Allen Park Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Allen Park Elementary School

3345 CANELO DR, Fort Myers, FL 33901

http://alp.leeschools.net//

Demographics

Principal: Melissa Booth

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2014

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
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* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (57%)
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 Lee 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

Allen Park Elementary School

3345 CANELO DR, Fort Myers, FL 33901

http://alp.leeschools.net//

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	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	78%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee 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.

A high performing school community inspiring high performing lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Today's Learners...Tomorrow's Leaders

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
		Lisa Eastridge - Principal; Collaborates with Fifth-Grade PLCs Dana Philpott - Assistant Principal; Collaborates with Third-Grade PLCs Terrance Siler - Dean of Discipline; Collaborates with Second-Grade PLCs Amy Holik - Reading Specialist/Testing Coordinator/Literacy Contact; Collaborates with ELA PLCs Sue Patti- Guidance Counselor- Collaborates with special area PLCs Stefanie DeMichele - 3-5 Reading Resource Teacher; Collaborates with Fourth-Grade PLCs Shelley Endrey- K-2 Reading Coach, Collaborates with Kindergarten and First grade PLCs Courtney Black- Science Coach, Collaborates with grades 4 and 5 PLCs Grade/Department-Level Chairs: Kindergarten: Patti Blanchard First: Amy Dunkel Second: Pascilla Gleason Third: Laura DeProfio Fourth:Valerie Tackney Fifth: Kirk Swope ESE: Renee Wagner-Pachiva
Eastridge, Lisa	Principal	Lisa Eastridge is the Instructional Leader of the school. She works with her administrative and leadership team as on form of communication with the staff. The Assistant Principal, Dana Philpott works with new teachers, scheduling, discipline, and ordering curriculum. Terrance Siler serves to support the behavior choices and discipline needs of students. Amy Holik works with ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies based questions. She also serves as the liaison between Allen Park Elementary and the Curriculum Department at the District Office. As the liaison between the Curriculum Department and District Office, she serves as the contact with the Leading and Learning Teams for each grade level and department. The Leading and Learning Teams facilitate the Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). Amy assists with test-administrator responsibilities, as well. Sue Patti teaches classes, guides the implementation of the Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) and character education systems at Allen Park Elementary, and counsels with students referred to her and connects families with community resources to meet their individual needs. She works with various stakeholders to support behavior, mental health, and socioeconomic needs. Sue is the member of the Mental-Health Team who is present on campus full time. Kelly Scibilia serves as the Intervention Specialist, as well as the English Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) Coordinator. She works with teachers and parents to monitor student progress through data and the Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) to facilitate the Problem-Solving Team (PST) Meetings. She monitors our ESOL students to provide feedback to teachers on resources and accommodations available to service our students. Kelly also collaborates with our School-Social Worker to monitor and support our students with attendance concerns. Stefanie DeMichele, 3-5 Reading Resource Teacher, works with our student receiving intensive reading interventions within the fourth- and fifth-grade levels. She collaborates with teachers and students regarding student progress. Stefanie coaches teachers with reading

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		instruction and implementation of reading initiatives. Shelley Endrey, K-2 reading coach works with the district in providing ELA initiatives with fidelity in grades K-2. Grade-level Chairs serve as one avenue of communication between administration and grade-level team members. They represent the initial point of contact for grade-level team members to reach out to for support. They also serve to support new teachers in their grade level acclimating to the school. Grade-Level/Subject-Area PLCs are facilitated by the Leading and Learning Teams, who also meet monthly with the Reading Specialist for vertical PLCs. The Leadership Team participates in the various PLCs, as noted by Leadership team members' names above. This serves as another means for building communication between the Leadership Team, Administrative Team, and the different grade levels and subject areas. Within the PLC meetings, student-performance data is reviewed and used to drive instruction. In addition, grade levels meet with administration on a monthly basis to address questions, concerns, and review data to further drive instruction and general approaches to supports for teachers and students.
Patti, Susan	School Counselor	
Siler, Terrance	Dean	
Holik, Amy	Instructional Coach	
Philpott, Dana	Assistant Principal	
Endrey, Shelley	Instructional Coach	
Blanchard, Patti	Teacher, K-12	Grade Chair
DeMichele, Stefanie	Instructional Coach	3-5 Coach ELA
Gleason, Priscilla	Teacher, K-12	
Tackney, Valerie	Teacher, K-12	
Ellinger, Susan		

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/1/2014, Melissa Booth

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.*

1

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

56

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	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* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (57%)
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	138	138	159	133	144	143	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	855
Attendance below 90 percent	12	14	17	15	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	1	4	3	3	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	5	14	16	10	33	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
Course failure in Math	5	7	9	8	13	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	14	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	13	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

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	5	11	12	10	30	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90

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	6	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 10/24/2020

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	41	29	13	29	38	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	201
Attendance below 90 percent	9	3	1	5	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	11	30	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83

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	41	29	13	29	38	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	201

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	3	1	12	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	41	29	13	29	38	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	201
Attendance below 90 percent	9	3	1	5	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	11	30	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83

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	41	29	13	29	38	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	201

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	3	1	12	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	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%	57%	57%	66%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	56%	58%	57%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	50%	53%	47%	49%	52%
Math Achievement	62%	62%	63%	72%	60%	61%
Math Learning Gains	60%	65%	62%	65%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	25%	54%	51%	41%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	61%	52%	53%	64%	51%	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	56%	58%	-2%	58%	-2%
	2018	59%	55%	4%	57%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	55%	8%	58%	5%
	2018	65%	53%	12%	56%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	60%	54%	6%	56%	4%
	2018	62%	52%	10%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	57%	61%	-4%	62%	-5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	66%	58%	8%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison	-9%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	62%	1%	64%	-1%
	2018	58%	58%	0%	62%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison	5%					
Cohort Comparison	-3%					
05	2019	52%	58%	-6%	60%	-8%
	2018	63%	57%	6%	61%	2%
Same Grade Comparison	-11%					
Cohort Comparison	-6%					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	58%	50%	8%	53%	5%
	2018	66%	52%	14%	55%	11%
Same Grade Comparison	-8%					
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	19	53	48	28	51	33	29				
ELL	39	50	46	50	45	17	24				
ASN	92	94		96	94						
BLK	39	49	35	39	47	19	34				
HSP	51	55	47	52	56	33	44				
MUL	79			57							
WHT	84	69	50	82	70		83				
FRL	50	55	43	49	52	22	49				
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	29	25	20	37	28	5	38				
ELL	31	53	45	45	39	40	43				
ASN	97	84		97	74						
BLK	46	38	38	40	26	15	44				
HSP	48	50	46	55	34	22	47				
MUL	64	50		60	50						
WHT	83	67	38	83	59	36	83				

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
FRL	50	46	36	52	35	18	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	22	43	50	32	51	43	15				
ELL	26	50	62	40	48	47					
ASN	97	86		97	81		93				
BLK	42	44	45	44	48	38	31				
HSP	55	57	61	66	68	55	56				
MUL	70			70							
WHT	80	59	29	85	68	32	73				
FRL	55	51	48	57	56	40	43				

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	56
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	76
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	451
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	43
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	94
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
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	51
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	68
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	73
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	49
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.

Science proficiency was 67% on FSA 2018 and dropped to 61% proficiency on FSA 2019.
Math proficiency was 62% based on FSA 2019 and learning gains was 60% based on FSA 2019.
Based on the data, our math proficiency scores have steadily declined. It is a trend. Teachers are using Go math curriculum and progress monitor using STAR Math.
ELA L25 was 43% on FSA 2019 which was an increase from 40% on FSA 2018. This is a rise but is still a targeted area for our school.

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

Third Grade and Fifth Grade Math declined 9-11%. We had a third grade math teacher with medical factors and two students with intensive behavioral needs that affected the learning environment. These students have appropriate educational plans for the upcoming school year.

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.

Math and specifically 3rd and 5th grade had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. We did not have a consistent math fact program across grade levels. We are working as a team to determine our next steps. Class size and influx of students who attended Allen Park for their first year also impacted classroom and learning environments

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

4th Grade math showed the most improvement. They met with district Math Coach and collaborated closely regarding the optimal implementation of the District Academic Plan..

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

Students who missed over 10% of school days
Disruptive Behavior that impacts the learning environment

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

1. Science Gr 5 Proficiency
2 Math L25 Learning Gains with additional focus of support for students with disabilities.
3. ELA L25 Learning Gains with additional focus of support for students with disabilities.
4. Discipline: Disruptive Behavior
5. Attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The proficiency percentage decreased by 6 points between 17-18 and 18-19 school years, as demonstrated by FCAT Science report
Measurable Outcome:	Given collaboration between highly effective Science teacher with documented high scores in Science and colleagues, the 20-21 FCAT Science proficiency scores will reflect a growth in percentage proficient by 3 percentage points (resulting in 64% proficient on 20-21 FCAT Science Assessment).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Eastridge (lisade@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will utilize continuous-progress monitoring of skills and provide a review based upon targeted areas at the end of each unit/concept. Students will be grouped based upon demonstrated performance (data-driven grouping). Targeted-instruction sessions will be created during collaborative planning. Based upon noted needs, differentiated instruction will be provided students to meet independent needs to close any learning gaps. During PLCs and collaborative planning, performance of students with disabilities will be looked at specifically to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses, so that individualized supports may be addressed for students. Teachers will share data with the administration team at the monthly grade-level meetings to discuss the performance of students with specific focus regarding students with disabilities. Maximize data-driven instruction and proven results of identified teacher by collaborating and sharing practices with other teachers. Identified teacher will serve as the Leading and Learning Team member for Science. She will lead fifth-grade Science PLCs. She will share resources, lessons, and best practices that she has used to guide students to learning gains in the past. The fifth-grade and fourth-grade Leading and Learning Team members collaborate on student learning needs between grade levels to reduce and eliminate learning and performance gaps. We will hire a Science Coach that will work closely with 4th and 5th grade students to prepare them for proficiency in the NGSSS assessments. Mrs. Black, our science coach will monitor data, meet with teachers, and deliver engaging hands on science lessons in classrooms. Teachers will be asked to identify the High Yield Strategies being implemented within their Lesson Plans, which are reviewed by the Administration Team. Common planning time is offered for additional partnering on instruction, which includes, but is not limited to the identification and implementation of High Yields Strategies within instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Using data to drive instruction offers the opportunity to adjust instruction based upon learning needs of students. This then translates to students receiving information needed to fill any educational learning gaps or receive enrichment for furthering their knowledge. Both concepts result in learning, ultimately leading to increased student proficiency. Collaborative efforts offer the opportunity for shared successes to be repeated beyond one classroom, increasing the the opportunities for learning by an increased number of students. High Yield Instructional Strategies increase engagement and rigor leading to optimized learning by students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide common planning times.
a) Ongoing collaborative planning (lessons and reviews)
b) Collaborative creation of formative assessments (shared/common assessments)

2. Grade-level/Subject-Area: PLCs - Collaborative review of formative assessments to drive instruction and plan groups
a) Data review, discussion, and planning for targeted-instruction
3. Implementation of targeted-instruction based upon student needs
4. Review of results and summative assessments
a) Grade-level/Subject Area Planning
b) PLCs
c) Grade-level meetings with Administration Team
5. Students with disabilities will be monitored closely, and progress will be shared with the administrative team monthly, or more frequently if needed, to discuss progress.
6. ESE Teachers will participate in grade-level/subject area PLCs in accordance to their caseloads, so they may actively participate in the discussion of performance data and individualized needs of students noted within their IEPs.
7. Monthly grade level with administration team meetings occur to monitor plans in place.
8. Separate grade-level chair meetings with administration are held on a monthly basis to offer another avenue of monitoring plans in place.
9. Science Coach, Mrs. Black will assist in monitoring assessment data and delivering engaging lessons based on the NGSSS assessment.

Person Responsible   Lisa Eastridge (lisade@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math L25 Learning Gains Continued focus on L25 learning gains will strengthen overall student performance and ultimately proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	Given additional supports,(High Yield Strategy Training and a new Math Fact Fluency program) the 20-21 FSA Math L25 learning gains will increase by 5 percentage points, yielding an overall 30% L25 Learning gains.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Eastridge (lisade@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaboration with and district-provided training by approved district personnel regarding best practices and proven instructional strategies in the math content area. During PLCs and collaborative planning, performance of students with disabilities will be looked at specifically to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses, so that individualized supports may be addressed for students. Teachers will share data with the administration team at the monthly grade-level meetings to discuss the performance of students with specific focus regarding students with disabilities. During PLCs and collaborative planning, performance of students with disabilities will be looked at specifically to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses, so that individualized supports may be addressed for students. Teachers will share data with the administration team at the monthly grade-level meetings to discuss the performance of students with specific focus regarding students with disabilities. Teachers will be asked to identify the High Yield Strategies being implemented within their Lesson Plans, which are reviewed by the Administration Team. Common planning time is offered for additional partnering on instruction, which includes, but is not limited to the identification and implementation of High Yields Strategies within instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The fourth-grade team collaborated with the district-math curriculum team the prior year regarding how to best approach math instruction and utilize tools provided. Math learning gains demonstrated by our fourth-grade students was one of our strongest areas when reviewing FSA data. We would like to translate these learning gains across grade levels.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Reach out to district for in-depth training and specific point of contact for increasing math L25 learning gains
2. Provide common planning times.
a) Ongoing collaborative planning (lessons and reviews)
b) Collaborative creation of formative assessments (shared/common assessments)
3. Grade-level/Subject-Area: PLCs - Collaborative review of formative assessments to drive instruction and plan groups
a) Data review, discussion, and planning for targeted-instruction
4. Implementation of targeted-instruction based upon student needs
5. Review of results and summative assessments
a) Grade-level/Subject Area Planning
b) PLCs
c) Grade-level meetings with Administration Team
6. Implement "iReady" Math Program
7. Leading and Learning Team to support optimize use of curriculum map as part of PLCs (houses

multiple resources for remediation).

8. Implement plan-do-study-act (PDSA) cycle with common goal of increasing L25 learning gains.

9. Students with disabilities will be monitored closely, and progress will be shared with the administrative team monthly, or more frequently if needed, to discuss progress.

10. ESE Teachers will participate in grade-level/subject area PLCs in accordance to their caseloads, so they may actively participate in the discussion of performance data and individualized needs of students noted within their IEPs.

11. Students will participate in individualize prescriptive programs, such as iReady, to remediate students according to their individual needs.

12. Monthly grade level with administration team meetings occur to monitor plans in place.

13. Separate grade-level chair meetings with administration are held on a monthly basis to offer another avenue of monitoring plans in place.

Person Responsible   Lisa Eastridge (lisade@leeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA L25 Learning Gains Continued focus on L25 learning gains will strengthen overall student performance and ultimately proficiency. Based upon the ESSA data, students with disabilities are lower than the 41% federal performance threshold. These students are within the L25.
Measurable Outcome:	Given support with and mentors for L25 students and students with disabilities as well as RGR support to teachers from Really Great Reading Model support team, the L25 subgroup will increase learning gains by 4% points in 2020-2021 to 47 points based on ELA statewide assessment in grades 3 – 5.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Eastridge (lisade@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will utilize continuous-progress monitoring of skills and provide a review based upon targeted areas at the end of each unit/concept. Students will be grouped based upon demonstrated performance (data-driven grouping). Targeted-instruction sessions will be created during collaborative planning. Based upon noted needs, differentiated instruction will be provided students to meet independent needs to close any learning gaps. During PLCs and collaborative planning, performance of students with disabilities will be looked at specifically to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses, so that individualized supports may be addressed for students. Teachers will share data with the administration team at the monthly grade-level meetings to discuss the performance of students with specific focus regarding students with disabilities. Maximize data-driven instruction and proven results of identified teacher by collaborating and sharing practices with other teachers. Identified teacher will serve as the Leading and Learning Team member for Science. She will lead fifth-grade Science PLCs. She will share resources, lessons, and best practices that she has used to guide students to learning gains in the past. Mrs. Black, our science coach will lead our school in Science instruction in grades 4-5 by delivering hands on science instruction to upper grade levels and she will closely monitor assessments and data. Teachers will be asked to identify the High Yield Strategies being implemented within their Lesson Plans, which are reviewed by the Administration Team. Common planning time is offered for additional partnering on instruction, which includes, but is not limited to the identification and implementation of High Yields Strategies within instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows ongoing progress monitoring, targeted instruction, and high-yield instructional strategies result in high growth. Increased engagement and rigor through the implementation of high-yield instructional strategies has been shown to positively influence learning gains.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify students with disabilities and L25 students: determine Buddy Systems between identified students and leadership-team members (buddies will meet with individual students for encouragement and support, leadership-team members will provide additional progress monitoring and collaborate with teachers of identified students).
2. Provide additional high-yield instructional strategy training (administrators to provide support and accountability based upon walk-through observations)
3. Collaborate in ongoing PLCs with grade-level teachers and administration to determine any additional needed steps and review results of ongoing-progress monitoring

4. Reach out to district for in-depth training and specific point of contact for increasing math L25 learning gains

5. Provide common planning times.

a) Ongoing collaborative planning (lessons and reviews)

b) Collaborative creation of formative assessments (shared/common assessments)

6. Grade-level/Subject-Area: PLCs - Collaborative review of formative assessments to drive instruction and plan groups

a) Data review, discussion, and planning for targeted-instruction

7. Implementation of targeted-instruction based upon student needs

8. Review of results and summative assessments

a) Grade-level/Subject Area Planning

b) PLCs

c) Grade-level meetings with Administration Team

9. Students with disabilities will be monitored closely, and progress will be shared with the administrative team monthly, or more frequently if needed, to discuss progress.

10. ESE Teachers will participate in grade-level/subject area PLCs in accordance to their caseloads, so they may actively participate in the discussion of performance data and individualized needs of students noted within their IEPs.

11. Students will participate in various intervention programs based upon their performance levels. Program-dependent benchmarks are in place for ongoing progress monitoring.

12. Monthly grade level with administration team meetings occur to monitor plans in place.

13. Separate grade-level chair meetings with administration are held on a monthly basis to offer another avenue of monitoring plans in place.

Person Responsible   Lisa Eastridge (lisade@leeschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Discipline: Reduce Number of Disruptive Behaviors in classrooms. Lowered classroom disruptive behaviors reflects a higher level of engagement and continued instruction time within the classrooms, ultimately allowing for more learning to occur within classrooms.
Measurable Outcome:	Given the implementation of Sanford Harmony, Zones of Regulation, and intentional collaboration between the Intervention Specialist with our Behavior Specialist and Dean of Students, the number of Disruptive Behavior Referrals will decrease from 62 to 59 for the 2020-21 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Eastridge (lisade@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	A Dean of Discipline was hired to build positive relationships with students and provide coaching to teachers regarding PBIS. A mentor program will be implemented with a targeted group of students to further build relationships with students and encourage students with their educational career. The Behavior Specialist will work with teachers and students who are in MTSS tier 2 or 3 for behavior and the implementation of the Zones of Regulation.Teachers will be teaching Stanford Harmony and implementing Zones of Regulation to help students learn how to monitor their feelings and make wise choices. Positive reinforcement will be used to promote a culture of learning and self regulation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Dedicated individuals for coaching and building of relationships will allow for more support to be given to teachers giving them tools to instruct students on how to self regulate their behavior. Curriculum and programs that teach students how to make positive choices and accept ownership for their behavior will enhance students' toolboxes. These areas of targeted focus should lead to stronger relationships, more engaging instruction, informed teachers stronger support systems and decrease the number of disruptive referrals.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Collaborate with Dean
2. Collaborate with behavior specialist
3. Begin Implementation of Sanford Harmony Curriculum (PBIS) - schoolwide
4. Implement Zones of Regulation
5. Increase Positive Behavior Support with "Caught Ya" positive recognitions on morning announcements.
6. Share behavior data regularly with teachers at Conversations with Administration meetings.
5. Behavior Specialist, Intervention Specialist, Dean and Administration meet monthly to discuss subgroups and behavior data.

Person Responsible	Lisa Eastridge (lisade@leeschools.net)

No description entered

Person Responsible	Susan Patti (susanmp@leeschools.net)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Attendance Attendance is instrumental in learning, as students must be present to receive instruction and collaborate to learn.
Measurable Outcome:	Given new procedures to communicate attendance concerns to the school social worker, and monitoring student attendance with our information specialist and school social worker, the school will maintain a 90 or above attendance percentage (18-19: 94%) during the 20-21 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Eastridge (lisade@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Ongoing-progress monitoring by teachers, school-information specialist, school counselor, social worker, principal, and mental-health team in conjunction with collaborating with families to build relationships. Token-based economy will be implemented on random days to celebrate those in attendance on that day to encourage daily attendance.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Ongoing-progress monitoring and relationship building provide a collaborative approach for support and accountability by students and families. Each year we receive new students in Kindergarten as well as all grade levels. We do our best to maintain the awareness and importance of school attendance with all stakeholders.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Post daily attendance records in visible-to-parents area
2. Teachers will complete an electronic form and submit to the school social worker when there are attendance forms.
3. Teachers will call student homes when a student is absent for 2 consecutive days.
4. Develop and implement regular touch base meetings for mental-health team members

Person Responsible	Lisa Eastridge (lisade@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings will continue to identify and determine the best ways to support students and their various needs. Team building activities will continue to be implemented among personnel to increase the positive culture of the school. Ongoing trainings on high yield strategies and rigor will be provided to allow for further enhancement of teachers' craft, based upon teacher need.

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.

Allen Park will host School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings in accordance to SAC guidelines. Parents, family members, community, and personnel are welcomed and encouraged to attend virtually via Zoom due to Covid. We promote participating in SAC through email and school messenger as well as in Google Classrooms. Our SAC meetings will be help five time throughout the year for all stakeholders to participate in dialogue regarding enhancing relationships and supports for students and families. Parents are given the opportunity to provide feedback at our SAC meeting on our SIP and share ideas concerning school wide plans. We will hold a virtual Curriculum Night, a virtual Author's Parade, Storybook Character Day, Title I Virtual Parent Information Meeting, and Student-Led Conferences. These activities will be offered to all stakeholders to attend and participate in. Allen Park and the Parent Teacher Association (PTA) collaborate with community businesses to raise funds and resources to meet the needs of students. Parents and families are invited and encouraged to attend a variety of virtual meetings and events such as Curriculum Night, Meet the Teacher, and Title I involvement meetings. We encourage parents and families to be an active participant in the learning process and educational growth of their children. School newsletters are sent out electronically each month, and agendas, email, zoom, and school messenger are used as a means of communication concerning upcoming events and classroom activities.

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: Science	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00