Cape Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Cape Elementary School

4519 VINCENNES BLVD, Cape Coral, FL 33904

http://cap.leeschools.net//

Demographics

Principal: Nicole Osterholm

Start Date for this Principal: 12/3/2012

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
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 Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: C (52%) 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

Cape Elementary School

4519 VINCENNES BLVD, Cape Coral, FL 33904

http://cap.leeschools.net//

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served
(per MSID File)

Elementary School
PK-5

2019-20 Title I School

No

2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate
(as reported on Survey 3)

62%

Primary Service Type
(per MSID File)

K-12 General Education

Charter School

No

2018-19 Minority Rate
(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)

42%

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 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.

To provide a safe and supportive learning community where every student experiences success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We believe that the most promising strategy for achieving the mission of Cape Elementary is to develop our capacity to function as a professional learning community.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Osterholm, Nicole	Principal	*Facilitate implementation of the MTSS problem-solving process in your building *Provide or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development *Assign paraprofessionals, curriculum specialist, and instructional coach to support the MTSS intervention implementation *Attenda Team meetings to be active in the MTSS change process *Conduct classroom walkthroughs to monitor fidelity *Discipline monitoring and coaching *APPLES mentoring *Progress monitoring through school data dashboards *Facilitate data chats with teachers
Sund, Kristine	Assistant Principal	*Facilitate implementation of the MTSS problem-solving process in your building *Provide or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development *Assign paraprofessionals, curriculum specialist, and instructional coach to support the MTSS intervention implementation *Attenda Team meetings to be active in the MTSS change process *Conduct classroom walkthroughs to monitor fidelity *Discipline monitoring and coaching *APPLES mentoring *Progress monitoring through school data dashboards *Facilitate data chats with teachers
Boeck, Shelly	School Counselor	*Lead MTSS Team meetings for behavior *Train teachers in interventions, progress monitoring, and behavior strategies *Maintain log of all students involved in the MTSS process *Send parent invites *Complete necessary MTSS forms *Meets with small groups and one-on-one with students in the MTSS process to receive interventions *Conduct social-developmental history interviews when requested *Leads and facilitates Mental Health team meetings. *Tracks behavior progress monitoring *Lead 504 meetings and monitor student progress *Maintain log of all students involved in 504 process *Ensures students are receiving 504 accommodations *Ensures teachers are aware of and implement 504 plans
Horn, Debra	Instructional Coach	*Model and implement instructional strategies school=wide to improve teaching and learning. *Attend MTSS Team meetings to collaborate with teachers and monitor students who are struggling. *Implement interventions designed by MTSS team for students receiving supplemental and intensive supports. *Deliver and/or support instructional interventions with fidelity. *Train teachers in interventions, progress monitoring, and differentiating

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		instruction. *Keep progress monitoring notes and anecdotals of interventions implemented. *Administer screenings for students referred to MTSS process *Collect school-wide data for teams to use in determining at-risk students *Lead and facilitate PLC meetings to assist in analyzing data to drive instructional decisions *Lead and facilitate professional development * Monitor progress for IEP goals *Curriculum map / instructional guide implementation support
Johnson, Dianne	Other	*Schedule and facilitate MTSS Team Meetings for academics. *Train teachers in interventions, progress monitoring, and differentiated instruction. * Keep progress monitoring notes and anecdotes of interventions implemented. *Monitor MTSS progress trend lines in Castle. *Administer screenings for new and at-risk students *Monitor ESOL students' progress *Ensure students are receiving all testing accommodations during testing and within the classroom *Attend District Literacy Meetings and relay information to administration and staff. *Coordinate state and district testing schedules. *Curriculum map / instructional guide implementation support

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 12/3/2012, Nicole Osterholm

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.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
35

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)	93%
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 Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: C (52%) 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	111	100	113	122	121	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	688
Attendance below 90 percent	21	9	10	16	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	8	6	5	4	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in Math	6	3	0	4	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	1	1	2	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 11/5/2020

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	111	117	103	94	116	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	691
Attendance below 90 percent	8	10	6	5	7	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	1	4	6	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	7	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	16	6	7	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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	0	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	111	117	103	94	116	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	691
Attendance below 90 percent	8	10	6	5	7	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	1	4	6	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	7	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	16	6	7	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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	0	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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%	57%	57%	68%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	56%	58%	55%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	50%	53%	39%	49%	52%
Math Achievement	70%	62%	63%	67%	60%	61%
Math Learning Gains	60%	65%	62%	49%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	54%	51%	36%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	51%	52%	53%	53%	51%	51%

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

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	73%	58%	15%	58%	15%	
	2018	78%	55%	23%	57%	21%	
Same Grade Comparison		-5%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	67%	55%	12%	58%	9%	
	2018	63%	53%	10%	56%	7%	
Same Grade Comparison		4%					
Cohort Comparison		-11%					
05	2019	63%	54%	9%	56%	7%	
	2018	67%	52%	15%	55%	12%	
Same Grade Comparison		-4%					
Cohort Comparison		0%					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
03	2019	83%	61%	22%	62%	21%	
	2018	78%	58%	20%	62%	16%	
Same Grade Comparison		5%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	69%	62%	7%	64%	5%	
	2018	72%	58%	14%	62%	10%	
Same Grade Comparison		-3%					
Cohort Comparison		-9%					
05	2019	62%	58%	4%	60%	2%	
	2018	66%	57%	9%	61%	5%	
Same Grade Comparison		-4%					
Cohort Comparison		-10%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
05	2019	50%	50%	0%	53%	-3%	

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	57%	52%	5%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
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	31	43	29	33	49	44	35				
ELL	42	41	40	53	65						
BLK	56	58		50	8						
HSP	65	49	28	65	58	50	43				
MUL	65	50		63	62						
WHT	71	58	48	73	65	43	58				
FRL	60	47	32	60	48	30	39				
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	25	46	63	27	57	45	15				
ELL	42			25							
BLK	63	67		53	50						
HSP	62	54	50	62	57	46	43				
MUL	58	57		58	50						
WHT	74	64	61	76	64	45	60				
FRL	63	56	48	61	51	41	38				
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	19	29	26	21	29	26	13				
ELL	45	60		27	60						
BLK	53	42		60	50						
HSP	57	55	50	53	44	53	43				
MUL	50			63							
WHT	75	58	34	74	50	24	58				
FRL	55	47	38	54	44	38	44				

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	60
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	100
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	482
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
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	57
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	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	57
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	60
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	59
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	45
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 last 3 years, our data component that scored the lowest was Math Learning Gains of the Lowest 25th Percentile. However, this year our lowest data component was ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% with our Math Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% closely following by 2%. We believe the contributing factor of our Lowest 25% not making learning gains in math is because of the focus on reading with our intensive/lowest 25% students.
After 4 years of data showing that our Lowest 25% students are our lowest performing group, we need to develop a plan to focus on increasing our learning gains for our Lowest 25% students since they are having difficulties making learning gains in both reading and math

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 last year was ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest 25th Percentile from 54% to 38%.

The contributing factors to this decline are ....

*2a/2b students in Read 180 Program and wasn't rigorous enough.

*Had 1 intensive teacher with all IS and MTSS Tier 3 students and out of classroom for meetings a lot.

*4th grade had 1 intensive class with co-teacher model which put 18 L25 students in "meets" classes without co-teacher support and had a lack of structured intervention time.

*Pairing of new co-teacher teams

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.

Cape Elementary was above the state average in each category. The greatest gap Cape Elementary has when compared to the state average is in 3rd Grade ELA Math which is a positive gap between the state's average of 62% and Cape Elementary's average of 83%. Over a 3 year trend, our data always shows our 3rd grade students scoring well above the district and state averages.

Some contributing factors to these high scores, are utilizing our highly effective resource teachers to implement a co-teaching model with our intensive students/classrooms. Having the support for the students and classroom teachers ensures that our students performing in the bottom 25% as well as our lower performing students' needs would be met on a daily basis.

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

Our percent proficient in 3rd grade math showed the most improvement from last year to this year by 5%. We scored 78% proficient last year and 83% proficient this year. This year we had 2 intensive classrooms with resource teachers pushing in using a co-teach model for reading and math. This new implementation helped eliminate the amount of time the intensive teachers were out of their classrooms for MTSS and ESE meetings. Having highly effective teachers and resource teachers working together with the intensive group of students contributed to their success. We plan to implement this model for this upcoming school year for grades 4th and 5th.

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

*Chronic attendance, early sign outs, and tardies.

*Behavior Tier 2 and 3 MTSS students.

*Mental Health Referrals

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

1. Chronic/Excessive absences- 8% of students are chronically absent students (those absent more than 10% of the school year)
2. L25 Math Learning Gains- 60% learning gains and 40% learning gains for lowest 25% students
3. L25 Reading Learning Gains- 54% learning gains and 38% learning gains for lowest 25% students
4. Maintaining 3rd grade proficiency in Math- 83% proficiency
5. Maintaining 3rd grade proficiency in Reading- 73% proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	When analyzing a 3 year data trend, our 4th and 5th grade students are having difficulties maintaining their proficiency scores and making learning gains throughout the 3 years. Each year our 3rd grade students do well; this year for math they scored 83% proficiency and last year 78% proficiency. Our 3rd graders in 16-17 were at 74% proficiency, the following year (17-18) that same group of students scored 72% proficient in 4th grade, and that same group of students in 5th grade in 18-19 scored 62%. In 18-19, our subgroup SWD had 33% proficiency in math achievement and the year prior was 27%.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the percentage of students making Learning Gains in Math from 60% to 62% as measured by the FY21 Math FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nicole Osterholm (nicoledo@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	*Implementation of iReady Math with ongoing professional development K-5th *Quarterly Data chats with teachers *Monthly PLC meetings with Admin during planning period *Increase classroom walkthroughs by administration *Resource teachers providing interventions to all L25 and SWD students each day.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We will continue to implement and monitor iReady Math grades K-5th and provide ongoing professional development. Administration will meet with teachers individually to discuss "Data Dashboards" focusing on student achievement and growth. Administration feels the need for more consistent classroom walkthroughs to inspect what we expect.

Action Steps to Implement

*Provide Quarterly Planning Day for the grade level to plan for the upcoming quarter
*Implementation of iReady Math K-5th grade
*Support teachers work daily with L25 students in small groups in 4th and 5th grade classrooms
*ESE Support teachers work daily with SWD in small groups and provide interventions and accommodations
*Administration will provide feedback to teachers on iReady data
*Administration will provide incentives each week to reward students for meeting weekly iReady goals.
*Weekly Grade Level PLCs
*Monthly grade level PLC with admin to discuss data, L25 students, and Professional Development
*Quarterly Data Chats with admin
* High Yield Strategies will be implemented
*Focus on mastery of standards
*Teachers will develop lesson plans that are rigorous & use data to drive instruction based on student needs and address any areas of deficiency
*Teachers will implement Quality Practices: data folders, student reflection on data, student self-reflection, and goal setting

Person Responsible	Nicole Osterholm (nicoledo@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Cape Elementary decreased ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest 25 from 54% to 38%. The year prior, we increased from 39% to 54%. In 2019, our SWD subgroup decreased their ELA learning gains from 63% to 29%. SWD subgroup increased ELA Achievement from 25% (2018) to 31% (2019).
	The root cause is that students have learning gaps and are missing foundational skills in reading.
Measurable Outcome:	Cape Elementary will increase learning gains in ELA for our L25 students from 38% to 40% as measured by FY21 FSA scores.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nicole Osterholm (nicoledo@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	*Quarterly data chats with administration with individual teachers *Monthly Grade Level PLC meetings with admin *Resource teachers pushing in as a co-teach classroom each day during reading block. *Resource teachers providing interventions to all L25 and SWD students each day. *Really Great Reading is being implemented with fidelity in grades K-2nd and in grades 3rd-5th with students needing interventions to close the learning gap and provide instruction on the missing foundational skills in reading. *iReady will be implemented with fidelity in grades K through 5th. *Read 180 will be implemented with fidelity based on student needs. *Professional Development and Implementation of High Yield Strategies
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The 15% increase from 16-17 to 17-18 showed that having our monthly grade level PLC meetings as well as the quarterly data chats with individual teachers and school leadership was an effective tool to help teachers drill down on data and target specific students and standards ensuring data driven decisions/instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Continue to monitor data closely with PLC leadership team to monitor effectiveness.
2. Teachers continue to meet in PLCs to review data, including iReady, STAR, AR and formative assessments.
3. iReady reports reviewed weekly by leadership team during and reward students for lessons passed with the "Principal Prize Cart".
4. Continue to review individual student progress; remediate or extend learning plans created using tag reports.
5. Quarterly data chats with administration.
6. Students continue to track individual progress in student data folders.
7. Continue student-led conferences twice a year.
8. Implement "Pineapple Chart" where teachers are required to observe a teacher each quarter.
9. Professional Development and Implementation of High Yield Strategies
10.ESE Support teachers work daily with SWD students in small groups and provide interventions and accommodations as stated in IEPs.

Person Responsible	Nicole Osterholm (nicoledo@leeschools.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students who follow SOAR expectations, avoid student discipline referrals both on campus and on the bus and receive all S's in personal development on the report card, are invited to the quarterly SOAR celebrations. The average in attendance for 18-19 school year was 89% (650 out of 692 students). Of the 42 non-attenders, there were 22 repeaters from Q1, Q2, and/or Q3. 13 students missed 2 SOAR celebrations and 8 missed 3 SOAR celebrations. Cape's 3 year trend has an average of 27 repeated non-attenders each school year.
Measurable Outcome:	Cape Elementary will decrease the number of repeated non-attenders from 22 students to 20 or less as measured by SOAR Celebration Summary Reports.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nicole Osterholm (nicoledo@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Positive Behavior Supports system will be further implemented for the 2019-2020 school year. PBIS Committee will meet monthly to discuss strategies, interventions, as well as to monitor data to look for areas of strengths as well as opportunities for improvement. The committee is comprised of 1 teacher per grade level, support personnel, and administration. The committee will continue to plan for school wide recognition of classes as well as individual recognition for students. Staff will be frequently trained for the use of positive behavior supports systems.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	PBIS represents a radical change in thinking about behavior and discipline. Instead of allowing poor behavior to escalate into disciplinary measures, the focus is on teaching and promoting positive behaviors. By building on these positive behaviors, escalations into discipline are reduced. Students who follow SOAR expectations, avoid student discipline referrals both on campus and on the bus and receive all S's in personal development on the report card, are invited to the quarterly SOAR celebrations. The average in attendance for 18-19 school year was 89% (650 out of 692 students). Of the 42 non-attenders, there were 22 repeaters from Q1, Q2, and/or Q3. 13 students missed 2 SOAR celebrations and 8 missed 3 SOAR celebrations.

Action Steps to Implement

1. FOCUS reports, teacher reports, and referral data will be presented at each PBIS meeting.
2. The committee will look at all variables such as time of day, day of the week, location, grade level, and nature of disciplinary infractions.
3. PBIS Professional Development will be given each month based on the needs of students/classes/school.
4. Students in Tier 3 MTSS Behavior students meet with school counselor weekly on skills identified in individual plans.
5. Behavior Specialist hired and works with SWD, and students with Tier 2 and 3 MTSS Behavior plans as needed. Behavior Specialist also works with teachers to assess and improve student behavior.
6. New students to Cape Elementary will attend a "New Kids on the Block" party to meet other new students and learn Cape SOAR Expectations in order to set them up for success and have an easier school transition.

Person Responsible	Nicole Osterholm (nicoledo@leeschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	When analyzing a 3 year data trend, our 4th and 5th grade students are having difficulties maintaining their proficiency scores and making learning gains throughout the 3 years. Our 3rd graders in 16-17 were at 72% proficiency, the following year (17-18) that same group of students scored 63% proficient in 4th grade, and that same group of students in 5th grade in 18-19 scored 63%. The root cause is a lack of active student engagement, rigor, and differentiated instruction based on data driven decisions.
Measurable Outcome:	Cape Elementary will increase ELA Learning Gains from 54% to 56% as measured by the FY21 FSA scores.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nicole Osterholm (nicoledo@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	*Really Great Reading- required K-2nd and 3rd-5th interventions based on individual student needs *iReady Reading Program grades 2nd-5th *Kindergarten is piloting iReady *"Pineapple Chart" implemented for teachers to observe other teachers to improve instruction *Professional Development based on teacher needs with the focus on active student engagement, higher level questioning, rigorous instruction, High Yield Strategies, and differentiated instruction. *Resource teachers providing interventions to all L25 and SWD students each day.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	*Really Great Reading will help us close the gaps and provide interventions with the foundational skills needed for students based on individual needs. *iReady is a rigorous program that mirrors FSA which will help prepare our students. iReady provides detailed reports and data tracking for students, teachers, and administration. There was a true correlation between our iReady scores and our FSA scores. *The Pineapple Chart is a system that allows teachers to invite one another into their classrooms for informal observation. Teachers can chose to observe based on the area they would like to improve or is a weak area. Having it differentiated based on their needs will make it more effective professional development for teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

1. We will do a screening on all students 2nd-5th grade with Really Great Reading to identify individual student needs and provide interventions based on needs.
2. Have afterschool clubs focusing on areas of needs and only invite a targeted group of students to that specific club.
3. Implementation of the Pineapple Chart
4. Review ways to increase engagement with teachers, including Kagan
structures.
5. Place students scoring in level 2B in Read 180.
6. Continue to have school leadership team work with grade level PLCs to implement best practices.
7. Quarterly data chats with administration.
8. Professional Development and Implementation of High Yield Strategies
9. ESE Support teachers work daily with SWD students in small groups and provide interventions and accommodations as stated in IEPs.

Person Responsible   Nicole Osterholm (nicoledo@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Increase administration walkthroughs and provide coaching opportunities as needed.

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.

At the beginning of the school year, families and students will be invited to an open house, during which staff will share the vision, mission, and culture of the school.

Parents, teachers, students, community members and business partners will participate in the comprehensive needs' assessment by having Curriculum Night, FSA Night, Student Led Conferences, Celebrations of Learning, and sharing and analyzing data for all student groups including regular ed, ESE, gifted, migrant, ELLs, L25, educationally disadvantaged and historically underserved, identifying school needs. Stakeholders will participate as the result of invitations through the school newsletter, School Messenger, Peach Jar, the school's Facebook page, and the school's Twitter page.

Input from stakeholders will be collected through surveys and open discussions to continually improve, stay focused on our goals, and meet the needs of students.These communications will be flexible in format such as online, in person or on paper allowing for all parents to give input. Formats will be in different languages as needed and in simple terms that parents can easily understand. Information gathered from this data will be used to identify school needs and to create a plan. Stakeholders will be involved in the design, implementation and evaluation of the school wide plan such as creating and reviewing during SAC meetings. SAC is the driving force behind the Cape Elementary's school improvement process and increased student achievement. The School Advisory Council is a school based group intended to represent the school, the community, and those closest to our students.The group shares responsibility for guiding the school process towards continuous improvement.
We will include time on the SAC meeting agenda for parent involvement, monitoring of plan progress, ongoing review of data, and question/answer/feedback session.

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
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**