

The School District of Lee County

Harns Marsh Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 25 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 25 |

Harns Marsh Elementary School

1800 UNICE AVE N, Lehigh Acres, FL 33971

<http://hme.leeschools.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Cynthia Hernandez

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 (47%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (45%) |
| 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

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 25 |

Harns Marsh Elementary School

1800 UNICE AVE N, Lehigh Acres, FL 33971

<http://hme.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 | 85% |

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 purpose of Harns Marsh Elementary is to develop respectful, responsible, and resourceful citizens in a safe and supportive learning community that fosters high academic expectations through collaboration with all stakeholders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Harns Marsh Elementary is to do whatever it takes to empower students to reach their fullest potential by creating a safe, loving and engaging learning environment.

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 |
|-------------------|---------------------|---|
| Garlick, Heather | Instructional Coach | Heather is a PCT who's instructional time is in 3rd grade with retainees. She also supports new teachers and provides PD and coaching for all. She is also the literacy contact for our school. She is also the leading and learning facilitator for 1st grade ELA. |
| Iovine, Martha | Assistant Principal | Marti is in charge of our school safety team. She also serves as the administrator for MTSS and ESOL. In this role she monitors the progress of students in MTSS and ESOL and attends meetings. She also attends PLCs. |
| Yelvington, Cindy | Instructional Coach | Cindy is our testing coordinator and our curriculum specialist. In these roles she coordinates testing schedules and needed accommodations. She also handles curriculum needs such as textbooks and other resources. In addition she is an intervention teacher for 3rd and 5th grade ELA, as well as, part of our safety committee. |
| Zenoniani, Tracey | Principal | Tracey is the instructional leader that collaborates with teachers and the leadership team to set goals and monitor progress towards those goals. Other duties include, studying research and making decisions on adopting best practices and curriculum to meet the needs of students. Likewise, enhancing the productivity of PLCs conferencing with teachers about interventions systems and providing guidance for differentiation. |
| Gibbs, Marta | School Counselor | Marta serves as a school counselor, equity coordinator and GAT chair. Marta is also a trainer for social emotion supports in the classroom. In addition, she serves on the MTSS team to provide strategies and supports for behavior interventions. She also is part of the mental health team at the school, which includes the other counselor, the nurse and the school social worker. |
| Kane, Arlene | Assistant Principal | Arlene is the APPLES administrator and provides support for new teachers. She is also the Title 1 administrator who oversees parent involvement, community involvement, and SAC meetings. She also monitors data and coordinates data in PLC meetings. |
| Pritchett, Alisha | Instructional Coach | Alisha is a peer collaborative teacher who spends her instructional time in 4th grade ELA. She also supports new teachers and is our Read 180 contact and support. She is also the leading and learning contact for 4th grade ELA and provides PD for all. |
| | School Counselor | Lindsay Dunnigan is one of our school counselors. She serves on the mental health team, as well as, our attendance advocate and monitor. She meets with parents and teachers and supports our social emotional training and development. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Cynthia Hernandez

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.*

4

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

46

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 (47%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (45%) |
| 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 | 130 | 115 | 154 | 137 | 156 | 131 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 823 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 10 | 19 | 20 | 27 | 18 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 114 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 10 | 19 | 27 | 45 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 13 | 6 | 19 | 31 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 |

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 | 8 | 9 | 18 | 39 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 113 |

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 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

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 | 152 | 146 | 138 | 179 | 171 | 144 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 930 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 34 | 15 | 18 | 25 | 23 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135 |
| One or more suspensions | 3 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 18 | 12 | 13 | 59 | 69 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 219 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 60 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 191 |

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 | 8 | 3 | 5 | 52 | 57 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 169 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 3 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| 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 | 152 | 146 | 138 | 179 | 171 | 144 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 930 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 34 | 15 | 18 | 25 | 23 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135 |
| One or more suspensions | 3 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 18 | 12 | 13 | 59 | 69 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 219 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 60 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 191 |

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 | 8 | 3 | 5 | 52 | 57 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 169 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 3 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| 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 | 47% | 57% | 57% | 47% | 55% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 47% | 56% | 58% | 50% | 53% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 45% | 50% | 53% | 37% | 49% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 50% | 62% | 63% | 46% | 60% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 52% | 65% | 62% | 51% | 60% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 41% | 54% | 51% | 35% | 50% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 45% | 52% | 53% | 41% | 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 | 51% | 58% | -7% | 58% | -7% |
| | 2018 | 45% | 55% | -10% | 57% | -12% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 40% | 55% | -15% | 58% | -18% |
| | 2018 | 42% | 53% | -11% | 56% | -14% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 44% | 54% | -10% | 56% | -12% |
| | 2018 | 47% | 52% | -5% | 55% | -8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 2% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 49% | 61% | -12% | 62% | -13% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 46% | 58% | -12% | 62% | -16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 53% | 62% | -9% | 64% | -11% |
| | 2018 | 49% | 58% | -9% | 62% | -13% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 37% | 58% | -21% | 60% | -23% |
| | 2018 | 53% | 57% | -4% | 61% | -8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -16% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -12% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 42% | 50% | -8% | 53% | -11% |
| | 2018 | 55% | 52% | 3% | 55% | 0% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -13% | | | | |
| 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 | 3 | 35 | 40 | 21 | 45 | 36 | | | | | |
| ELL | 35 | 46 | 60 | 43 | 56 | 46 | 44 | | | | |
| BLK | 42 | 39 | 25 | 38 | 43 | 36 | 21 | | | | |
| HSP | 47 | 47 | 51 | 51 | 53 | 44 | 49 | | | | |
| MUL | 30 | | | 40 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 58 | 55 | 45 | 62 | 60 | | 59 | | | | |
| FRL | 46 | 44 | 39 | 49 | 51 | 40 | 45 | | | | |
| 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 | 21 | 34 | 30 | 24 | 44 | 53 | 31 | | | | |
| ELL | 23 | 41 | 46 | 39 | 62 | 48 | 26 | | | | |
| BLK | 34 | 34 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 47 | 40 | | | | |
| HSP | 49 | 54 | 50 | 50 | 57 | 49 | 61 | | | | |
| MUL | 10 | | | 40 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 57 | 47 | 50 | 65 | 79 | 67 | 61 | | | | |
| FRL | 46 | 48 | 44 | 50 | 56 | 49 | 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 | 12 | 30 | 23 | 21 | 32 | 17 | 16 | | | | |
| ELL | 23 | 33 | 33 | 25 | 32 | 22 | | | | | |
| BLK | 40 | 46 | 38 | 32 | 46 | 36 | 34 | | | | |
| HSP | 48 | 50 | 40 | 47 | 50 | 36 | 42 | | | | |
| WHT | 52 | 50 | 29 | 55 | 59 | 30 | 46 | | | | |
| FRL | 43 | 47 | 36 | 43 | 49 | 33 | 40 | | | | |

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 | 49 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 61 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 388 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 32 |
| 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 | 49 |
| 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 | 35 |
| 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 | 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 | 35 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 57 |
| 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 | 47 |
| 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.

Math gains for the lowest 25% showed the lowest performance at 41%. Consequently, this component is also one that showed the greatest decline. Contributing factors are:

1. Students in 5th grade took a dive in both proficiency and gains. Two 5th grade teachers left mid-year and one was struck with an illness. This left us at a disadvantage to cover math classes with qualified teachers.
2. There was no defined intervention time for math.
3. Student behaviors led to some students missing class.

This is not a trend. This component varies in performance from year to year

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

Two components show a great decline. First, is science which declined 12 points. Factors that contribute to this are, students' low reading proficiency and teacher vacancies. Additionally, math gains for the lowest 25% declined by 10 points. Contributing factors are: 1. Students in 5th grade took a dive in both proficiency and gains. Two 5th grade teachers left mid-year and one was struck with an illness. This left us at a disadvantage to cover math classes with qualified teachers.

2. There was no defined intervention time for math.
3. Student behaviors led to some students to be missing class.

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.

One component, ELA has the greatest gap when compared to the state average. It is concerning in 2 ways. First, our 4th graders, this group scored below the state average of 58% proficient by 18 points. This same cohort lost 5 points from their previous year. There is not enough data here to determine a trend for this group. However, on another note, most years, school data shows there are less students proficient in 4th grade then there are in 3rd grade. Possible factors could be the total of good cause students that are moving on with a level 1 score and the decreased time spent on interventions. Or, perhaps the correct interventions.

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

The area that showed the most improvement this year was third grade ELA. The new action we took was an extended intervention time in which support was pushed into each class. Additionally, we worked on fluency and word recognition every day, along with detailed standards support.

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

When reflecting on the EWS, data in two areas of concern stand out:

1. There are 201 students left at our school that 2 or more warning factors.
2. There are 41 upcoming 4th graders that scored a level 1 and 38 upcoming 5th graders that scored a level 1.

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

1. Gains in math for the lowest 25%
2. Proficiency for ELA
3. Lowering the number of students on the EWS
4. Increasing Science scores
5. Increase positive behavior strategies

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: This year, we are working towards increasing levels of proficiency.

Measurable Outcome: HME will increase the percentage of students proficient in Science from 45% to 50% as measured by the FY20 State Science Test.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tracey Zenoniani (traceysz@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Science Lab is scheduled for 4th grade every other week and 5th grade weekly. Classroom teachers attend and participate during science lab. Additionally, grades 3-5 attend a science class as a special on the rotation. The science lab/special area teacher has attended multiple STEM workshops offered by district and FGCU and was awarded several grants to purchase both consumables and inventoried equipment for the science lab and teachers to sign out for their classrooms. We have also been trained in and have adopted the Argument-Driven Inquiry (ADI) framework and continue to do so through the Page Keeley inquiries offered through district's adopted workbooks. Science vocabulary will be added during rapid word practice along with Document-Based Questioning articles, targeted with Science content that parallel the Science standards.

ADI Framework is an interactive way for students to participate in preconceived concepts of science in cooperative groups. Learning in a risk-free place to take chances, students are able to move from the misconception to scientific thinking and corrected concepts through self discovery and the scientific process.

Page Keeley is a STEM author and district leader who introduces as the anticipatory set for science standards through probes, reasoning and conceptual change.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Rapid Word Recognition - Instant and rapid word recognition is developed through a methodical, repeated exposure to words. With increased recognition at 90% of a given list before proceeding, students will work independently and with partners to create increased fluency in both read alouds and reading to self. Once students prove mastery of Fry's 1,000 sight

words, teachers will incorporate vocabulary words taken directly from science-based fluency passages and prescribed vocabulary.

DBQ aid students at any reading level to create a strong thesis and support this thesis through provided documents in all subject areas. Grades 4 and 5 will be focusing on non-fiction documents that incorporate science concepts that directly correlate with the Science Standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Continue collaboration of 4th and 5th grade teacher with science resource teacher
2. Continue Labs weekly
3. Continue training of science teacher and 5th grade teachers in ADI and other science training
4. Use CCE data to determine what 3rd and 4th grade standards still need to be reinforced
5. Use specials time to reinforce remediation with 5th grade students

Person Responsible Tracey Zenoniani (traceysz@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: This is an area we did not make gains in this year. We have previously concentrated on making gains with our lowest 25%. While we have made gains, they have not been enough to move the majority to proficiency. If we focus more on the "bubble kids" we will not only make gains, but also meet proficiency. Making gains will also increase our number of students proficient.

Measurable Outcome: HME will increase the percentage of students making a gain in Math from 52% to 60% as measured by the FY 20 MATH FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tracey Zenoniani (traceysz@leeschools.net)

High yield instructional practices adopted by HME will be embedded in lessons; such as numbered heads, distributive summarizing, and high order thinking. These are strategies we have been developing over the last couple of years. PLCs will collaborate weekly on building instructional frameworks with standards in mind. Teachers trained in Cognitive Guided Instruction (CGI) Training - focusing on students' mathematical thinking

Evidence-based Strategy: Data walls will display our progress towards our goals. Students will also monitor their own progress through data binders and make action plans to improve. Quarterly data chats with grade levels and administrators will yield a graphic organizer that will be used to plan differentiation.

Math interventions have been scheduled based on the Math levels of learning, beginning with the bubble students based on last year's FSA scores.

Intermediate math resource teacher and an additional Peer Collaborative Teacher will be assisting in all aspects of Math planning, intervention and resources.

Marzano's High Yield Instructional Strategies: Cooperative Learning and Notetaking & Summarizing have been found to have the greatest positive affect on student achievement. With consistent delivery of these strategies, teachers can expect a total of 51% increase in achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: CGI Training is a student-centered approach to teaching math. By meeting our students academically where they are, our teachers build on students' natural understanding of word problems. The goal is to improve understanding and to increase proficiency.

STAR and Math Formatives - Math STAR assessments and Math formatives will help teachers to efficiently plan for achievement. Acquisition Lesson for Learning has been introduced to our teachers as part of their lesson planning.

Math Coach books will be used with the bubble students during this intervention. Students identified will walk to intervention with the average ration of 1 adult to seven students for 30 minutes each day on the master schedule.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Form groups of students based on levels and needs
2. Intervention provided with Coach Foundations

3. Monitor progress through exemplars and STAR
4. Foundational Coach books will be used with the bubble students during this intervention.

Person
Responsible Tracey Zenoniani (traceysz@leeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | This is the only area we did not make gains in this year. We have previously concentrated on making gains with our lowest 25%. While we have made gains, they have not been enough to move the majority to proficiency. If we focus more on the "bubble kids" we will not only make gains, but also meet proficiency. Making gains will also increase our number of students proficient. |
| Measurable Outcome: | HME will increase the percentage of students making proficiency in ELA from 47% to 50% as measured by the FY 20 ELA FSA. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Tracey Zenoniani (traceysz@leeschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>High yield instructional practices adopted by HME will be embedded in lessons; such as numbered heads, distributive summarizing, and high order thinking. These strategies will increase our success the most. They are strategies we have been developing over the last couple of years. PLC will collaborate weekly on building instructional frameworks (best practices) based on standards with centers serving as individualized needs. To help our ELL students, we will look at their WIDA scores to help us understand what area to focus on, then design language strategies to improve their learning. Wordly Wise K-5 will be implemented with ESOL paraprofessionals to increase vocabulary. Daily interventions will focus on Rapid Word, Six Minute Solution (fluency) and standard-based instruction. Students identified by prescribed inventory will also receive explicit instruction from BOOST and Read 180. Document-Based Questioning (DBQ) training was given to grade 3-5 teachers with ongoing support throughout the year.</p> <p>Marzano's High Yield Instructional Strategies: Cooperative Learning; Notetaking & Summarizing provide the greatest positive affect on student achievement for all subjects.</p> <p>Wordly Wise will be used with ESOL and ESE students- direct, academic vocabulary is the key to reading comprehension.</p> |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>Rapid Word Recognition - With increased recognition at 90% of a given list before proceeding, students will work independently and with partners to create increased fluency in both read alouds and reading to self.</p> <p>Six Minute Solution - This cooperative learning solution pairs similarly skill-leveled students to read age-appropriate non-fiction passages and record fluency progress.</p> <p>BOOST phonics interactive reading tool is a highly motivating program to prepare our students through virtual manipulatives, classroom kits and implementation of writing.</p> <p>Read 180 will be utilized by our identified 4th and 5th graders.</p> <p>DBQ aids students at any reading level to create a strong thesis and support through documents in all subject areas.</p> |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Assess current levels
2. Determine intervention strategies, for example, fluency passages. Read 180 and phonics
3. Resource teachers pull out for intervention
4. Monitor progress with fluency, STAR and Ready 180

Person Responsible Tracey Zenoniani (traceysz@leeschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increased positive behavior school wide increases positive relationships within the school culture. Students who feel safe and ready to learn will spend more time on task. In our zone there are many students who have been affected by trauma. Students in trauma are less likely to stay engaged in academics or build a trusting relationship with adults. We have reduced our number of students being suspended because of alternatives to suspension; however, we are still dealing with difficult behaviors. These behaviors cause disruptions in the class and the lost of instructional time. Therefore we need to work in ways that will increase students time in class and time on task. Close to 3% of our students have chronic behavior issues, many are in the MTSS process. We feel building a positive school environment and educating students in positive social emotional behaviors will increase student engagement in school. In turn it will increase student attendance and the desire to be in school.

Measurable Outcome: HME will decrease the number of students with 2 or more indicators on the Early Warning System form 18% to 16%, as measured by the 2020 EWS.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tracey Zenoniani (traceysz@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We have adopted the Sanford Harmony curriculum to introduce to grades K-2 this year with the intent to include grades 3-5 next year. In addition we have made Social Emotional Skills (SEL) a special in our 8 day rotation for grades K-2. This special will reinforce Sanford Harmony, practice positive interactions between peers, and learn lessons through literature and readers theater. We will continue the practice of "Responsive Classrooms" through class meetings. In addition, we will use a safe spot in each classroom for deescalation and refocus to reengage in instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Sanford Harmony is a curriculum adopted by the district and it meets social emotional standards. We have attended training for the Responsive Classroom and have developed a behavior committee that collaborates with PLCs on the best practices for positive behaviors and building relationships.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Continued behavior committee meetings
2. SEL Special
3. Class meetings
4. Increase student engagement in the class room through high yield strategies

Person Responsible Tracey Zenoniani (traceysz@leeschools.net)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus | Anytime away from instruction impedes a student's progress. According to the Early Warning System 14% of our students exhibit habitual attendance problems. More than 8% of these students are in the grade levels of 3-5 which are our FSA tested grades. |
| Description and Rationale: | |
| Measurable Outcome: | HME will continue to decrease chronically absent students from 14% to 11% as measured by the Early Warning System by June 2020. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Tracey Zenoniani (traceysz@leeschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>As part of our comprehensive plan school counselors will meet with students and their parents to make a plan for increased attendance. We are paying particular attention to the ESSA subgroups that are not making progress and meeting with those families first. If there is a barrier such as transportation, illness or family homelessness, a team approach will be deployed. The team will be composed of: school counselors, administration, teacher, school parent involvement specialist and school social worker will work together to problem solve.</p> <p>As a school we will recognize attendance daily. Quarterly celebrations and prize drawing are also done.</p> <p>We will educate families on research findings about how attendance affects student success. When students miss more than 5 days in a quarter, teachers and parents will meet to make a plan to fill in for lost instruction time. Some solutions could mean using apps such as Compass to practice standards missed or extra homework and practice to be done within the family.</p> <p>Attendance Recognition through PBS is a behavior management system used to understand what maintains an individual's challenging behavior. Desired behaviors are supported by reinforcement in the environment.</p> |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | The Compass computer program assesses students' strengths and weaknesses, and designs a learning path for students who may need remediation or extensions. Teachers are able override and/or customize the learning path based on what lessons students have missed. The Compass program provides direct instruction for students who may have a high attendance issue while motivating them to stay in school. |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Recognizing attendance at each class
2. Celebrate quarterly the students and classes that have the best attendance
3. Meet with families with high absenteeism
4. Meet with families that have 2 or more indicators on the EWS

Person Responsible Tracey Zenoniani (traceysz@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Harns Marsh is targeting our subgroups to close the achievement gap in ELA, for our most struggling groups.

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.

Harns Marsh Elementary values our relationship with parents. At the beginning of the school year, we start with Open House and Meet Your Teacher Night. We distribute and share our school compact and our Title I flyer. During the first month of school, we hold our annual Title I meeting, during which we share our budget, school grade and our school mission. We ask for parent and community feedback regarding the needs of our school. A survey is also handed out that allows for input. We have a Parent Involvement Specialist who's main job is to build relationships and get to know parents. Many parents confide in her as a result of the relationship. We discover there are many families in need of resources. Sometimes, it is as simple as needing food. We partner with the residents of Lexington Country Club. They hold fund raisers, raising money that we use to host Harry Chapin food trunks and supply families with meals during long school breaks. At other times they may need help finding housing or resources for water and electric. We also have 2 school counselors that serve a resource for mental health needs. Like all schools, we also hold monthly activities. Some are academic in nature, while others are meant to build family engagement. To ensure participation we use invitations through the school newsletter, School Messenger, Peach Jar, personal phone calls. We enlist community/business partners through business acquaintances.

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 |