San Carlos Park Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

San Carlos Park Elementary School

17282 LEE RD, Fort Myers, FL 33967

http://sac.leeschools.net/

Demographics

Principal: Monica Stevens

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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: D (38%) 2015-16: C (51%)
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.](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

San Carlos Park Elementary School

17282 LEE RD, Fort Myers, FL 33967

http://sac.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	92%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	64%

School Grades History

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

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.

San Carlos Park Elementary's School Mission Statement to ensure excellence in a safe, creative, and nurturing environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

San Carlos Park Elementary's School Vision Statement is to actively engage students as lifelong learners and 21st Century world-class leaders.

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
Wagoner, Brandi	Teacher, K-12	
Kutz, Christy	Principal	
Russo, Brittney	Instructional Coach	
Parker, Jack	Administrative Support	
Williams, Teresa	Instructional Coach	
Robinson, Michele	Assistant Principal	
Hacker, Brianna	Instructional Coach	
McFerin, Allison	Instructional Coach	
Lorenzini, Tracy	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2015, Monica Stevens

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.*
0

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.*
14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
45

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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: D (38%) 2015-16: C (51%)
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	105	106	130	114	104	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	659
Attendance below 90 percent	40	15	19	11	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	1	6	7	6	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	0	2	7	6	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	6	7	5	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 10/24/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	50%	57%	57%	41%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	44%	56%	58%	40%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	50%	53%	39%	49%	52%
Math Achievement	46%	62%	63%	44%	60%	61%
Math Learning Gains	51%	65%	62%	29%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	54%	51%	23%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	36%	52%	53%	49%	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	52%	58%	-6%	58%	-6%	
	2018	51%	55%	-4%	57%	-6%	
Same Grade Comparison		1%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	50%	55%	-5%	58%	-8%	
	2018	44%	53%	-9%	56%	-12%	
Same Grade Comparison		6%					
Cohort Comparison		-1%					
05	2019	41%	54%	-13%	56%	-15%	
	2018	53%	52%	1%	55%	-2%	
Same Grade Comparison		-12%					
Cohort Comparison		-3%					

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
03	2019	46%	61%	-15%	62%	-16%	
	2018	53%	58%	-5%	62%	-9%	
Same Grade Comparison		-7%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	46%	62%	-16%	64%	-18%	
	2018	43%	58%	-15%	62%	-19%	
Same Grade Comparison		3%					
Cohort Comparison		-7%					
05	2019	40%	58%	-18%	60%	-20%	
	2018	49%	57%	-8%	61%	-12%	
Same Grade Comparison		-9%					
Cohort Comparison		-3%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
05	2019	33%	50%	-17%	53%	-20%	

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	46%	52%	-6%	55%	-9%
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	24	34	21	26	49	45	39				
ELL	35	35	30	36	45	32	21				
BLK	29	27		29	36						
HSP	39	43	36	39	48	30	30				
WHT	68	48	33	59	56	64	47				
FRL	46	45	41	37	46	38	32				
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	26	50	47	42	54	37	33				
ELL	31	53	57	40	49	45	20				
BLK	39	55		37	39		69				
HSP	47	63	63	48	49	45	38				
WHT	67	55	36	65	54	45	64				
FRL	50	58	55	49	51	48	48				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	19	30	35	26	33	33	18				
ELL	7	42	54	21	29	28	13				
ASN	27			36							
BLK	43	48		40	32		45				
HSP	33	38	38	39	23	24	39				
WHT	53	40	44	52	37	22	71				
FRL	37	40	42	39	27	22	41				

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	45

ESSA Federal Index	
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	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	359
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	30
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	41
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	54
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	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

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

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

The data area with the lowest performance was science. The data was impacted by three factors:
1. The grade 5 students are not proficient readers.
2. Students lack academic vocabulary necessary to score well in science.
3. A mobility rate of 39% makes it difficult to count on science standards having been taught in grades 3 and 4.

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

The greatest area of decline was our grade 4 students in mathematics. As grade 3 students, 53% were proficient and as fourth graders, there proficiency dropped 7 percent to 46%. A drop in proficiency will also equate to a drop in learning gains and will have an overall negative effect on our school grade. The high mobility rate of our school and staff turnover impacted this cohort tremendously. Another contributing factor was not having a math coach.

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.

In all areas of mathematics, we showed a tremendous gap between our students and the state average. We continue to see a decline in our mathematics' proficiency. The need for additional mathematics support in the form of a mathematics instructional coach position, which was unable to be filled, impacted the support we were able to offer new staff. Our students' basic computation skills and number and operations in all areas are lacking.

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

Our cohort who showed a decline was 4th grade as evidenced by our FSA data for mathematics. Our 3rd and 5th grade cohorts remained consistent in their FSA scores. After our great gains in FY18, the plateau in 4th grade was not unexpected. A new math coach was hired and math vocabulary will be explicitly taught moving forward.

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

Pursuant to 1001.42 (18) (a)2 Florida Statue, this section is to be completed by schools with grades 6, 7, or 8.

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

1. Academic vocabulary across all subject areas
2. Science instruction in all grade levels
3. Mathematics proficiency
4. Increased student attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Science data is unique in that students have not previously been assessed in this area and there is no co-hort to track. The state assessment also tests three years worth of standards. For a school like SCPE with a 39% mobility rate it often leaves the grade 5 teachers playing catch up with content. This barrier makes it imperative that the stable SCPE students have exposure to a guaranteed and viable science curriculum aligned to the state standards.
Measurable Outcome:	Grade 5 students will score at or above the district average on the state science assessment in the 2019-2020 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christy Kutz (christymk@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	All SCPE students will be instructed in standards-based science lessons daily. Lessons will be monitored via classroom walk-thrus, lesson plans and progress monitoring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students are unable to learn what is not taught to them.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Ensure all teachers have access to the science standards for their grade level.
2. Provide professional development for all teachers on the science curriculum materials.
3. Add science to the PLC agenda monthly.
4. Monitor lesson plans and classroom instruction, via classroom walkthroughs.

Person Responsible Christy Kutz (christymk@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	All grade levels showed a decrease in mathematics proficiency. Teachers are still working to gain a full understanding of the complexity of the mathematics standards and test specs. This area of focus is needed to build the content understanding and proficiency of the teaching staff so that it can be transferred to the student.
Measurable Outcome:	All students will show a learning gain in mathematics and thus increasing the proficiency score.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christy Kutz (christymk@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional development to increase the knowledge base of teachers in mathematics. Continued use of proficiency scales to deepen the understanding of the standards for both teachers and students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	A proficiency scale states what students are expected to achieve and how to get there. It also provides the teacher a clearly stated deconstructed blueprint to the standard. The mathematics coach will continue to provide teachers with professional development to improve their instruction and meet the needs of the learners in their classroom.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Recruit and hire a mathematics coach.
2. School-wide mathematics fluency goals and tracking via Reflex Math
3. Implementation of proficiency scales for each mathematics standards across all grade levels.

Person Responsible   Christy Kutz (christymk@leeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The student population at SCPE lacks fluidity with academic vocabulary. This is a barrier to proficiency in all subject areas.
Measurable Outcome:	The school plans to improve proficiency in all tested subject areas; ELA, mathematics and science. Students will improve in ELA proficiency by 7 percentage points, math proficiency by 14 percentage points, and science proficiency by 14 percentage points.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christy Kutz (christymk@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will identify and explicitly teach 20 subject specific words in ELA and mathematics school-wide in all primary classrooms and 30 in intermediate classrooms. Embedded strategies for collecting data include progress monitoring, iReady, formatives, summatives, and other assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The ability to decode a new word is only half of the battle students must have the oral language to understand the word when it appears in print. Students with limited vocabulary knowledge will struggle to be "good" in ELA, mathematics or science as their ability to show proficiency is dependent on a paper and pencil test. (The New Art and Science of Teaching Reading by Julia Simms and Robert J Marzano 2019)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Select terms at each grade and subject level.
2. Provide training on how to explicitly teach vocabulary
3. Create school-wide vocabulary plan
4. Monitor the instruction associated with teaching academic vocabulary

Person Responsible	Christy Kutz (christymk@leeschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Inappropriate and disengaged student behavior, including students who are out of class and/or suspended, negatively impact student learning. In 2018-19, student referrals in DSA reached almost 250 which resulted in loss of instructional time for the student and disruption of the learning environment for the class.
Measurable Outcome:	Decrease the number of student referrals by 50% from 250 to 125 as measured by District Support Applications compared to May 2019 to May 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christy Kutz (christymk@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	PBIS and Student Services PLC will work together to implement strategies for various tiers of student behavior throughout the school.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Student discipline reports in Castle will be monitored daily and PLC monthly data will target frequent offenders for intervention support. Student services PLC will meet weekly to review behavior data. When deemed appropriate, student interventions will be implemented to target and support student needs with the MTSS team. PBIS meetings will occur monthly to enforce school-wide common language and practices for leadership and responsibility. PBIS SOAR posters will be posted throughout the building to remind students of the expectations in different areas.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide teacher education on effective student discipline and the impact on student instruction.
2. Provide teacher education on intervention and support for student behavior such as small group counseling and mentoring.
3. Continued implementation of PBIS, Second Step and researched based strategies.
4. Continued implementation and provide training support of Love and Logic.
5. Implement student services team to review and target students in need of support.
6. Provide additional .5 behavior specialist for support of student needs.

Person Responsible	Christy Kutz (christymk@leeschools.net)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Student attendance was an area of impact for our L25 students.
Measurable Outcome:	Decrease the number of chronically absent students (below 90%) from 118 to 93 as measured by castle early warning systems May 2020 report.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christy Kutz (christymk@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Monitoring and meeting student needs by using "High Reliability Schools" safe section 1.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students who are absent are negatively impacted due to missing instructional time. San Carlos had a 14% rate of attendance below 90%. According to Malcolm, Wilson, Davidson and Kirk (2003) teachers identified the effects of absenteeism on children as: - academic under-achievement. - difficulty in making friends which could lead to boredom and loss of confidence. - prolonged absence can have deleterious effects for the child in later life. - students who are absent from school are at the greatest risk of dropping out of school early.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will monitor monthly attendance, reporting to the school guidance counselor of repeated attendance concerns.
2 The counselor will work with the school social worker to determine if interventions and supports are necessary.
3. Implement attendance club for students in need of intervention and support, proving them with mentoring and incentives.
4. Provide Parent Involvement Specialist to increase parent engagement and home/school communication.
5. Use of Castle for parent contact logs and parent link to remind parents of attendance.
6. Communicate and educate in parent newsletter the importance of daily attendance and the impact it has on student achievement.

Person Responsible	Christy Kutz (christymk@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team meets weekly with grade level teams to identify areas of need. The team then brings back this information to a weekly leadership team where we problem solve and identify support services. Support includes intervention utilizing resource teachers and coaches, differentiated instruction, supplemental instruction and afterschool tutoring.

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 to the Annual Title 1 meeting, during which staff will share the vision, mission, and culture of the school.

Parents, teachers, students, community members and business partners will participate in the comprehensive needs' assessment by attending monthly meetings for feedback on what they would like to see for their child and how to address their needs. Throughout the year, monthly activities are held including: Watchdogs, Donuts with Dad, Muffins with Mom, Student Led Conferences, Fall Festival, Family Literacy Breakfast, Center for the Arts Monthly Activities, FSA Parent Night, and additional parenting and community involvement segments at SAC meetings referenced in our PFEP. Stakeholders will participate as the result of school newsletters, School Messengers, Peach Jar, and personal phone calls. We contact local community and business partners to help support our school's Title 1 events throughout the year.

SCPE has a diverse population of students and families across the south zone of Lee County. Many of these families are ESOL, therefore, we provide written, prerecorded communication in both English and Spanish. We have bilingual personnel in our office to ensure parents are comfortable expressing their needs. Input from stakeholders will be collected through parent surveys and open discussions. These communications will be flexible in format such as online, in person or on paper allowing for all parents to give input. Formats will be in different languages 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 by attending SAC/PTO Title 1 quarterly meetings.

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.