruction for SWD students and provide specific PLC's for standard based strategies. Within the MTSS meeting process, Data Discussion meetings will take place with planned agenda items and talking points. During these meetings, we will review progress of students who have Student Success Plans as well as IEP's to determine effectiveness of interventions and accommodations. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | During planning we will discuss consistent use of math evidence-based strategies in lesson planning and the use of strategies in the classrooms by administration observations. During data chats, grade level meetings and MTSS Data Discussions we will build a staff community of consistency in common language, trackers and monitoring of student data. All stakeholders will know who the students are that have IEP's and be knowledgeable of their goals and progress. |

### Action Steps to Implement

All teachers who work with students who have IEP's will know the accommodations and use them with fidelity.

| **Person Responsible** | Barbara Fields (fieldb@collierschools.com) |
|---|---|

Resource schedules will be created to allow for maximum support for SWD students.

| **Person Responsible** | Brandon Carter (carteb2@collierschools.com) |
|---|---|

Quarterly PLC's will target specific strategies that are standard based and vetted for SWD students for each resource teacher and classroom teacher who has the SWD clusters.

| **Person Responsible** | Barbara Fields (fieldb@collierschools.com) |
|---|---|

MTSS process will be transparent through weekly meetings in which the MTSS team will discuss each student with an IEP and review their data.

| **Person Responsible** | Barbara Fields (fieldb@collierschools.com) |
|---|---|

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**MTSS Tiers are being looked at from previous year's and data from i-ready taken in consideration. The teacher, Reading Coach, ESE Specialist, Administration and the previous teachers are all being consulted in multiple meetings to discuss the course of action on each student after such a long break. In some cases the targeted instruction is going through change based on the students true combined need of intervention. Parents are being contacted of such changes. Our goal is to really do a deep dive on what the student needs first and foremost. We are working on a leveled system of immediate need with close monitoring of interventions and data.**

## 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.

BCE is in the second year of Leader in Me. We will begin to include the 4 Disciplines of Execution this year. This will develop students as life-ready leaders. We will create a leadership environment by teaching students to lead, monitor and achieve goals, share leadership roles with all stakeholders and empower all learners through social emotional learning and data driven achievement. SAC will be working along side of the PTA to allow for parent involvement in alignment with Leader in Me goals. SACC and the community will also be in support and with the goals of student leadership and implementation of the whole child empowerment of academic and emotional social learning. BCE will work in the framework of leadership, culture and academics to start with adult learning and modeling, teach the students to lead, create the leadership environment and share leadership through action teams and student voice teams. Our positive culture and environment plan through Leader in Me teams will shift the leadership paradigm to produce a high trust school culture where every person's voice is heard and their potential is affirmed.

**Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.