Dr Carrie D Robinson Littleton Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Dr Carrie D Robinson Littleton Elementary School

700 HUTTO RD, North Fort Myers, FL 33903

http://lit.leeschools.net//

Demographics

Principal: Monica Broughton

Start Date for this Principal: 1/2/2006

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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: D (38%)
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

Dr Carrie D Robinson Littleton Elementary School

700 HUTTO RD, North Fort Myers, FL 33903

http://lit.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	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	50%

School Grades History

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

The Robinson Littleton Elementary staff, students, parents, and community believe that the education provided should meet the various needs of the people served. The curriculum will change as required to fulfill this responsibility by providing for the implementation of educational programs, instructional techniques, and classroom management systems. Our mission will be accomplished within the framework of the local and state educational goals.

Provide the school's vision statement.

There is a consensus that the education provided for students who attend Dr. Carrie D. Robinson Littleton Elementary School will determine our future role in the community, the character of our society, and the quality of lives of our children. Our students will be provided a structured education stressing strong foundational skills, as well as, a shared responsibility with parents and teachers.

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
Broughton, Monica	Principal	The School Leadership Team at Dr. Carrie D. Robinson Littleton Elementary meets on a monthly basis to analyze school and/or student progress data in order to identify students in need of further support and monitor the progress of students receiving interventions to ensure that the needs of all students are being met. We also look at the needs of our teachers to plan for professional development in order to provide a more effective learning environment. The Leadership Team also attends grade level PLC meetings in order to support the collaborative process for teaching and learning.
Patel, Dharmistha	Instructional Coach	
Giampi, Jenna	Teacher, K-12	
Kirdahy, Marlene	Teacher, ESE	
Moore, Lindsey	Teacher, K-12	
Bush, Kelli	Teacher, K-12	
Warthen, Cynthia	Teacher, K-12	
Sanders, Jeff	Assistant Principal	
Andle, Jenna	Teacher, K-12	
Kayson, Melanie	Teacher, K-12	
Howard, Julie	Instructional Coach	
Carter, Christopher	Teacher, K-12	
Balzano, Debra	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 1/2/2006, Monica Broughton

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

28

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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: D (38%)
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	58	79	78	66	68	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	427
Attendance below 90 percent	3	18	11	3	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	4	1	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	1	1	4	10	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	2	5	7	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	3	6	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	1	2	0	3	2	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	91	90	91	89	70	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	544
Attendance below 90 percent	32	23	14	17	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124
One or more suspensions	3	5	9	6	1	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in ELA or Math	7	8	15	18	21	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	19	29	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92

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	7	7	16	22	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98

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	8	6	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	91	90	91	89	70	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	544
Attendance below 90 percent	32	23	14	17	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124
One or more suspensions	3	5	9	6	1	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in ELA or Math	7	8	15	18	21	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	19	29	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92

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	7	7	16	22	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98

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	8	6	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	50%	57%	57%	46%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	56%	58%	51%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	50%	53%	46%	49%	52%
Math Achievement	48%	62%	63%	50%	60%	61%
Math Learning Gains	47%	65%	62%	59%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	54%	51%	54%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	43%	52%	53%	46%	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	47%	55%	-8%	57%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	41%	55%	-14%	58%	-17%
	2018	38%	53%	-15%	56%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	44%	54%	-10%	56%	-12%
	2018	44%	52%	-8%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	53%	61%	-8%	62%	-9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	51%	58%	-7%	62%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	39%	62%	-23%	64%	-25%
	2018	41%	58%	-17%	62%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
05	2019	43%	58%	-15%	60%	-17%
	2018	55%	57%	-2%	61%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	42%	50%	-8%	53%	-11%
	2018	32%	52%	-20%	55%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
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	24	59		38	53	60					
ELL	22	73		39	60						
BLK	25	47		30	47						
HSP	49	68	92	44	46	59	36				
MUL	20			20							
WHT	57	49	44	57	46		58				
FRL	46	56	63	45	45	37	42				
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	19	20	9	38	50	27	40				
ELL	17	54		33	46						
BLK	27	42		35	37	20	20				
HSP	43	48	47	50	54	64	24				
MUL	50			40							
WHT	47	38	38	54	60	47	43				
FRL	40	43	44	45	52	44	29				

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	13	37	32	26	63	59	35				
ELL	7	36		47	57						
BLK	23	29		35	53						
HSP	44	59	67	52	68	55	33				
MUL	45			36							
WHT	50	50	33	51	56	55	49				
FRL	41	47	43	45	56	59	46				

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	413
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
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	51
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	37
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	57
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	20
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	52
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	46
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.

Based on FSA scores, we increased in all areas except Math. Science increased from 32% to 43%. ELA Achievement increased from 44% to 50%. ELA Learning Gains increased from 42% to 57%, and ELA Lowest 25th Percentile increased from 43% to 68%. Math Achievement decreased from 50% to 48%, Math Learning Gains from 56% to 47%, and Math Lowest 25th Percentile 51% to 38%. Math Lowest 25th Percentile was our lowest performing. There has been an decline trend the past three years for the Math Lowest 25th Percentile (2017-54%, 2018 - 45%, and 2019 - 38%)

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

FY19 data indicated Science increased from 32% to 43%. ELA Achievement increased from 44% to 50%. ELA Learning Gains increased from 42% to 57%, and ELA Lowest 25th Percentile increased from 43% to 68%. Math Achievement decreased from 50% to 48%, Math Learning Gains from 56% to 47%, and Math Lowest 25th Percentile 51% to 38%. Math Lowest 25th Percentile was our lowest performing. Math Learning Gains decreased from 56% to 47%, which was the greatest decline. Contributing factor for a decline in Math Learning Gains was time.

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.

RLE scored below the District and State average in all areas. 3rd Gr. ELA Achievement: RLE 56% and State 58%. 4th Gr. ELA Achievement: RLE 41% and State 58%. 5th ELA Achievement: RLE 44% and State 56%. 3rd Gr. Math Achievement: RLE 53% and State 62%. 4th Gr. Math Achievement: RLE 39% and State 64%. 5th Math Achievement: RLE 43% and State 60%. Science Achievement: RLE 42% and State 53%. This data indicates that 4th Grade Math had the greatest gap compared to the State with a difference of -25%. Math instructional time played a factor.

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

RLE data indicated that ELA Lowest 25th Percentile showed the most improvement. A increase from 43% to 68% from FY18 to FY19. New actions: Implementation of Read180 with fidelity and assigning strong teachers to provide the reading instruction

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

Based on the EWS data the two areas of concerns
1. Course failures in ELA or Math
2. Students with 2 or more indicators

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

Based on the FY19 data
1. Math (all components for all subgroups to include those below the federal index of 41%(Blacks and Multi-Racial)
2. Science
3. Maintaining reading proficiency, however, rdg. proficiency is a priority for Blacks and Multi-Racial subgroups

4. Behavior
5. Attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	FY19 Science proficiency increased from 32% to 43%. However, FY17 to FY18, science scores decreased from 46% to 32%.
Measurable Outcome:	To increase science proficiency of 5th grade students from 43% to 49%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Monica Broughton (monicatb@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	High-Yield Instructional Strategies: 1. Numbered Heads Collaborative Pairs 2. Distributed Summarizing 3. Text-Dependent Questioning 4. Writing to Raise Achievement 5. Higher-Order Thinking
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	High-Yield Strategies are researched-based instructional practices linked to increase student achievement.The strategy supports the student higher-level thinking with the goal of using level 3 or 4 questions on Webb's Depth of Knowledge.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Progress monitoring using NGSS assessments
2. PLC analyzation of data to determine students needs and what to implement to help the students not meeting the expectations.
3. Utilization of the Curriculum Maps and Instructional Guides
4. Research-based High-Yield Strategies will be documented in Lesson Plans
5. Supplement science instruction with lab by a science resource teacher - provided weekly to 3rd-5th grade students
6. Science Vocabulary - usings scientific verbs daily with students
7. Science Parent Involvement Night is scheduled for March 2021
8. Administration will attend PLC meetings, pull data from Performance Matters and see that the Curriculum
Maps are being followed based on walk-throughs and lesson plans.

These strategies will be implemented with all subgroups including black and multiracial.
Monitoring data of every single student including the ESSA subgroup

Person Responsible	Monica Broughton (monicatb@leeschools.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	FY19 FSA data indicated a decline in Math Achievement from FY18. Math Achievement declined from 50% to 48%, Learning Gains from 56% to 47%, and Math Lowest 25th Percentile from 45% to 38%. Students are not practicing math skills at home and falling further behind their grade level peers who are getting the additional practice. The math homework is not being done by many students. Math vocabulary development remains a focus through our Curriculum Maps and Instructional Guides.
Measurable Outcome:	The Math Achievement of 3rd-5th grade students will increase from 48% to 53%, Math Learning Gains of 5th grade students will increase from 47% to 52%, and Math Lowest 25th Percentile of 5th grade students will increase from 38% to 45% as measured by the FSA 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Monica Broughton (monicatb@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	High-Yield Instructional Strategies: 1. Numbered Heads Collaborative Pairs 2. Distributed Summarizing 3. Text-Dependent Questioning 4. Writing to Raise Achievement 5. Higher-Order Thinking
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	High-Yield Strategies are researched-based instructional practices linked to increase student achievement. The strategy supports the student higher-level thinking with the goal of using level 3 or 4 questions on Webb's Depth of Knowledge.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Progress monitoring using i-Ready
2. Utilization of IXL Math
3. PLC analyzation of data collected from i-Ready Math and summatives to determine students' needs and what to implement to help the students not meeting the standards
4. Utilization of Curriculum Maps and Instructional Guides
5. Math manipulatives will be utilized in all classrooms to help students with concrete examples
6. Math Vocabulary will be used daily with students
7. Parent Involvement Night with an emphasis on math is scheduled for January 2021.
8. Teachers will conference 1:1 with students about their performance and goal setting
9. Administration will attend PLC meetings, pull data from Performance Matters and see that the Curriculum Maps are being followed based on walk-throughs and lesson plans.

These strategies will be implemented with all subgroups including black and multiracial.
Monitoring data of every single student including the ESSA subgroup

Person Responsible	Monica Broughton (monicatb@leeschools.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students are not practicing reading and falling further behind their grade level peers who are getting the additional practice. The reading homework is not being done by many students, even just reading each night. We need to increase active practicing of reading during school day to ensure all students have practice time. Vocabulary development remains a focus though our Curriculum Maps and Instructional Guides . Really Great Reading is used schoolwide to support phonics instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	The ELA Achievement of 3rd-5th grade students will increase from 50% to 55%, ELA Learning Gains of 5th grade students will increase from 52% to 61%, and ELA Lowest 25th Percentile of 5th grade students will increase from 54% to 63% as measured by the FSA 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Monica Broughton (monicatb@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	High-Yield Instructional Strategies: 1. Numbered Heads Collaborative Pairs 2. Distributed Summarizing 3. Text-Dependent Questioning 4. Writing to Raise Achievement 5. Higher-Order Thinking
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	High-Yield Strategies are researched-based instructional practices linked to increase student achievement.The strategy supports the student higher-level thinking with the goal of using level 3 or 4 question on Webb's Depth of Knowledge.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Progress monitoring using i-Ready
2. Utilization of IXL & Flocabulary for ELA
3. PLC analyzation of data collected from i-Ready Math and summatives to determine students' needs and what to implement to help the students not meeting the standards
4. Utilization of the Curriculum Maps and Instructional Guides
5. Research-based High-Yield Strategies will be documented in Lesson Plans
6. Focused intervention groups across each grade level to target student need.
7. Reading Parent Involvement Night is scheduled for September 28, 2020
8. Teachers will conference 1:1 with students about their performance and goal setting
9. Administration will attend PLC meetings, pull data from Performance Matters, and see that the Curriculum
Maps are being followed based on walk-throughs and lesson plans.

These strategies will be implemented with all subgroups including black and multiracial.
Monitoring data of every single student including the ESSA subgroup

Person Responsible	Monica Broughton (monicatb@leeschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Disruption and insubordination continue to be the greatest areas of concern, as the actions lead to internal suspension (ISS) or out of school suspension (OSS). Teacher support is critical to ensure students are in the classroom focused on learning. Behavior disruptions negatively impact the student receiving the referral, as well as, the learning environment of all students. Instructional time is lost for all students when behavior escalates, especially for the student removed from the learning environment for any period of time.
Measurable Outcome:	To decrease the number of students receiving referrals which result in an internal (ISS) or out of school (OSS) suspension from 8% to 5%, as reported in Castle, by June 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Monica Broughton (monicatb@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Continue the use of Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports (PBIS) school wide which allows for positive referral recognition and clear behavioral consequences. This approach emphasizes instruction of appropriate behaviors.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	PBIS allows for consistent implementation of school behavior expectations across campus for the majority of our population and the flexibility to work with students who need more support learning appropriate choices in the school environment. PBIS allows teachers and specialists on our campus to work on identifying the specific behaviors to address, establishing goal(s) for change and step(s) required to achieve it, procedures for recognizing and monitoring changed behavior, and the flexibility to choose the appropriate behavioral strategies that will be most effective for students with higher need.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Communicate school wide behavior expectations to staff (Preschool 2020) and students (Aug/Sept. 2020).
2. Implement use of daily behavior chart throughout campus for grades K-2. Class Dojo will be used 3-5 for monitoring daily behavior.
3. Utilize counselor to strengthen mentor system and focus on proactive approach to meeting with mentor; the counselor will be the liaison between the teacher, student, and mentor to help improve student behavior.
4. Continue monthly No Referral Incentive celebrations, Principal's Party & PRIDE tickets
5. Implement "Handle with Care" system for private communication of students in need.

Person Responsible	Monica Broughton (monicatb@leeschools.net)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on FY20 data, our attendance dropped to 92.82%.
Measurable Outcome:	To increase the school wide attendance from 92.82% to 93.82% as measured by the District Support Application System: Attendance Percentage Comparison Report, by June 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Monica Broughton (monicatb@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Focus on students identified as chronically absent (more than 5 days absent), at each grade level, as identified by the EWS. The social worker will work closely with the school to determine the "why" school is often missed. For those identified as "at risk" (2 days per month), a team comprised of the information specialist, counselor, school nurse, Intervention Support Specialist, and admin will work to determine the "why" and help the family overcome the barrier. Guidance from the social worker will be solicited for those at risk.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	A child's attendance is vital to their success in school. The overall attendance rate dropped slightly during FY20. We, as a school, will work together to determine what the barriers are to getting our students to school. By doing so, we will be able to put a plan of action in place for those who are chronically absent. As a result, students will not miss so much time of direct instruction from the teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

1. identify those who are chronically absent
2. monitor their attendance weekly
3. contact parents/guardians using letters, phone calls, and teachers
4. promote daily attendance via morning announcements and via newsletters
5. use daily perfect attendance hangers on doors to promote attendance and announce during live news.

Person Responsible	Monica Broughton (monicatb@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

NA

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, parents and students are invited to Meet Your Teacher, School Advisory Committee (SAC) and Annual Title I meeting where staff shares the vision, mission, and culture of the school.

Analyzation of data for all student groups to include regular ed, ELL, ESE, L25, and FRL, is shared with faculty and staff in addition to SAC which is comprised of parents, faculty, community members, and business partners at the beginning of the school year and also at the end of each quarter. This is done to monitor the progress of student performance and to determine what adjustments may be needed and what areas to celebrate. Also, throughout the school year, curriculum and parent involvement events are held with a focus on reading, math, and Science. Parents receive their child's progress monitoring report to include strategies to use to help their child be successful.

Communication to families about school events are provided via newsletters, School Messenger, school's weekly communication folder, marquee, flyers, and the website. To ensure that we have community and business partners as stakeholders, they are extended the opportunity to be a part of the School Advisory Council and/or mailed a letter requesting their partnership. Input from stakeholders is collected through surveys after parent involvement events and during SAC meetings. The administration has an open door policy, thus parents and other stakeholders are able to communicate in person of their suggestions and/or concerns. Relationship-building is a clear priority for all faculty and staff members. A variety of methods are used to set a positive tone and clarify the values that will guide interpersonal interaction between students and between the teacher and students starting with day one and continues throughout the school year. Strategies to increase family engagement are included in the PFEP.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Science				$64,581.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0791 - Dr Carrie D Robinson Littleton Elementary	Title, I Part A	1.0	$64,581.00
			Notes: The budget includes a Science resource teacher to support and strengthen the instruction of Science and to afford students with hands-on opportunities in a lab & outdoor learning experiences for the purpose of increasing proficiency. The teacher will work			

		collaboratively with grade level teachers so that the labs and lesson align with the standards taught in the gen ed classrooms.				
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Math**				**$47,671.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0791 - Dr Carrie D Robinson Littleton Elementary	Title, I Part A	0.5	$42,671.00
		Notes: Funds allocated for a peer collaborative teacher to support and coach classroom teachers.				
	5100	311-Subagreements up to $25,000	0791 - Dr Carrie D Robinson Littleton Elementary	Title, I Part A		$5,000.00
		Notes: to provide additional instruction to targeted students after the regular school day				
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: ELA**				**$47,671.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0791 - Dr Carrie D Robinson Littleton Elementary	Title, I Part A	0.5	$42,671.00
		Notes: Funds allocated for a peer collaborative teacher to support and coach classroom teachers.				
	5100	311-Subagreements up to $25,000	0791 - Dr Carrie D Robinson Littleton Elementary	Title, I Part A		$5,000.00
		Notes: to provide additional instruction to targeted students after the regular school day				
4	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline**				**$0.00**
5	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$159,923.00**