



---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

# Mirror Lakes Elementary School

525 CHARWOOD AVE S, Lehigh Acres, FL 33974

<http://mle.leeschools.net>

## Demographics

**Principal: Amy Bobak**

Start Date for this Principal: 5/6/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (41%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: D (40%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

# Mirror Lakes Elementary School

525 CHARWOOD AVE S, Lehigh Acres, FL 33974

<http://mle.leeschools.net>

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Title I School</b></p> <p>Yes</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>100%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>83%</p>

## 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.**

Mission: Through a safe and positive learning environment, focused engagement, collaboration, and student-centered learning, we will build a community of dedicated citizens who show passion for their achievements.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

To inspire and educate all students for success

### 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
	Principal	
Knight, Tonya	Assistant Principal	
Slichter, Peggy	Assistant Principal	
Wylie, Rachel	School Counselor	
Perez, Daimary	Attendance/Social Work	
Ventura, Allison	Other	MTSS Specialist
DeMeyer, Jan	Instructional Coach	

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Wednesday 5/6/2020, Amy Bobak

**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.*

13

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

54

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (41%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: D (40%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**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	158	139	152	156	167	178	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	950
Attendance below 90 percent	9	25	23	11	10	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
One or more suspensions	0	2	8	1	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	1	7	12	9	14	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
Course failure in Math	2	6	4	5	8	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	13	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

**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	6	7	7	17	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84

**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	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

**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	170	166	181	176	183	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1028
Attendance below 90 percent	38	39	22	28	33	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	187
One or more suspensions	5	8	9	8	8	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in ELA or Math	20	24	30	35	53	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	206
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	71	62	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	208

**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	11	10	7	41	48	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167

**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	2	5	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

**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	170	166	181	176	183	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1028
Attendance below 90 percent	38	39	22	28	33	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	187
One or more suspensions	5	8	9	8	8	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in ELA or Math	20	24	30	35	53	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	206
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	71	62	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	208

**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	11	10	7	41	48	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167

**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	2	5	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

**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%	39%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	56%	58%	46%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	50%	53%	44%	49%	52%
Math Achievement	50%	62%	63%	44%	60%	61%
Math Learning Gains	63%	65%	62%	54%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	54%	51%	37%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	44%	52%	53%	32%	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	49%	58%	-9%	58%	-9%
	2018	45%	55%	-10%	57%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	43%	55%	-12%	58%	-15%
	2018	40%	53%	-13%	56%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	39%	54%	-15%	56%	-17%
	2018	40%	52%	-12%	55%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	46%	61%	-15%	62%	-16%
	2018	35%	58%	-23%	62%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	55%	62%	-7%	64%	-9%
	2018	39%	58%	-19%	62%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				
05	2019	44%	58%	-14%	60%	-16%
	2018	41%	57%	-16%	61%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	41%	50%	-9%	53%	-12%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	37%	52%	-15%	55%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
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	26	36	46	35	57	48	25				
ELL	34	55	62	42	67	63	30				
BLK	39	42	59	48	72	60	35				
HSP	47	48	52	48	63	54	42				
MUL	69			46							
WHT	52	49	69	58	57	42	58				
FRL	44	47	52	46	60	48	40				

  

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	27	37	42	26	46	46	53				
ELL	32	40	40	34	43	41	35				
BLK	44	43	29	34	42	30	28				
HSP	41	48	39	38	44	36	37				
MUL	64			50							
WHT	45	48	42	47	55	47	57				
FRL	43	46	35	38	44	35	36				

  

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	6	22	26	18	37	21	8				
ELL	20	44	47	23	46	38					
BLK	38	52	50	34	41	32	19				
HSP	40	47	40	45	59	41	32				
MUL	46	45		46	70						
WHT	35	36	40	49	52	36	33				
FRL	34	44	43	40	49	36	26				

**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

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
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	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	420
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
----------------------	--

<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
-----------------------------------	--

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

<b>English Language Learners</b>	
----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - English Language Learners	52
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

<b>Native American Students</b>	
---------------------------------	--

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

<b>Asian Students</b>	
-----------------------	--

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

<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
--	--

Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
--------------------------	--

Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
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	58
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	55
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	50
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

Science Proficiency= 44%  
Slow increase since 2015-16 (+11%)

1. Less than 50% of our 5th graders are proficient readers. Students' inability to read and comprehend the questions on the science test prohibits them from demonstrating mastery of the science standards we know many of them were proficient based on spring Compass assessment performance.
2. Of the four original 5th grade science teachers, 1 left in September and 1 in January. Both were replaced with multiple long term guest teachers. We altered the specials schedule for 5th grade by sending them to a science special instead of math lab once a week. Although we made efforts to support the team with a science resource teacher, it was not enough to offset the loss of certified science teachers. We added a science boot- camp in April. We also provided Florida Performance

Coach work-books to the science block & TAG time. Of the 4 science teachers, 2 used the materials with fidelity.

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

We did not decline in any area. However, we did not meet our goal for ELA overall learning gains (1%) or proficiency (3%).

**COHORT DATA**

ELA % Proficient Math % Proficient  
 FY18 FY19 LG FY18 FY19 LG

3rd into 4th 45 43 -2 3rd into 4th 35 55 20  
 4th into 5th 40 39 -1 4th into 5th 39 44 5

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

The largest gap in our performance compared to the state is overall Math proficiency (12% lower than state). We are also 10 points below the state in ELA Proficiency and overall ELA learning gains. The gap however, is closing in all 3 areas. (Trend data shows us closing the gap)

Overall learning gains in math were 17 percent higher and learning gains of the L25 were 17 percent higher. Learning gains of the L25 in ELA showed an increase of 19 percent. As we continue to close the gap, proficiency will increase.

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

ELA L25 gains increased 19% this year. Overall learning gains and those of the L25 in Math also had significant gains (17%).

1. Focused professional development and resource allocation on differentiation of instruction and increasing rigor in both Math and ELA. PLCs focused work around increasing alignment of instruction and assessment to the rigor of the Florida Standards and FSA while at the same time differentiating at the small group teacher table to increase mastery of standards. Standards were re-taught whole group across the grade level as needed and then small group when 80% of the grade level showed improved mastery. Instructional materials were provided that were more closely aligned to the rigor of the FSA (Florida Ready LAFS & MAFS). The amount of time spent working at grade level in whole group, small group, and even smaller group intervention was significantly increased. Informal assessments were added that were much more aligned to the rigor of FSA to increase exposure to grade level standards/expectations. Students need more time to close the gap in reading and improve writing.

2. Teams used progress monitoring data to monitor monthly learning gains of ALL students. Intervention/ enrichment groups were adjusted as students made progress toward mastery of standards. Increased support for students that were not making gains as quickly as others was provided once the grade level showed acceptable mastery of the standard. We “walked” to reading & math to increase gains.

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

1. Attendance continues to be an area of concern despite intensive intervention. The number of students missing > 10% instruction continues to be too high. In particular, the number of students

tardy to school and leaving early did not improve as much as expected for the level of intervention provided.

2. The percent of students reading on grade level did not improve significantly this year. The gap however, is closing as students make reading gains.

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

1. Increase the number of students making learning gains and becoming proficient in ELA.
2. Increase the number of students proficient in Math.
3. Increase the number of students proficient in Science.
4. Increase the number of students in class all day, every day.

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Data indicate less than 50% of our students are proficient in science. Mastery of science standards is vital to student success.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	We will increase the percent of student proficient in science to 51% as measured by the FCAT science test at the end of May 2020.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	David Sanon (davidsan@leeschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Science resource teacher providing hands-on labs and /content vocabulary instruction to grades 4 and 5 during the specials wheel (level 3rd and 4th grade standards). 5th grade standards are delivered in the core science block.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Using high yield strategies in the core block and during science specials increases engagement, and mastery of the standards. FCAT 2.0 data indicate specific clusters for which we need to target instruction.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Schedule 4th and 5th grade into science lab on specials wheel.
2. Increase science instructional time on the master schedule.
3. Purchase "FI. Performance Coach: Science" to be used as supplement to science curriculum during core block.
4. Provide PD around the grade level science standards tested in 5th grade.
5. Develop grade level science vocab lists from the FCAT 2.0 test specs and science standards. Provide PD
6. Provide PD specific to grade level standards, C. Maps and instructional guides (district support).
7. Progress monitoring data from formatives will be used to re-teach standards to mastery as needed.

**Person Responsible** David Sanon (davidsan@leeschools.net)



**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Data indicate 50% of our students are proficient in math. Improving math proficiency for out students is vital to student success.

**Measurable Outcome:** Increase math proficiency from 50% to 54%  
 Increase the number of students making learning gains.  
 Increase the number of students in the lowest quartile making learning gains.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** David Sanon (davidsan@leeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Implement Thinking Maps, distributed summarizing, explicit instruction of vocabulary, and writing to raise achievement in all math classrooms.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Data indicate 50% of our students are working on grade level in math. Hattie and Marzano's research indicate these high yield strategies impact student achievement in significant ways. The only addition to math curriculum we will need to make is a piece to help teachers "spiral" standards across the year, a few pieces to fill in the standards gaps in our Go Math curriculum, and calendar math for kindergarten.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Provide PD in district curriculum maps & instructional guides.
2. Provide PD in Thinking maps and the other high yield strategies from above.
3. Train the kinder teachers to use the calendar math.
4. Train teachers in the ALDs for math.
5. Push in resource support to the students that need support to close the gap.
6. Monitoring of standards based instruction is done weekly: during leadership team classroom walk-throughs, lesson plan review, PLC conversation, and formative data chats. Grade level AP and Principal sit in PLCs weekly and hold monthly data chats with each grade level team.

**Person Responsible** David Sanon (davidsan@leeschools.net)

### #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

**Area of Focus**

**Description and Rationale:**

Increasing the number of students reading and writing at grade level is vital to student success.

**Measurable Outcome:**

Increase the number of students reading and writing on grade level from 47% to 52%.  
 Increase the overall number of students making learning gains.  
 Increase the number of students in the lowest quartile making learning gains.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

David Sanon (davidsan@leeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

High yield strategies: explicit, direct instruction in guided reading, distributed summarizing, writing to raise achievement, and academic vocabulary. These high yield strategies are used in every classroom. The explicit instruction in guided reading is also being delivered in the K-5 learning lab for students in the L25 subgroup.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Student achievement data indicate less than 50% of our students are reading and writing on grade level. Hattie and Marzano's research both indicate the evidence based strategies we've selected are high impact strategies to improve student achievement. We selected these strategies because they can be implemented across content areas by every teacher on campus. They do not require additional extensive curriculum or materials.

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide PD for the high yield strategies (both initial PD in August and ongoing throughout the school year)
2. Provide PD around the FSA test specs, achievement level descriptors, and blueprint test design summaries.
3. Train teachers to build proficiency scales and standard ladders for the ELA standards to increase differentiation and accelerate learning for all students.
4. Implement Thinking Maps across the school. Initial PD in August and ongoing throughout school year. Address cognitive vocabulary of the standards.
5. Train teachers to use the Top Score writing system used in the district curriculum maps and instructional guides.
6. Book study- "Every Child a Super Reader" using student strengths & specific reading behaviors to close the reading gap.
7. Push in resource teachers to support students in closing the achievement gap.
8. Create learning lab where K-5 students in the L25 subgroups will receive additional 30 minutes of guided reading daily.
9. SWD subgroup is receiving additional push-in support. Progress monitoring is conducted monthly within the district formative window using formative assessments and STAR ELA/Early Literacy.

**Person Responsible**

David Sanon (davidsan@leeschools.net)

**#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Discipline data indicate 56 students received a suspension during the 2018-19 school year. Students received 950 referrals. (a 40% reduction from 2017-18).

**Measurable Outcome:** We will reduce the number of students receiving a suspension by 10% and the number of referrals by 20% as measured in CASTLE by June 4, 2020.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** David Sanon (davidsan@leeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** PBIS and direct instruction of SEL standards. Implementation of the House System to support relationship building and PBIS strategies.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** PBIS is evidence based. Data indicate we need to continue to reduce the number of students receiving referrals and suspensions.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Add SEL to the specials wheel. School counselor and Social worker will deliver Sanford Harmony.
2. Add calm down corners to classrooms with posters illustrating self-regulation and coping strategies.
3. Install a "activity circuit" in the hallway to allow students structured "fidget" time to include crossing the midline.
4. Implement the House System
5. Continue to implement restorative practices with discipline and SEL lessons.
6. Implement "Live School" APP school-wide beginning second semester, to provide a simple tool to track data and support the PBIS reward system.

**Person Responsible** David Sanon (davidsan@leeschools.net)

**#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Increasing instructional time closes the achievement gap. Data indicate we have 18% of our students missing 10% or more of school days.

**Measurable Outcome:** We will decrease the number of students chronically absent by 10% as measured in FOCUS by June 4, 2020

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** David Sanon (davidsan@leeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** We will make parent contact for those families tardy to school, leaving early and/or missing an entire day of school.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Offering support to families will help parents understand the importance of good attendance and provide resources needed to get kids in school daily.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers will make contact after the first absence.
2. School counselor or social worker will make contact after the 3rd absence.
3. Social worker will send tardy letters (after 3 tardies in a 30 day period) and attendance letters based on the Board policy.
4. Attendance board in the main office will post daily attendance for students and staff.
5. House points will be awarded to students with improved attendance and perfect attendance each quarter.

**Person Responsible** David Sanon (davidsan@leeschools.net)

## Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**This year there is a Science Resource Teacher specifically to work with Teachers and students by closely working with data, breaking down standards and focusing on the low standards. Math and ELA will focus on standards based on iReady scores during Intervention.**

## 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 and the Annual Title I meeting where 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 attending SAC meetings, family ELL, science and reading nights. They will also have the opportunity to share and analyze achievement and progress monitoring data for all student groups including regular ed, ESE, gifted, migrant, ELLs, L25, educationally disadvantaged and historically underserved, identifying school needs during our SAC meetings, student led conferences and LEP, IEP, 504 meetings. Stakeholders will participate as the result of receiving invitations through the school newsletter, School Messenger, Peach Jar flyers, and personal phone calls. Community/business partners are invited to attend monthly SAC meetings and participate in projects such as the monthly mobile food pantry, fall festival, spring carnival, and various academic family nights. Input from stakeholders will be collected through family surveys, school messenger calls, and open discussions in SAC meetings. These communications will be flexible in format ie: online surveys, in person discussions and paper surveys/comment sheets, allowing all parents to give input. Formats will be in different languages and simple terms that parents can easily understand. Information gathered from this data will be used to identify school needs and 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/Title I quarterly meetings where decisions are made as to how we spend 1% set aside for parent involvement, monitor plan progress, and conduct ongoing review of student data. 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: 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
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>