

The School District of Lee County

Tortuga Preserve 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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	22

Tortuga Preserve Elementary School

1711 GUNNERY RD N, Lehigh Acres, FL 33971

<http://tpe.leeschools.net>

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Shonak

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Tortuga Preserve Elementary School

1711 GUNNERY RD N, Lehigh Acres, FL 33971

<http://tpe.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	83%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Tortuga Preserve is shaping well-rounded leaders by being Proactive, Organized, Wise, Engaged, and Respectful. Our mindset is #ALLIN!

Provide the school's vision statement.

One TEAM with one MINDSET on the path to 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
Shonak, Jennifer	Principal	Oversees all processes and procedures for the students and staff of the school. Ensure teachers and staff are working towards SIP Goals.
Crawford, Dave	Assistant Principal	Oversees all processes and procedures for the students and staff of the school. Ensure teachers and staff are working towards SIP Goals. AP over Grades 3-5, K-5 Math and Science, ESE and Safety.
Vest, Marla	Assistant Principal	Oversees all processes and procedures for the students and staff of the school. Ensure teachers and staff are working towards SIP Goals. AP over K-2, K-5 ELA, Title I and ESOL.
Phennicie, Molly	Instructional Coach	Peer Collaborative Teacher who supports teachers 40% of the day and one classroom 60% of the school day. Supports instruction related to SIP Goals and assists in leading PLCs.
Pappas, Nicole	Instructional Coach	Supports instruction related to SIP Goals and assists in leading PLCs.
Subbert, Elizabeth	Instructional Coach	Supports instruction related to SIP Goals and assists in leading PLCs.
Akridge, Chansi	Instructional Coach	Primary Literacy Coach who supports teachers and curriculum/instruction. Supports instruction related to SIP Goals and assists in leading PLCs.
Putnam, Amy	Instructional Coach	Supports instruction related to SIP Goals and assists in leading PLCs.
Carter, Elizabeth	Instructional Coach	Supports instruction related to SIP Goals and assists in leading PLCs.
Schmidt, Kimberly	Dean	Student discipline, administrative role/team, PBIS and testing coordinator

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Jennifer Shonak

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.*

1

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

62

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems**Current Year**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	133	141	162	154	175	153	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	918
Attendance below 90 percent	3	13	17	10	17	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	3	11	8	11	14	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Course failure in Math	3	4	2	6	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	30	5	2	7	11	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	160	156	175	167	155	175	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	988
Attendance below 90 percent	30	20	22	24	22	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139
One or more suspensions	3	1	2	5	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA or Math	26	6	4	46	17	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	50	63	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	172

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	10	1	2	36	23	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95

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	12	1	1	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	160	156	175	167	155	175	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	988
Attendance below 90 percent	30	20	22	24	22	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139
One or more suspensions	3	1	2	5	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA or Math	26	6	4	46	17	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	50	63	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	172

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	10	1	2	36	23	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95

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	12	1	1	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	45%	57%	57%	46%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	41%	56%	58%	54%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	50%	53%	49%	49%	52%
Math Achievement	53%	62%	63%	50%	60%	61%
Math Learning Gains	53%	65%	62%	54%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	54%	51%	47%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	48%	52%	53%	47%	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	54%	55%	-1%	57%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	40%	55%	-15%	58%	-18%
	2018	49%	53%	-4%	56%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
05	2019	43%	54%	-11%	56%	-13%
	2018	48%	52%	-4%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	54%	61%	-7%	62%	-8%
	2018	59%	58%	1%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	62%	-9%	64%	-11%
	2018	59%	58%	1%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	54%	58%	-4%	60%	-6%
	2018	53%	57%	-4%	61%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	48%	50%	-2%	53%	-5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	59%	52%	7%	55%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
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	36	33	33	42	42	28				
ELL	32	33	20	42	47	50	33				
BLK	37	43	61	43	46	48	35				
HSP	41	34	26	49	49	39	35				
MUL	67	75		67	50						
WHT	61	51	64	70	65	64	80				
FRL	41	41	42	48	50	44	41				
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	25	36	32	35	52	33	35				
ELL	27	44	48	44	47	26	27				
BLK	42	48	39	46	46	26	52				
HSP	44	49	52	54	59	41	53				
MUL	69	67		81	75						
WHT	70	59		70	65		84				
FRL	48	49	41	54	56	39	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	18	49	61	23	50	41	15				
ELL	23	34	24	33	50	53	26				
BLK	36	48	50	37	47	52	28				
HSP	40	54	47	47	51	39	49				
MUL	50	38		50	58						
WHT	70	66	64	72	70		68				
FRL	40	52	46	41	49	43	40				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	389
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	40
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	45
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	42
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	65
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	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	46
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 component that showed the lowest performance was ELA learning gains. Our percentage was 41% (18-19).

Three year trend:

16-17: 54%

17-18: 52%

18-19: 41%

19-20: Quarter 3 data showed that we were at 58%.

The contributing factors continued to be: new leadership team, high turnover, and many first year teachers in 4th and 5th grades.

This is a continued area of focus for the 2020-21 school year.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was ELA learning gains. The contributing factor was a lack of resources available to support intervention. In 2019-20 our Quarter 3 data showed growth but we will continue to have this as a focus for the 2020-21 school year.

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

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was ELA Learning Gains. Our percentage was 41% making gains and the state average was 58%, making a gap of 17%. The trend has been 54% (16-17) and 52% (17-18). The contributing factors were: new leadership team, high turnover and many first year teachers in 4th and 5th Grade.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was Math L25 Learning Gains. After reviewing the data our school decided to allocate extra resources to the area of math (support for students and teachers).

In the 2019-20 school year our Quarter 3 data showed that our Math L25 Learning Gains were at 35%. This is a continued area of focus for 2020-21 school year.

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

An area of concern is attendance. We decreased the percentage of students that had an absence rate greater than 90% from 19% (SY 18) to 16% (SY 19). This is still an area of concern as we wish to decrease that percentage from 16% to 14%. The implementation of an Save One Student mentor program has helped and we hope to expand that program this school year.

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

1. ELA Learning Gains
2. Math Learning Gains
3. Science Proficiency
4. Increase Attendance
5. Implement School-Wide Discipline Plan

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus	Achievement level for Science decreased from 60% proficient to 48% during the 2018-2019 school year.
Description and Rationale:	2019-20 Quarter 3 data showed a proficiency of 41% proficient. This is a continued area of focus for the 2020-21 school year with a focus on our students in the ELL and SWD subgroups.

Measurable Outcome: In 2020-2021 we will increase our Science proficiency from 48% to 58% as reported by the FLDOE School Grade Report.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennifer Shonak (jenniferis@leeschools.net)

Diagnostic results from the Compass Science Assessment will be utilized to track student progress.

Evidence-based Strategy: Leading and Learning teams at 4th and 5th Grade will support the team with Science planning. District personnel along with Math/Science Resource Teacher, will plan with 4th and 5th Grade throughout the school year. K-3 will include Science 30 minutes per day at least 3 days a week. Grades 4 and 5 will include 45 minutes per day of Science. 5th Grade will revisit 3rd and 4th Grade Science standards as needed. 5th grade Resource Teacher will work with small groups of students to target specific areas of need based on standards/diagnostic results.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Consistent team planning and collaboration with the District will help strategize and plan for Science instruction. Including 30-45 minutes per day of Science instruction across K-5 will build mastery of Science standards across all grade levels. Creating a plan to revisit 3rd and 4th grade Science standards will assist students in the mastery of standards taught in previous grades.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Conduct Science Compass Diagnostic with 5th Grade students.
2. Determine students scoring below proficient level.
3. Identify standards not mastered.
4. Plan for intervention of standards based on student needs.
5. Monitor progress, revisit plan.

Person Responsible Jennifer Shonak (jenniferis@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based upon the 2018-2019 FSA Spring data, one of our lowest performing categories in Math was our Learning Gains with 53%. This was a 5% decrease from the previous year. In 2019-20 our Quarter 3 data showed we were at 41% for Math Learning Gains. This will continue to be a focus for the 2020-21 school year, especially targeting our SWD and ELL subgroups.
Measurable Outcome:	By the spring of 2019-2020, Math Learning Gains will increase from 53% to 60% as measured by the FSA. Our goal will remain the same for the 2020-21 school year with a focus on our SWD and ELL subgroups.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Shonak (jenniferis@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Tortuga Preserve's Leadership along with the Math Leading & Learning Teams will plan with district personnel throughout the year to review data and determine what the biggest area of needs are in reference to the math standards. Resource teachers will pull small groups of students of for Math intervention time and supplement instruction based on grade level standards. All students will also use iReady Math intervention and teachers will provide intense intervention using differentiation and High Yield Strategies throughout their lessons and centers. Additional intervention time will be implemented throughout the day and during morning breakfast clubs/lunch bunch. 2/3/20 Update: Based off of data, after school tutoring (3-5) and students pulled for extra instruction via PE Waivers (4 and 5) will begin in Jan/Feb. Grade level intervention time will rotate between ELA and Math.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Intervention time/small groups instruction allows teachers to differentiate and target standards not being met or need for enrichment specific to the individual student needs. Data will be tracked from i-Ready Math and formatives to analyze what standards students need and intervention/enrichment will be based on need.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify students/subgroups that did not make math learning gains during the 2018-19 school year using FSA data/and 2019-20 school year using Quarter 3 data.
2. Based on data, determine push in/pull out math groups with Resource teacher's support.
3. Determine standards that are not mastered using STAR and/or iReady Reports and make focus standards.
4. 75 minute Math block to include whole group and small group instruction both on level and reteach standards not mastered.
5. Assess, review data, plan for instruction and change instruction/groups based on needs.
6. Students considered bubble kids in Grades 3-5 will be invited to after school tutoring.
7. Students considered bubble kids in Grades 3-5 not mastering math standards will be provided with PE Waivers to attend extra instruction during their PE block.

Person Responsible Jennifer Shonak (jenniferis@leeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based upon the 2018-2019 FSA Spring data, one of our lowest performing categories in ELA was our Learning Gains with 41%. This was a 11% decrease from the previous year. According to Quarter 3 data, in the 2019-20 school year we were at 58% making learning gains. This will continue to be a focus for the 2020-21 school year, especially our SWD and ELL subgroups.

Measurable Outcome: By the spring of 2020-2021, ELA Learning Gains will increase from 41% to 51% as measured by the FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennifer Shonak (jenniferis@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Tortuga Preserve's Leadership Team along with the ELA Leading & Learning Teams will support grades 3-5 with ELA planning. They will work with district personnel to also review data to determine what the greatest area of needs are in reference to ELA standards. Students will use iReady intervention to support the classroom instruction along with LAFS curriculum based on grade level standards. High Yield strategies will be implemented into daily instruction. Students will also be placed in flexible intervention groups during WIN time for 30-45 minutes daily. All students, in all subgroups will be placed based on their individual needs for standards mastery/enrichment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We selected the WIN strategy (30-45 minutes of intensive instruction) it was determined that small group instruction allowed teachers to differentiate and target standards not being met and specific to the individual student needs. This also allows for enrichment for those students that have already mastered the standards. Also, High Yield Strategies have been proven to increase student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify students that did not make ELA learning gains during the 2018-19 school year based on FSA Data/Quarter 3 2019-20 data.
2. Determine students/standards needed (mastery/enrichment) based on STAR and iReady Data.
3. Determine intervention/enrichment groups based on need.
4. Instruct on level for 90 minute block and based on needs during 45 minutes of intervention. Provide support from Resource teachers to push in/pull out or coaching.
5. Assess, review data, plan for instruction and change instruction/groups based on needs.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Shonak (jenniferis@leeschools.net)

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

The total number of discipline referrals for the 2018-2019 school year was 560 office referrals. Of these referrals, the Black subgroup totaled 182 office referrals making up 32.5%. The breakdown by demographic subgroup is below:

White – 140 (25%)
 Black – 182 (32.5%)
 Hispanic – 196 (35%)
 Indian – 2 (<1%)
 Multi-racial – 40 (7%)

Measurable Outcome:

By the end of the 2020-21 school year, Tortuga Preserve will decrease the total number of office discipline referrals by 10% as measured by Castle. We will decrease the amount in the Black subgroup from 32.5% to 28% as measured by Castle.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Shonak (jenniferis@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

School-wide discipline plan. A schoolwide discipline plan was introduced during pre-school week. This plan outlines what staff members vs. administrative discipline procedures look like. The plan specifies what constitutes a discipline referral as well as steps/actions to take in correcting the behavior before writing infractions. Administration, school counselor and behavior specialist will support classroom teachers with discipline issues and utilize more restorative practices.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Discipline was inconsistent in past years. Our school-wide plan will mainstream the process and give teachers a step by step guide when disciplining students in their class. Administration went over with teachers and staff the criteria for a behavior infraction as well as the criteria for a discipline referral during preschool week. This has been reinforced during weekly grade level meetings and through email messages. They will know when an behavior infraction or discipline referral should be written and they will be supported by admin, school counselor and behavior specialist. This will continue to be a focus for the 2020-21 school year.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Admin team with behavior specialist and school counselor will develop school-wide discipline plan. The team will meet with the PBIS team to identify additional opportunities to encourage positive behavior in the classroom, hallways, cafeteria and outside areas.
2. Admin team will present the plan to staff.
3. Assistant Principal Dave Crawford will meet with the behavior team on a monthly basis to discuss the plan and make adjustments if necessary.
4. Behavior specialist and school counselor will get together at the end of each month to discuss students that are starting to present challenges in the classroom before the behavior gets to a more extreme stage.
5. Reflect on the process with staff at the conclusion of the school year.
6. Make changes, as needed, for the next school year.

Person Responsible

Dave Crawford (davehc@leeschools.net)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Each of our grade levels have 20 or more students that had below 90% attendance. That is an average of 16% of our entire population. Kindergarten had the highest percentage of students that were chronically absent. Grades K-2 had an average of 15% of students that were below 90% attendance and grades 3-5 had an average of 14%.

K - 30 (19%)
 1 - 20 (13%)
 2 - 22 (13%)
 3 - 24 (14%)
 4 - 22 (14%)
 5 -21 (12%)

Measurable Outcome:

By the Spring of 2019-2020, we will decrease the amount of students who are chronically absent from 16% to 14% overall. We will decrease the amount in K-2 from 17% to 15% and the amount in 3-5 from 16% to 14% as measured by the EWS report.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Shonak (jenniferis@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

We will continue our adult/student mentorship - Save One Student (SOS). We will add to our current program including more consistent check in times and quarterly incentives. Along with our SOS program, we will communicate with our School Social Worker regarding those chronically absent. She will be hosting attendance groups for those students. In addition, we will provide attendance wheels for classrooms to complete and be rewarded.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Staff members choose the student they mentor and build a relationship with them outside of their classroom teacher. Teachers can meet with the students during their planning and lunch periods. Having that one person for support on school campus can assist with encouraging them to visit them in the mornings when they arrive, celebrate accomplishments, and/or be a check in person when they are having a rough day. Having staff choose their students to mentor connects adults to students that they may have had in their class in the past or for other reasons.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify students below 90% attendance for the 18-19 school year.
2. Reach out to staff - asking for volunteers to mentor students.
3. Set expectations, guidelines, and incentives.
4. Finalize adult/student mentorships
5. Encourage and support the staff members, review data, plan for action.

Person Responsible

Jennifer Shonak (jenniferis@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 will continue to monitor data and progress monitor to make curriculum/instructional changes as needed to meet the needs of our students, especially our SWD and ELL subgroup population, through intervention and small group/push in sessions.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

At the beginning of the school year, families and students will be invited to an open house and the Annual Title I meeting where staff will share the vision, mission, and culture of the school.

Parents, teachers, students, community members and business partners will participate in the comprehensive needs' assessment by hosting an Annual Title I Meeting, Curriculum Night, PTA Meetings, SAC Meetings, ESE Parent Meetings, Parent-Teacher Conferences, Math and Science Night, and a Families First Breakfast. We also have a Parent Resource Room that our bilingual Parent Involvement Specialist is available to meet with parents. Stakeholders will participate as the result of our monthly school newsletter, School Messenger, PeachJar, paper flyers, school marquee, school website and Facebook Page, email and phone calls. Our events are at various times (before and after school). We enlist community and business partners via our school events, partnering with local agencies for our Spirit Nights and our SAC Meeting.

Input from stakeholders will be collected through open discussions and workshop feedback responses. 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 during attendance and participation in the SAC Meetings. The SAC will openly discuss, make edits and vote as a committee to approve the SIP and the expenditure of the 1% parent involvement dollars. The SAC will also discuss progress monitoring data during all meetings and the progress we are making towards SIP Goals. Strategies to increase family engagement are included in the PFEP.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00

3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00