

District School Board of Madison County

Lee Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	16

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

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (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
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 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.

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	16

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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	Yes	95%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	28%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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	
Smith, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	
Douglas, Heather	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Christi Minor

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.*

0

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

15

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (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
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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	37	30	39	31	35	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	191
Attendance below 90 percent	2	5	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	4	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	8	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/21/2020

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	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

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	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

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	
	(0)	(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%	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					
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	

ESSA Federal Index	
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%	0
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%	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	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	

Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	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.

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 their iReady diagnostic.

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

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. Achievement of black students increase
5. Improvement in 5th Grade Science Scores

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In the 2019 data, the math achievement and gains dropped. The most noticeable drop was in 5th grade math.
Measurable Outcome:	Math proficiency - 75% Math Gains - 60% Math Lower 25% Gains - 60%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amanda Brown (amanda.brown@mcsbfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	iReady toolbox - targeting specific math deficiencies in students Math Fluency
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The iReady toolbox provides resources that targets specific skills prescribed by the iReady diagnostic assessment on each student. This allows the teacher to address the student's most specific need.

Action Steps to Implement

Small Group Math time - using the iReady toolbox to target specific needs
Math fluency sprints

Person Responsible Amanda Brown (amanda.brown@mcsbfl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Teachers know who their lower quartile students are and those target group of students that need the most interventions.

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.

Lee Elementary School relies on the support of our community and stakeholders. This year we will be striving to meet virtually with our stakeholders to ensure that they continue to be able to make a contribution to our school environment even though they may not be able to physically be in our school building. The community and our stakeholders continue to provide resources and support to our students even during the pandemic. They understand that their contributions are making positive impacts on our school and our students.

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

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00