Tice Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Tice Elementary School

4524 TICE ST, Fort Myers, FL 33905

http://tic.leeschools.net/

Demographics

Principal: Cherise Trent

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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	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* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: D (36%) 2015-16: C (44%)
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

Tice Elementary School

4524 TICE ST, Fort Myers, FL 33905

http://tic.leeschools.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	97%

School Grades History

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

To facilitate high achievement for all students in a safe learning environment through an effective and efficient operation.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To prepare every student 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
Trent, Cherise	Principal	Provide Instructional and Organizational Leadership Monitor and attend PLC's Monitor Lesson Planning and Standards Based Instruction Provide training and resources to staff Lead Data Chats and communicate expectations for progress monitoring Create and implement systems for progress monitoring, data collection, school safety, academics, behavior and attendance. Provide support and mentorship for new teachers. Evaluate staff effectiveness. Manage budgets. Support and involve students and families to reach academic success.
Riemenschneider, Katie	Assistant Principal	Attend PLC's*, Standards-Based Planning, and Monitoring. APPLES (new teacher orientation) *detailed description in the Principal's section above.
Lampkins, Christina	Teacher, K-12	Math / Science Coach; Instructor; Leadership Literacy Team Member, attends PLC's* and Standards-Based Planning for her grade level
Lands, Valerie	Teacher, K-12	MTSS, Safety, After-School Tutoring, Instructor; Leadership Literacy Team Member; attends PLC's* and Standards-Based Planning for her grade level
Ballard, Marcile	Instructional Coach	Reading Coach, ESOL Contact, Curriculum & Materials orders, School Schedule & report cards loaded into Focus; Instructor; Leadership Literacy Team Member; attends PLC's* and Standards-Based Planning for her grade level
Moreland, Stephanie	Instructional Coach	Peer Consultative Teacher, ELA Oral Language and Writing to Raise Achievement; Instructor; Leadership Literacy Team Member; attends PLC's* and Standards-Based Planning for her grade level
Teblum, Amy	Teacher, ESE	SWD Resource Teacher & SWD Dept. Head; Leadership Literacy Team Member, Leadership Literacy Team Member; attends PLC's* and Standards-Based Planning for her grade level

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Cherise Trent

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

30

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* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: D (36%) 2015-16: C (44%)
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	91	86	84	97	104	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	549
Attendance below 90 percent	8	10	10	5	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	5	9	20	24	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Course failure in Math	0	5	1	15	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	5	2	14	22	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated
Sunday 10/25/2020

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	93	97	94	107	71	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	529
Attendance below 90 percent	27	21	13	13	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	2	0	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	25	12	26	41	16	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
Level 1 on statewide assessment	1	0	0	45	26	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93

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	2	3	6	38	19	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74

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	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
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	93	97	94	107	71	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	529
Attendance below 90 percent	27	21	13	13	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	2	0	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	25	12	26	41	16	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
Level 1 on statewide assessment	1	0	0	45	26	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93

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	2	3	6	38	19	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74

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	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
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	37%	57%	57%	32%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	45%	56%	58%	45%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	50%	53%	49%	49%	52%
Math Achievement	64%	62%	63%	32%	60%	61%
Math Learning Gains	71%	65%	62%	35%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	54%	51%	30%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	37%	52%	53%	30%	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	32%	58%	-26%	58%	-26%
	2018	36%	55%	-19%	57%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	32%	55%	-23%	58%	-26%
	2018	37%	53%	-16%	56%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	33%	54%	-21%	56%	-23%
	2018	43%	52%	-9%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

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

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	53%	58%	-5%	62%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	62%	0%	64%	-2%
	2018	47%	58%	-11%	62%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	63%	58%	5%	60%	3%
	2018	46%	57%	-11%	61%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	36%	50%	-14%	53%	-17%
	2018	51%	52%	-1%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
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	27	33		36	85						
ELL	30	49	50	57	67	57	31				
BLK	31			46							
HSP	36	47	55	65	72	58	36				
WHT	60			70							
FRL	35	45	63	60	71	59	28				
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	28	62	55	27	64	62	15				
ELL	30	58	61	49	70	57	47				
BLK	53	50		33	50						
HSP	41	66	69	54	68	65	53				
WHT	47			64							
FRL	44	64	61	54	67	62	52				

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	4	21	25	8	17	25	20				
ELL	22	45	43	23	33	37	7				
BLK	41	50		36	50						
HSP	29	44	58	32	35	31	29				
WHT	67			33							
FRL	29	45	58	30	33	27	27				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	417
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	39
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
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	65
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	51
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.

ELA and Science were lowest at 37%.

Contributing factors:

1. State regulations (VAM/L300) caused exodus of 3-4-5 staff. Eight experienced employees/leaders left:
• Exiting employees made late decisions; applicants depleted:
• All three 5th grade new to grade. One non-renewed in due to performance. 100% of grade affected.
• One of three 4th grade had long-term sub Oct-May. No appropriate applicants. 40% of grade affected.
• Five of six 3rd grade new to grade; 3 late hires. One vacant 3 months; Literacy Coach subbed, resulting in sparse Literacy support schoolwide. One non-renewed due to performance. 83% of grade affected.
• One SWD Resource hired late; non-renewed due to performance.
• Turnover in 3-4-5 disrupted continuity of prior year's Turnaround.

2. Decreased funds affected class size/push-in. UniSIG not sustained once out of DA/L300 status. Some district-funded support remained (ESOL para; extra 30 minutes/day); five Teacher Leaders not funded. Effects: Decrease in coaching/teacher support; Science 80-minute block eliminated.

3. Staff and student absences contributed.

4. Mandatory common standards-based planning became part of SIP, creating learning curve for staff/administration. CSBP/PLC monitoring schedules impractical.

Trends:
ELA: -1 Science: -14.

For 5 years, ELA within 6 points: 32% (2017/D) to 38% (2018/B). Current ELA (37%) is 2nd highest.

Largest Science/ELA spread was 13 points, in 2017-18, when extra funds supported 80-minute 5th grade Science block.

14/15 ELA Achievement 35; Science 39
15/16 ELA Achievement 35; Science 35
16/17 ELA Achievement 32; Science 30
17/18 ELA Achievement 38; Science 51
18/19 ELA Achievement 37; Science 37

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

ELA Learning Gains (-17) showed greatest decline. Contributing factors are described in detail above, mainly large staff turnover in the FSA grades, shortage of qualified staff, removal of support from prior year (Teacher Leaders reduced from 5 to 1), attendance and new staff learning curve. Here is some additional data that did not fit in the word count limits above:

-- Subgroup of Black/African American students are below the ESSA Federal Index by 2%, at 39%; cutoff is anything below 41%. This group, then, represents our most significant achievement gap.
-- Attendance contributed to the decline.According to Early Warning System data, 12% of 3rd graders, 13% of 4th graders and 7% of 5th graders were below 90% for attendance.

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 terms of Achievement rates, below are the gaps between Tice Elementary and the State Achievement rates:

ELA
Grade 4 ELA has the greatest gap, 26% lower than the state. Grade 3 is 25% lower, and Grade 5 is 24% lower.

Math
Grade 4 Math has the greatest gap, 4% lower than the state. Grade 3 achieved 11% higher, and Grade 5 is 3% higher.

Factors that contribute to our gap in ELA Achievement are described in section a above. Tice ELA achievement for the last five years tends to fall between 32% and 28%.

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

Math Achievement (+15).

New Actions included:
• Part-time Math coach
• 1 day a week common standards-based planning for Math at all grade levels
• Increase time in Math block
• Required Math PLC
• Q3 - District Support Team member supported 5th grade Math 1 hour 2 x week

Continued Actions included:
• Coaching teachers and encouraging PD in CRA {concrete-representational-abstract/process} model of Math instruction

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

1. Academic concerns in the areas of ELA Proficiency, Gains, and L25 Gains, and Math L25 Gains are evident based on the large amount of Level 1 students in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades, coupled with a high number of Course Failures in ELA and Math (KG - 5th).
-- Course Failure is high in all grade levels except 5th, ranging from 12% in 1st grade to 38% in 3rd grade.
-- The % of students at Level 1 in grades 3-4-5 ranges from 31% Level 1's in 5th grade to 42% in 3rd grade.

2. A competing concern, and contributing factor is chronic non-attendance: 88 students (16%) of children in KG - 5th grade have less than 90% attendance.

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

1. Attendance (because it is a barrier to the rest)
2. Black/African American student subgroup Proficiency, Gains, and L25: this subgroup is Tice's only subgroup to fall below the Federal Index.
2. ELA Learning Gains (-17)
3. ELA L25 Gains (-12)
4. Math L25 Gains (-7)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In 2019-2020, Tice Elementary School ELA proficiency was 20% lower than the district and state levels of achievement. In addition, Tice Elementary School proficiency demonstrated a decrease of achievement from 43% in 2018-2019 to 37% in 2019-2020. As measured in Quarterly progress monitoring, it appeared that ELA proficiency continued to drop to 29% during Q3 last school year.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA proficiency will increase to 45%, compared to 37% in 2019-2020 and 29% in the 2019-2020 Q3 data report.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cherise Trent (cherisewt@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Foundational skills have been identified as the greatest overall need for students. As a result, teachers are engaging in a variety of professional development opportunities to increase targeted strategies for teaching these skills. I-Ready technology has been introduced and is being utilized to assess students and provide learning paths for students. Assessment strategies are being implemented to provide a quiet testing atmosphere, with accommodations provided if appropriate. Free, after school tutoring available to targeted students. Strategic use of paraprofessionals to increase small group instruction of targeted skills. Data monitored in order to create learning paths and progress toward goals. A Literacy Coach has been hired to coach and support teachers, focused on ELA. Weekly PLC's to discuss strategies and lesson plans monitored.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Focusing on differentiation and targeted intervention instruction will give students what they need to be successful. For many students, teaching foundational skills is essential. Monitoring data and assessing students allows staff to make academic decisions that are individualized and specific to their needs. Providing Professional Development to staff will increase strategies for teaching. Providing accommodations, according to IEPs/504s, during assessments will enable students to perform during a quiet, organized testing atmosphere.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional Development provided to teachers, including i-Ready, phonograms, monitoring data, and ELA strategies. (ADMIN & District ELA Subject Area Specialists, i-Ready Reps, Literacy Coach)
2. Data Chats to Discuss Data; Weekly PLC's (ADMIN & teachers)
3. Lesson Plans Monitored to reflect differentiation and intervention strategies (teachers/ADMIN)
4. Organized, quiet testing atmosphere, with accommodations (testing coor./classroom teachers)
5. New Literacy Coach supporting classroom teachers (Literacy Coach/ADMIN)
6. Free, After School Tutoring Program (After-School Teachers)
7. Classroom walk-throughs (ADMIN)

Person Responsible	Cherise Trent (cherisewt@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The Learning Gains of students at Tice are below the state and district levels. During the 2019 school year, it was reported that Tice ELA learning gains were 45%, as compared to 56% for the district and 58% for the state. In addition, according to quarterly assessments, it appeared that the Learning Gains at Tice were 36% for grade 5.
Measurable Outcome:	The Grade 5 ELA Learning Gains will increase to 50%, compared to 36% in Q3 during the 2019-2020 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cherise Trent (cherisewt@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will be trained to utilize i-Ready Assessment/Learning System in order to monitor data and create learning paths for each student. A school-wide focus on differentiation and intervention will support the needs of students. District ELA specialist will provide PD. Paraprofessional support will be strategic and monitored for effectiveness. Data chats and PLC's will be implemented to monitor student progress. Foundational ELA skills appear to be a school-wide need. As a result, professional development, focused on phonemic awareness/phonograms, and other skills will be provided to teachers. Free, after school tutoring will be provided to targeted students. Lesson Plans & PLC agendas/minutes will be monitored. The EWS will be monitored to identify barriers to learning. Classroom walk-throughs will be utilized. Model classrooms will be identified & literacy coach will support teacher development.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	A well trained teaching staff will be able to provide standards based focused lessons, with differentiation and intervention focused on student individual needs. Utilizing data to make academic decisions is imperative. Based on data, foundational skills are needed by the majority of students. Providing focused PD will assist teachers in planning for what students need most. Being strategic with personnel will increase the teacher/student ratio & opportunity for targeted instruction. Identifying model classrooms, successful with their craft, will provide another opportunity on campus to develop strong teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide Professional Development focused on identified student academic needs. (ADMIN, Coach, District Subject Area Specialists)
2. Schedule Support Personnel Strategically (ADMIN)
3. Data Chats & PLC's to discuss intervention & differentiation (ADMIN & Teachers)
4. Lesson Plans & PLC agendas/minutes monitored (ADMIN)
5. EWS monitored for chronic absentee (teachers & ADMIN)
6. Free, After School Tutoring Provided (Teachers)
7. Classroom walk-throughs to identify model classrooms (ADMIN)
8. Literacy Coach Support to Teachers (Literacy Coach)

Person Responsible	Cherise Trent (cherisewt@leeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to Quarter 3 data in 2019-2020, of the grade 5 ELA Lowest 25% students, only 36% made a learning gain. However, in 2019 data, the school wide L25% average was 53% making a learning gain, compared to 50% (district) and 50% (state). The significance of this data is that the school wide average decreased from 64% making a learning gain in 2018 to 53% in 2019. Comparatively, the school outperformed the district (47%) and the state (48%) in 2018, but was unable to continue that trend.
Measurable Outcome:	The ELA Grade 5 Lowest 25% students will increase to 50% making a learning gain, compared to 36% of L25%, grade 5 students in Quarter 3, 2019-2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cherise Trent (cherisewt@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will be trained to utilize i-Ready Assessment/Learning System in order to monitor data and create learning paths for each student. A school-wide focus on differentiation and intervention will support the needs of students. District ELA specialist will provide PD. Paraprofessional support will be strategic and monitored for effectiveness. Data chats and PLC's will be implemented to monitor student progress. Foundational ELA skills appear to be a school-wide need. As a result, professional development, focused on phonemic awareness/phonograms, and other skills will be provided to teachers. Free, after school tutoring will be provided to targeted students. Lesson Plans & PLC agendas/minutes will be monitored. The EWS will be monitored to identify barriers to learning. Classroom walk-throughs will be utilized. Model classrooms will be identified & literacy coach will support teacher development.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	A well trained teaching staff will be able to provide standards based focused lessons, with differentiation and intervention focused on student individual needs. Utilizing data to make academic decisions is imperative. Based on data, foundational skills are needed by the majority of students. Providing focused PD will assist teachers in planning for what students need most. Being strategic with personnel will increase the teacher/student ratio & opportunity for targeted instruction. Identifying model classrooms, successful with their craft, will provide another opportunity on campus to develop strong teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide Professional Development focused on identified student academic needs. (ADMIN, Coach, District Subject Area Specialists)
2. Schedule Support Personnel Strategically (ADMIN)
3. Data Chats & PLC's to discuss intervention & differentiation (ADMIN & Teachers)
4. Lesson Plans & PLC agendas/minutes monitored (ADMIN)
5. EWS monitored for chronic absentee (teachers & ADMIN)
6. Free, After School Tutoring Provided (Teachers)
7. Classroom walk-throughs to identify model classrooms (ADMIN)
8. Literacy Coach Support to Teachers (Literacy Coach)

Person Responsible Cherise Trent (cherisewt@leeschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math proficiency scores increased from 53% in 2018 to 64% in 2019. However, Quarter 3 data in 2019-2020 indicates that proficiency decreased significantly to 48%. When looking at specific grade levels in 2019, grade 3 math proficiency was 53%, compared to the district at 61% and the state at 62%. Grade 4 math proficiency was 62%, compared to 62% (district) and 64% (state). Grade 5 proficiency was 63%, compared to 58% (district) and 60% (state). In addition, the school increased math scores compared to 2018 at 53%. However, due to the Quarter 3 2019-2020 math proficiency being 48% (prior to pandemic), it is important to establish a school goal of math proficiency back to 60%.
Measurable Outcome:	Math proficiency will increase to 60%, compared to 48% in Quarter 3 assessment in 2019-2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cherise Trent (cherisewt@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Foundational math skills have been identified as the greatest overall need for students. As a result, teachers are engaging in a variety of professional development opportunities to increase targeted strategies for teaching these skills. I-Ready technology has been introduced and is being utilized to assess students and provide learning paths for students. Assessment strategies are being implemented to provide a quiet testing atmosphere, with accommodations provided if appropriate. Free, after school tutoring available to targeted students. Strategic use of paraprofessionals to increase small group instruction of targeted skills. Data monitored in order to create learning paths and progress toward goals. Weekly PLC's to discuss strategies and lesson plans are monitored. Classroom walk throughs assist in coaching and PD decisions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Focusing on differentiation and targeted intervention instruction will give students what they need to be successful. For many students, teaching foundational skills is essential. Monitoring data and assessing students allows staff to make academic decisions that are individualized and specific to their needs. Providing Professional Development to staff will increase strategies for teaching. Providing accommodations, according to IEPs/504s, during assessments will enable students to perform during a quiet, organized testing atmosphere.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional Development provided to teachers, including i-Ready, monitoring data, and math strategies. (ADMIN & District Math Subject Area Specialists, i-Ready Reps, Leading & Learning Reps)
2. Data Chats to Discuss Data; Weekly PLC's (ADMIN & teachers)
3. Lesson Plans Monitored to reflect differentiation and intervention strategies (teachers/ADMIN)
4. Organized, quiet testing atmosphere, with accommodations (testing coor./classroom teachers)
5. Free, After School Tutoring Program (After-School Teachers)
6. Classroom walk-throughs (ADMIN)

Person Responsible	Cherise Trent (cherisewt@leeschools.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Due to the pandemic, Math Learning Gains will be monitored in grade 5. According to the 2019 reported data, 71% of school-wide students made a math learning gain. However, according to 2020, Quarter 3 assessment data, grade 5 math learning gains were at 36%. Therefore, it is important to increase math learning gains to pre-pandemic levels.
Measurable Outcome:	Grade 5 Math Learning Gains will increase to 70%, from 36% in Grade 5 2019 Quarter 3 Assessment Data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cherise Trent (cherisewt@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Foundational math skills have been identified as the greatest overall need for students. As a result, teachers are engaging in a variety of professional development opportunities to increase targeted strategies for teaching these skills. I-Ready technology has been introduced and is being utilized to assess students and provide learning paths for students. Assessment strategies are being implemented to provide a quiet testing atmosphere, with accommodations provided if appropriate. Free, after school tutoring available to targeted students. Strategic use of paraprofessionals to increase small group instruction of targeted skills. Data monitored in order to create learning paths and progress toward goals. Weekly PLC's to discuss strategies and lesson plans are monitored. Classroom walk throughs assist in coaching and PD decisions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Focusing on differentiation and targeted intervention instruction will give students what they need to be successful. For many students, teaching foundational skills is essential. Monitoring data and assessing students allows staff to make academic decisions that are individualized and specific to their needs. Providing Professional Development to staff will increase strategies for teaching. Providing accommodations, according to IEPs/504s, during assessments will enable students to perform during a quiet, organized testing atmosphere.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional Development provided to teachers, including i-Ready, monitoring data, and math strategies. (ADMIN & District Math Subject Area Specialists, i-Ready Reps, Leading & Learning Reps)
2. Data Chats to Discuss Data; Weekly PLC's (ADMIN & teachers)
3. Lesson Plans Monitored to reflect differentiation and intervention strategies (teachers/ADMIN)
4. Organized, quiet testing atmosphere, with accommodations (testing coor./classroom teachers)
5. Free, After School Tutoring Program (After-School Teachers)
6. Classroom walk-throughs (ADMIN)

Person Responsible	Cherise Trent (cherisewt@leeschools.net)

#6. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Although discipline problems have not been a significant issue as a trend at Tice, we chose to create a goal due to the reported number of stressors facing students as a result of the pandemic. Students had not been attending traditional school since March, when the quarantine began, and many students have been impacted by the pandemic. It is important to create a positive learning environment, focus on Social emotional learning, and increase social skills in order to ensure limited referrals this year.
Measurable Outcome:	4% or fewer students will earn a referral, compared to 6% in 2019-2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cherise Trent (cherisewt@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Tice Elementary will employ a Tiered approach, adopting PBIS and focus on teaching appropriate replacement behaviors with an emphasis on teaching responsibility and self-control. PBIS is a researched-based system to support students in making acceptable choices in a positive, non-reactive manner. In addition, a focus on social emotional learning will be implemented in order to increase positive social skills and to address emotional needs as a result of the pandemic. Mental health services and guidance counselor interventions will provide support to those in need.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	PBIS aligns with the FLDOE Florida PBIS & MTSS Project and also aligns with School District of Lee County's Envision 2030 Goal 9 to decrease OSS. Goal 9 also directly supports Envision 2030 Goals 2-8, which are focused on student academic performance. Increased time in school leads to increases in academic progress. Mental health and guidance counselor strategies provide needed support to those in need.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create a PBIS leadership team that meets monthly to plan & assess strategies (PBIS team)
2. Monitor behavior data and share with stakeholders. (ADMIN)
3. Identify students demonstrating difficulty with behavior and refer them to school counselor for support and strategies. (classroom teachers)
4. Guidance Counselor to provide weekly/daily group or 1-1 sessions with struggling students. (counselor)
5. Identify and support students demonstrating the need for mental health services. (guidance/mental health team)
6. Utilize Social Emotional Learning Curriculum in all grade levels (counselor & teachers)
7. Identify "high flyers" as needed and pair them with a mentor, checking in with them regularly, in order to increase positive relationships and positive goals. (ADMIN)

Person Responsible	Cherise Trent (cherisewt@leeschools.net)

#7. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In order to increase student achievement and the time needed for mastery of standards, attendance will be a primary focus. During the 2019-2020 school year, the average daily attendance was 81% (school-wide average). Although the total number of chronically absent students decreased from 88 in 2018-2019 to 48 in 2019-2020, there are still too many students absent on a regular basis. Attending school will provide opportunities for learning to occur.
Measurable Outcome:	The school-wide attendance average will increase to 85% from 81% in 2019-2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cherise Trent (cherisewt@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Attendance data will be tracked daily/monthly, utilizing FOCUS, EWS, and CASTLE, and will be shared with stakeholders. Students with chronic attendance issues, as identified in CASTLE EWS, will be referred to the School Counselor and Social worker for additional follow up and support. Referrals to the Mental Health team will be made as needed. In addition, classroom teachers and front office staff will make contact with families when students are absent. Barriers to attendance will be discussed and addressed to support families. The importance of attendance will be communicated in a positive way on the school news, newsletters, website, and social media. Students who are quarantined or sick for a period of time, will be provided with computers, internet access, and school supplies so they can connect with a school based classroom teacher learning while home.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Monitoring attendance and having a process for follow-up is essential in identifying students with barriers to learning. Providing follow up and support helps the school and family work as a team to increase attendance. Sharing the impact of missing school with stakeholders provides the importance and academic impact of attending school. Providing computers, internet access, and school supplies for students who are sick or quarantined provides access to learning during the pandemic, despite obstacles.

Action Steps to Implement

1. EWS will be monitored to identify chronic attendance students and this list will be shared with grade levels, counselor/social worker. (ADMIN)
2. Daily attendance will be monitored and phone calls home will be made to those absent. (classroom teachers/front office)
3. Monthly attendance averages will be monitored and shared with stakeholders. (ADMIN)
4. The school counselor and school social worker will follow up with chronic attendance students in order to seek barriers and solutions. Those needing additional support will be referred to the mental health team. (school counselor & social worker)
5. The importance of attendance will be discussed and shared in the school news, newsletter, website, and social media. (ADMIN)
6. Students identified as sick or quarantined will be provided with a computer, internet access, and school supplies in order to be placed in an online, school based classroom. (technology specialist, front office, classroom teacher).

Person Responsible	Cherise Trent (cherisewt@leeschools.net)

#8. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Due to the pandemic, grade 5 L25% math students will be assessed in learning gains. According to 2019 data, school-wide only 56% of L25% math students made a learning gain, compared to 54% in the district. 2019 Math School-wide L25% Learning Gains decreased to 56% from 62% in 2018. But, according to Quarter 3 Math Assessment data for grade 5, the Lowest 25% students only showed 32% making a learning gain in 2020. As a result, focusing on increasing this group is urgent.
Measurable Outcome:	Grade 5 Lowest 25% math students will increase to 60% making a learning gain, compared to 32% L25% Grade 5 Math students making a learning gain in Quarter 3, 2019-2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cherise Trent (mariem@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Foundational math skills have been identified as the greatest overall need for students. As a result, teachers are engaging in a variety of professional development opportunities to increase targeted strategies for teaching these skills. I-Ready technology has been introduced and is being utilized to assess students and provide learning paths for students. Assessment strategies are being implemented to provide a quiet testing atmosphere, with accommodations provided if appropriate. Free, after school tutoring available to targeted students. Strategic use of paraprofessionals to increase small group instruction of targeted skills. Data monitored in order to create learning paths and progress toward goals. Weekly PLC's to discuss strategies and lesson plans are monitored. Classroom walk throughs assist in coaching and PD decisions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Focusing on differentiation and targeted intervention instruction will give students what they need to be successful. For many students, teaching foundational skills is essential. Monitoring data and assessing students allows staff to make academic decisions that are individualized and specific to their needs. Providing Professional Development to staff will increase strategies for teaching. Providing accommodations, according to IEPs/504s, during assessments will enable students to perform during a quiet, organized testing atmosphere.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional Development provided to teachers, including i-Ready, monitoring data, and math strategies. (ADMIN & District Math Subject Area Specialists, i-Ready Reps, Leading & Learning Reps)
2. Data Chats to Discuss Data; Weekly PLC's (ADMIN & teachers)
3. Lesson Plans Monitored to reflect differentiation and intervention strategies (teachers/ADMIN)
4. Organized, quiet testing atmosphere, with accommodations (testing coor./classroom teachers)
5. Free, After School Tutoring Program (After-School Teachers)
6. Classroom walk-throughs (ADMIN)

Person Responsible	Cherise Trent (mariem@leeschools.net)

#9. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The 2019 data shows that 39% of students demonstrated proficiency in science, compared to 52% in the district and 53% in the state. In the prior year (2018), Tice students demonstrated 53% proficiency, compared to 54% (district) and 55% (state). This shows a significant decline in science proficiency at the same school. Although both ELA and Science declined in 2019, ELA only declined by 6 percentage points as compared to 16 percentage points in science.
Measurable Outcome:	Science proficiency will increase to 45%, compared to 37% 2019 data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	An instructional coach is on site that focuses on math and science. Professional development, focused on Science, will be provided to instructional staff. Academic plans and curriculum maps are provided to instructional staff identifying the important concepts taught at each grade level. Professional Learning Communities meet weekly in order to discuss data related to progress monitoring in science. Lesson plans and PLC agendas/minutes are submitted. Foundational ELA skills are a strong focus. Classroom walk-throughs occur several times per week. District Subject Area Specialists provide professional development and intermediate grade level has a Leading & Learning Science & ELA representative.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Strong Professional development, focused on ELA and Science will provide teachers with the instructional strategies and tools needed for delivering instruction. ELA PD, with a focus on foundational skills, is essential due to reading and understanding content in science. Subject Area specialist on site training provides teachers with strategic strategies for delivering targeted instruction in science. Standards based posters provide easy access to grade level standards for each intermediate grade. Progress monitoring provides data to discuss at PLC's, leading to targeted academic instruction. Lesson Plans, PLC agenda's/minutes, and classroom walk-throughs serve as evidence of learning and provide insight needed to continue to make strategic decisions based on student need. Providing a coach, focused on science, provides teachers with a resource on site.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide Professional Development Opportunities focused on Science (ADMIN, Coaches, District Subject Specialists, Leading & Learning Reps)
2. Weekly PLC's with Minutes/Agenda (Teachers, ADMIN)
3. Lesson Plans following Academic Plans (ADMIN, Teachers)
4. Classroom Walk-throughs and Coach Resource (ADMIN, Coach)
5. Progress Monitoring (Testing Coordinator, Teachers)

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.

Same as listed in the plan.

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 are invited to an open house and the Annual Title I meeting where Principal shares the vision, mission, and culture of the school for several rotations so that all can attend.

Parents, teachers, students, community members and business partners participate in the comprehensive needs' assessment by participating in PTA/SAC meetings, DAC meetings, curriculum night events, and sharing and analyzing data for all student subgroups groups including regular ed, ESE, gifted, migrant, ELLs, L25, educationally disadvantaged and student performance categorized by race/ethnicity.

Stakeholders will participate as the result of School Messenger phone, email and text ,"Tice Together" school newsletter, Peachjar, Facebook, Website and Twitter ensuring participation by also offering transportation, flexible meeting times and 100% of all meetings conducted in English and Spanish.

Tice has 63 Business Partners; some provide input through surveys, quality tools like parking lots, affinity diagrams, or by open discussions.Buckingham Presbyterian Church is by far our most communicative community stakeholder. Communications with all stakeholders are flexible (such as online, in person, on paper and some even by texting the Principal --allowing for all to give input in both English/Spanish and in simple terms that parents can easily understand. Information gathered from this data is used to identify school needs and create a plan. Stakeholders are also personally involved in the design, implementation and evaluation of the school wide plan, including creating and reviewing during SAC/Title I monthly meetings. Parents also vote on how to spend the 1% set aside for parent involvement and via the SAC/Title 1 meetings they are involved in monitoring of plan progress and monthly review of data. Strategies to increase family engagement are included in the PFEP.

NOTEWORTHY: 63 partners donate 112,000+ worth of goods/services, enhancing student health/welfare in and out of school.

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: ELA**	$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**	$0.00

3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**	**$0.00**
4	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**	**$0.00**
5	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**	**$0.00**
6	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline**	**$0.00**
7	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance**	**$0.00**
8	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**	**$0.00**
9	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$0.00**