

The School District of Lee County

Pelican 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	13
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	24

Pelican Elementary School

3525 SW 3RD AVE, Cape Coral, FL 33914

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

Demographics

Principal: Clinton Garlick

Start Date for this Principal: 10/26/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	99%
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: B (56%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (55%)
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	13
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Pelican Elementary School

3525 SW 3RD AVE, Cape Coral, FL 33914

<http://pel.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	No	76%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	48%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Through the collaborative efforts of parents, staff, students, and the community, Pelican Elementary develops the emotional, social, academic, and physical potential of every student, enabling them to be respectful, responsible learners achieving their highest potentials.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pelican Elementary is a safe, secure, child-centered school which provides the foundation for a career and college readiness for every child.

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
Carter, Edwin	Principal	Provides leadership in developing, coordinating, implementing, and evaluating school instructional and extra-curricular programs. The Leadership Team consists of at least 1 member from each grade level. Each teacher in Leadership leads Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) in their grade level to guide and drive student success. Creates a positive school climate and a culture of collaboration and shared responsibility within the school. Organizes and provides staff development opportunities for all members of the school community. Facilitates parent involvement in the school community. Works collaboratively with teams and/or individuals to gather input for decision making. Supports the district's Vision 2030 Plan and school SEL initiatives.
Young, Kelly	Instructional Coach	Supports all Grades 3-5 instructional staff with English Language Arts, analyzes data and monitors student achievement. Works collaboratively with teams and/or individuals to gather input for decision making. Our ELA Coach actively work with targeted groups of students. She also model research-based instructional practices for staff both in the classroom with students and as a part of our continuous professional development program. Our ELA Instructional Coach is also our ELL Contact and supports teachers of English Language Learners with instruction, analyzes data and monitors student achievement. Works collaboratively with teams and/or individuals to gather input for decision making based on program needs and individual student needs
Lowry, Diana	Teacher, K-12	As a School Leadership Team member, actively represents SLT focus to grade levels. The teacher also creates a positive school climate and a culture of collaboration and shared responsibility within the grade level team. Supports the grade level instructional team with English Language Arts and math instruction, analyzes progress monitoring data and monitors grade level student achievement. Works collaboratively with the team and/or individuals to gather input for decision making.
Tolson, Larissa	Teacher, K-12	As a School Leadership Team member, actively represents SLT focus to grade levels. The teacher also creates a positive school climate and a culture of collaboration and shared responsibility within the grade level team. Supports the grade level instructional team with English Language Arts and math instruction, analyzes progress monitoring data and monitors grade level student achievement. Works collaboratively with the team and/or individuals to gather input for decision making.
Nicol, Anne Marie	School Counselor	Assists the Principal in maintaining a positive school climate and culture of collaboration and shared responsibility with the school. Serves as on-staff resource with expertise in student services and Social Emotional Learning supports. Works collaboratively with teams and/or individuals to gather input for decision making. Supports district's Vision 2030 plan and school SEL initiatives.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wills, Karen	Assistant Principal	Manages school operations in the absence of the Principal. Provides leadership to teachers and team leaders concerning instructional programs. Assists the Principal in the supervision of all school programs. Is a member of the Leadership Team and works to create literacy leaders within the school, strives to acquire knowledge in the area of literacy, supports and guides teams for ongoing collaboration. Seeks input from stakeholders before making decisions and works collaboratively with school staff. Supports the district's Vision 2030 plan and school SEL initiatives.
Autrey, Eveleen	Teacher, K-12	As a School Leadership Team member, actively represents SLT focus to grade levels. The teacher also creates a positive school climate and a culture of collaboration and shared responsibility within the grade level team. Supports the grade level instructional team with English Language Arts and math instruction, analyzes progress monitoring data and monitors grade level student achievement. Works collaboratively with the team and/or individuals to gather input for decision making.
Dwyer, Melinda		As a School Leadership Team member, actively represents SLT focus to grade levels. The teacher also creates a positive school climate and a culture of collaboration and shared responsibility within the grade level team. Supports the grade level instructional team with English Language Arts and math instruction, analyzes progress monitoring data and monitors grade level student achievement. Works collaboratively with the team and/or individuals to gather input for decision making.
Johnson, Maria	Teacher, K-12	As a School Leadership Team member, actively represents SLT focus to grade levels. The teacher also creates a positive school climate and a culture of collaboration and shared responsibility within the grade level team. Supports the grade level instructional team with English Language Arts and math instruction, analyzes progress monitoring data and monitors grade level student achievement. Works collaboratively with the team and/or individuals to gather input for decision making.
Holmes, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	As a School Leadership Team member, actively represents SLT focus to grade levels. The teacher also creates a positive school climate and a culture of collaboration and shared responsibility within the grade level team. Supports the grade level instructional team with English Language Arts and math instruction, analyzes progress monitoring data and monitors grade level student achievement. Works collaboratively with the team and/or individuals to gather input for decision making.
Ritter, Renee	Teacher, K-12	As a School Leadership Team member, actively represents SLT focus to grade levels. The teacher also creates a positive school climate and a culture of collaboration and shared responsibility within the grade level team. Supports the grade level instructional team with English Language Arts and math instruction, analyzes progress monitoring data and monitors grade level

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		student achievement. Works collaboratively with the team and/or individuals to gather input for decision making.
Wallace, Courtney	Other	As a School Leadership Team member, actively represents SLT focus to grade levels. The teacher also creates a positive school climate and a culture of collaboration and shared responsibility within the teachers throughout the school. Supports the each grade level with behavioral functions, analyzes progress monitoring data and monitors grade level student achievement. Works collaboratively with the team and/or individuals to gather input for decision making.
Rasner, Gregory	Teacher, ESE	As a School Leadership Team member, actively represents SLT focus to grade levels. The teacher also creates a positive school climate and a culture of collaboration and shared responsibility within the grade level team. Supports the grade level instructional team with English Language Arts and math instruction, analyzes progress monitoring data and monitors grade level student achievement. Works collaboratively with the team and/or individuals to gather input for decision making.
Costa, Breanne	Instructional Coach	Supports all K-2 instructional staff with English Language Arts, analyzes data and monitors student achievement. Works collaboratively with teams and/or individuals to gather input for decision making. Our Primary Literacy Coach actively work with targeted groups of students. She also model research-based instructional practices for staff both in the classroom with students and as a part of our continuous professional development program.
Wood, Courtney	Instructional Coach	Supports all instructional staff with Mathematics, analyzes data and monitors student achievement. Works collaboratively with teams and/or individuals to gather input for decision making. Our Math Coach actively work with targeted groups of students. She also model research-based instructional practices for staff both in the classroom with students and as a part of our continuous professional development program. Our Math Instructional Coach also assists with our ELL Contact and supports teachers of English Language Learners with instruction, analyzes data and monitors student achievement. Works collaboratively with teams and/or individuals to gather input for decision making based on program needs and individual student needs

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 10/26/2020, Clinton Garlick

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

41

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	99%
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: B (56%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (55%)
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	129	125	136	128	118	163	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	799
Attendance below 90 percent	3	3	9	6	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	1	2	5	7	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	7	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	1	2	6	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	149	149	148	175	146	178	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	945
Attendance below 90 percent	22	10	16	17	27	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108
One or more suspensions	1	4	0	6	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA or Math	6	4	15	31	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	35	31	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104

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	4	1	3	22	12	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

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

Prior Year - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	149	149	148	175	146	178	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	945
Attendance below 90 percent	22	10	16	17	27	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108
One or more suspensions	1	4	0	6	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA or Math	6	4	15	31	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	35	31	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104

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	4	1	3	22	12	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data**

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	61%	57%	57%	61%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	56%	58%	59%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	50%	53%	59%	49%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	61%	62%	63%	66%	60%	61%
Math Learning Gains	59%	65%	62%	65%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	54%	51%	57%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	59%	52%	53%	61%	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	63%	58%	5%	58%	5%
	2018	57%	55%	2%	57%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	55%	3%	58%	0%
	2018	57%	53%	4%	56%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	62%	54%	8%	56%	6%
	2018	62%	52%	10%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	58%	61%	-3%	62%	-4%
	2018	57%	58%	-1%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	65%	62%	3%	64%	1%
	2018	66%	58%	8%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	58%	58%	0%	60%	-2%
	2018	55%	57%	-2%	61%	-6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	57%	50%	7%	53%	4%
	2018	63%	52%	11%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
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	43	58	25	37	40	32				
ELL	40	52	41	40	57	38	33				
ASN	80			90							
BLK	36	52	50	43	48		36				
HSP	58	53	55	58	63	52	51				
MUL	69			38							
WHT	65	57	44	65	59	39	64				
FRL	55	51	52	54	52	44	55				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	29	49	53	30	58	56	31				
ELL	35	50	40	46	52	42					
BLK	19	40		29	36						
HSP	56	49	50	56	47	44	55				
MUL	64	64		50	45						
WHT	63	56	55	65	47	37	70				
FRL	55	50	54	54	47	42	58				
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	17	50	57	42	71	77	40				
ELL	44	76	80	48	70						
BLK	27			27							
HSP	59	67	58	61	65	63	63				
MUL	53	30		71							

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
WHT	65	57	61	71	65	50	60				
FRL	55	63	64	60	65	64	65				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	450
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	45
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	85
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
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	54
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	56
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	53
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 Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%. This was the lowest performance with 45%, but it did increase from the prior year by 4 points. Last year was at 41%. The increase could be due to the fact that we added a Math Coach to our staff and offered After School Math tutoring to the L25 students. We still have much work to do.

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

ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%. This dropped 7 points from the previous year. Last year was at 57% and this year we are at 50%. This year, there was a focus on Math. We did not offer ELA tutoring until the third quarter of school.

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.

3rd Grade Math 4 points lower than the state. 3rd Grade teachers concentrated on ELA during school time. They offered intervention in Reading, but did not in Math.

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

Math Learning demonstrated an increase of 13 points from last year. Last year, it was 46% and this year was 59%. We had after school tutoring in this area. We also added a Math Coach to our school staff.

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

The number of students scoring Level 1 on the FSA Assessment is a total of 104 students out of a total of 499 students in grades 3/4/5. This is a total of 20.8% of Pelican FSA students scoring a Level 1 on the FSA Assessment. This is a targeted area of growth for Pelican Elementary as both curriculum and instructional systems have been modified to provide intensive supports toward this goal.

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

1. ELA lowest 25%
2. Math lowest 25%
3. Science Proficiency
4. ESSA- Students with Disabilities under 41%
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: This Area of Focus was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. The data demonstrated that our Science proficiency scores decreased 64% in FY18 to 59% in FY19.

Measurable Outcome: Increase Science proficiency scores from 59% to 64% in FY20.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Edwin Carter (edwinlc@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Implement a hands on approach to science learning.
2. Implement PSEL in 5th grade.
3. Increase instructional time K-5 in science
4. Implement the district Scope and Sequence
5. Implement the district Instructional Guides
6. Administrative walkthroughs
7. PLC discussions in grades 3-5 to unpack the science standards
8. Communication between grade levels of science standards that need to be taught and sharing best practices.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The rationale for selecting the strategies is that, according to Hattie's Effect Size, each one has the potential to accelerate student achievement at a HIGH rate (.30-.69) or considerably accelerate student achievement at a SUPER HIGH rate (.70 and above)

Hands on Learning- .30 Effect Size
 Scaffolding- .82 Effect Size
 High Level of Student Engagement- .49 Effect Size
 Curriculum Maps and Instructional Guides .64 Effect Size

Action Steps to Implement

1. Discussion with all instructional staff of the science data trend
2. Training on PSEL for teachers
3. Develop the Master Schedule to provide for daily Science block for all students (minutes of instruction)
4. K-5 grade level PLC discussions on the science standards, scope and sequence and instructional guides.
5. Continuous professional development and conversations around High Yield Instructional Strategies

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This Area of Focus was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. The data demonstrated that while our Math L25 learning gains scores increased 4% from 41% in FY18 to 45% in FY19 this is still significantly below the district (54%) and state (51%).
Measurable Outcome:	Increase Learning Gains for Math L25 students 45% to 50% in FY 20.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Edwin Carter (edwinlc@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>-School-wide intervention and enrichment time will be provided for all students K-5 five days per week. Additional instructional supports will be provided to every grade level both during intervention time and during the instructional day to targeted groups of students in math.</p> <p>-PLC Data meetings with instructional staff for the purpose of immediate progress monitoring will ensure the right students are receiving the intended supports.</p> <p>-Math Grade Level Experts</p> <p>-Instructional Coaches</p> <p>-Providing Assistance and Resources when possible including intervention time!</p> <p>-SAMs Club/Kagan trainings</p> <p>-Coaching/Mentoring with a peer (A Superhero Duo - Goal Setting, Walk-Abouts, Impact Cycle, Reflection, Encouragement)</p> <p>The rationale for selecting the strategies is that, according to Hattie's Effect Size, each one has the potential to accelerate student achievement at a HIGH rate (.30-.69) or considerably accelerate student achievement at a SUPER HIGH rate (.70 and above)</p> <p>Small Group Differentiation Centers- .47 Effect Size</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Hands on Learning- .30 Effect Size</p> <p>Interventions/ Extensions- .77 Effect Size</p> <p>MTSS (RTI)- 1.29 Effect Size</p> <p>Scaffolding- .82 Effect Size</p> <p>High Level of Student Engagement- .49 Effect Size</p> <p>Goal Setting (Buckets)- .48 Effect Size</p> <p>Progress Monitoring- .58 Effect Size</p> <p>Curriculum Maps and Instructional Guides .64 Effect Size</p>

Action Steps to Implement

1. Develop the Master Schedule to provide optimal learning opportunities for all students (minutes of instruction).
2. Develop staffing schedules that provide optimal in-class time with students (minutes of instruction)
3. Student scheduling that effectively groups students to maximize the student to teacher ratio.
4. PLC meetings to analyze baseline and progress monitoring data to adjust supports as needed.
5. School Leadership team to meet monthly to analyze effectiveness of the strategy implementation.
6. Continuous professional development and conversations around High Yield Instructional Strategies

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This Area of Focus was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. The data demonstrated that our ELA L25 learning gains scores dropped 7% from 57% in FY18 to 50% in FY19.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase Learning Gains for ELA L25 students from 50% to 55% in FY 20.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Edwin Carter (edwinlc@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>-School-wide intervention and enrichment time will be provided for all students K-5 five days per week. Additional instructional supports will be provided to every grade level both during intervention time and during the instructional day to targeted groups of students in ELA.</p> <p>-PLC Data meetings with instructional staff for the purpose of immediate progress monitoring will ensure the right students are receiving the intended supports.</p> <p>-ELA Grade Level Experts</p> <p>-Instructional Coaches</p> <p>-Providing Assistance and Resources when possible including intervention time!</p> <p>-SAMs Club/Kagan trainings</p> <p>-Coaching/Mentoring with a peer (A Superhero Duo - Goal Setting, Walk-Abouts, Impact Cycle, Reflection, Encouragement)</p> <p>The rationale for selecting the strategies is that, according to Hattie's Effect Size, each one has the potential to accelerate student achievement at a HIGH rate (.30-.69) or considerably accelerate student achievement at a SUPER HIGH rate (.70 and above)</p> <p>Small Group Differentiation Centers- .47 Effect Size</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Hands on Learning- .30 Effect Size</p> <p>Interventions/ Extensions- .77 Effect Size</p> <p>MTSS (RTI)- 1.29 Effect Size</p> <p>Scaffolding- .82 Effect Size</p> <p>High Level of Student Engagement- .49 Effect Size</p> <p>Goal Setting (Buckets)- .48 Effect Size</p> <p>Progress Monitoring- .58 Effect Size</p> <p>Curriculum Maps and Instructional Guides .64 Effect Size</p>

Action Steps to Implement

1. Develop the Master Schedule to provide optimal learning opportunities for all students (minutes of instruction).
2. Develop staffing schedules that provide optimal in-class time with students (minutes of instruction)
3. Student scheduling that effectively groups students to maximize the student to teacher ratio.
4. PLC meetings to analyze baseline and progress monitoring data to adjust supports as needed.
5. School Leadership team to meet monthly to analyze effectiveness of the strategy implementation.
6. Continuous professional development and conversations around High Yield Instructional Strategies

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Social Emotional Skills plays a critical role in student success. The 5 key components of social emotional learning have been compared to being like a muscle and need to be flexed. Those 5 key components are self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relational skills and responsible decision making. When students are given instruction in and supported in the development of those key areas, behavior improves. By providing those supports students will not only be more successful behaviorally/socially this in turn will profit academic achievement as well.

Measurable Outcome: Reduce the amount of student referrals by 10% as documented by Castle for the 2019-2020 school year from 133 referrals to 119 referrals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Edwin Carter (edwinlc@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Implement Positive Preventions Systems to build relationships and a Culture for Learning through the following steps:

1. School and Classroom Rules explicitly taught
2. Building a Culture for Learning that is focused on building relationships with our students
3. Continued implementation and refinement of PBIS practices
4. Train all staff on De-escalation/ Zones of Regulation practices
5. Implementation of Restorative Practices
6. Guidance Counselor and Behavior Specialist
7. School Mental Health Team
8. Threat Assessment Team
9. Continuous professional development and conversations around High Yield Instructional Strategies

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

While we significantly decreased the number of referrals from 208 referrals in FY18 to 133 in FY19, a reduction of 37%, we believe that the potential to accelerate student achievement is inextricably tied to positive behavioral supports as demonstrated by Hattie's Effect Sizes for the following strategies:

Student- Teacher Relationships= .52 Effect Size
 Strong Classroom Cohesion= .44 Effect Size
 Behavioral Intervention Programs= .62 Effect Size

Action Steps to Implement

1. All staff provided training pre-school week in de-escalation/Zones of Regulation.
2. PLC conversations regarding grade-level discipline strategies and data.
3. Referral to Guidance Counselor, Ms. Nicol, as an intervention
4. Social Emotional Learning supports integrated in the culture of Pelican.
5. 2nd Step weekly lessons documented in lesson plans.
6. The Leadership Team will also monitor the amount of students who have OSS as a consequence. They will work with the Guidance Counselor and/or Behavioral Specialist to teach them other ways they can behave so the outcome is a more positive one in the future.
7. In addition, the Leadership Team will also monitor what students are getting OSS as a consequence in relation to the overall school profile.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Every absence, tardy arrival or early sign-out is a lost opportunity for academic and social/emotional learning. Students who attend school regularly achieve at greater levels. Conversely, research has shown that poor attendance starting in kindergarten carries implications into subsequent grade levels as patterns of attendance often start then.

Measurable Outcome: Increase the Average Daily Attendance (ADA) from 94.47% to 96% as measured by FOCUS.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Edwin Carter (edwinlc@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Pelican will engage students and parents in positive ways. Additionally, we will monitor attendance and chronic absenteeism. Pelican will implement strong preventions and interventions. Finally, Pelican will provide mentors for chronically absent students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The rationale for selecting these strategies is that by addressing the reasons behind the attendance concern and the needs of the students / families we will increase achievement for that student.

Action Steps to Implement

1. First and foremost, teachers will develop relationships with students and families using various methods.
2. Teachers will monitor the daily attendance for each student. When a student has missed 3 days the expectation is that the teacher will contact the family to find out why.
3. If an attendance concern continues, a referral to the school Social Worker will be made.
4. The Social Worker will make home visits and other means of contact for students who have chronic absences.
5. Grade level PLCs will monitor overall attendance data and will continue to communicate with the School Social Worker for students with chronic absences.
6. Teachers and the School Social Worker will monitor absences of students who are identified in the Early Warning System.
7. A program of Social Emotional Learning will be implemented.
8. Continuous professional development and conversations around High Yield Instructional Strategies

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We are continuously looking at our resources and restructuring, throughout the school year, staff supports based on the needs of the students, when looking at the i-Ready, fluency, MTSS and IEP data of students. We have also added a Primary Literacy Coach to assist with the K-2 grades levels. This gives our Intermediate Literacy Coach time to really hone in the students needs for grades 3-5. We are also adding Science as a Science Special to allow for project based learning opportunities not only for 5th graders, but also school wide, in order to better develop Scientific foundations.

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.

Pelican welcomes parents, families, and the community to be a part of our school. It is important that we build a positive relationship with all of our stakeholders. At the beginning of the school year, families and students are invited to an open house where staff share the vision, mission and culture of the school. We invite all stakeholders in to volunteer and assist with teachers and student development. We have been very successful with this and have many volunteers come and work with teachers and students throughout the week. We also invite all stakeholder in to be a part of school events, such as Curriculum Nights, Read Across America Day, Pelican Pursuit, Storybook Parade, Fall Spectacular, etc. In addition to volunteering, parents, community and staff members meet monthly at the School Advisory Committee (SAC) to discuss the school's mission and goals of the school. We also meet to go review the School Improvement Plan (SIP), monitor school data, identify the needs of the school and modify or create new goals as deemed necessary.

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