

The School District of Lee County

# Trafalgar Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

# Trafalgar Elementary School

1850 SW 20TH AVE, Cape Coral, FL 33991

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Lisa Murphy**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (64%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I

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

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

# Trafalgar Elementary School

1850 SW 20TH AVE, Cape Coral, FL 33991

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

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">54%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">47%</p>

## School Grades History

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

## 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.**

Our mission is to inspire our students to think and learn.

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

Our vision is to provide a quality education in a safe and well-managed environment.

### 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
Murphy, Lisa	Principal	Leadership team meets biweekly: monitors student achievement data, review and adjust schedules to support intervention in classrooms, and reviews attendance and behavior data. Administration attends all grade level PLCs and other leadership team members are assigned at least one grade level PLC to attend and support.
Stanford, Michele	Assistant Principal	
Zaiser, Jill	Other	

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Saturday 7/1/2017, Lisa Murphy

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

8

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

38

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (64%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**Early Warning Systems**

**Current Year**

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



Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	106	121	116	142	144	129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	758
Attendance below 90 percent	2	5	1	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	1	5	3	1	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in Math	0	1	2	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

**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	2	2	1	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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

**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	0	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	0
One or more suspensions	0	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	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	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	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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	71%	57%	57%	76%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	56%	58%	65%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	50%	53%	46%	49%	52%
Math Achievement	75%	62%	63%	77%	60%	61%
Math Learning Gains	74%	65%	62%	72%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	54%	51%	58%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	68%	52%	53%	71%	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	71%	58%	13%	58%	13%
	2018	75%	55%	20%	57%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	55%	16%	58%	13%
	2018	64%	53%	11%	56%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	64%	54%	10%	56%	8%
	2018	62%	52%	10%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	77%	61%	16%	62%	15%
	2018	75%	58%	17%	62%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	74%	62%	12%	64%	10%
	2018	71%	58%	13%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	69%	58%	11%	60%	9%
	2018	60%	57%	3%	61%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	66%	50%	16%	53%	13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	54%	52%	2%	55%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
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	28	39	35	31	54	41	30				
ELL	54	60		62	70						
BLK	57	55		54	40						
HSP	63	53	31	71	78	53	58				
MUL	64			91							
WHT	76	64	64	78	74	46	75				
FRL	65	60	41	66	69	41	59				
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	24	29	27	25	22	18	17				
BLK	50	15		50	38						
HSP	65	49	34	64	49	32	47				
MUL	67	64		75	55						
WHT	73	51	33	74	49	21	60				
FRL	66	45	33	64	47	28	49				
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	41	47	43	38	50	41	43				
BLK	73	79		55	71						
HSP	68	61	50	77	76	72	61				
MUL	93			79							
WHT	78	65	38	80	71	51	78				
FRL	68	59	45	69	69	60	64				

**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	62

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
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	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	497
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	60
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	52
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57
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	78
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	68
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	56
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.**

L25 making learning gains in Math. 47% L25 in math made learning gains compared to 50% at the district level and 53% at the state level. 5th grade had 30 students with IEPs in Math. In addition, learning gains for the L25 has been in a decline since 2016-17 school year.

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

3rd grade proficiency decreased from 75% to 71% proficient a decrease of -4%.

**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.**

Although we have made learning gains with the L25 in Reading and Math, we are still below the state average in both areas. ELA -6% and Math -5%  
Trafalgar historically is a school of high proficiency. Scheduling and planning intervention based on individualized student data was lacking.

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

Science 56 to 66. 10 point gain. 5th grade was departmentalized with Math/Science and ELA/Writing. We included science in our WIN time in which all teachers taught science. Time was allotted to review 3rd and 4th grade standards.

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

The number of students with 2 or more early warning indicators.

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

1. L25 Learning gains in ELA
2. L25 Learning gains in Math
3. SWD ELA Achievement
4. 3rd grade proficiency
4. Overall Learning gains ELA

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** 46% of students identified in the lowest 25th percentile (L25) in math made learning gains compared to 54% at the district level and 51% at the state level.

**Measurable Outcome:** Increase the % of L25 students making learning gains from 46% to 54%, as measured by the FY21 Math FSA.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Lisa Murphy (lisajm@leeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Standards-based small group instruction.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Standards-based small group instruction to reinforce or reteach specific skills and concepts and provide reduced student-teacher ratio. Small groups will be fluid based on need and standard using i-Ready assessments and formative assessments provided in the district Instructional Guides.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Common planning for teachers to conduct weekly Standard based PLCs using the 4 guiding questions to plan instruction.
2. Instructional Guide resources and i-Ready Math Toolbox we be used as resources for intervening in the small group setting.
3. Teachers will have ongoing training on High Yield Strategies.
4. Strategic planning quarterly with district and school based math coach.

**Person Responsible** Lisa Murphy (lisajm@leeschools.net)



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

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	47% L25 made learning gains in ELA compared to 50% at the district level and 53% at the state level.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Increase the % of L25 students making learning gains from 47% to 50% as measured by the FY21 ELA FSA.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Lisa Murphy (lisajm@leeschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Fluency Strategies Fluency strategies will increase accuracy, automaticity and prosody. In addition, also build stamina for reading extended passages.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Students will be assessed with grade level passages to determine fluency rate.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Fluency placement assessments
2. During intervention blocks, students will use the fluency components in Read 180 and HD Word.
3. During small group instruction, students will use fluency strategies such as choral reading, paired reading and repeated readings of passages.
4. Students will monitor and track their fluency rates.
5. Teachers will track and monitor fluency rates for targeted students bi-weekly.
6. Teachers will have ongoing training on High Yield Strategies.
7. Strategic planning quarterly with district and school based Reading coach.

**Person Responsible**            Lisa Murphy (lisajm@leeschools.net)

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

<b>Area of Focus</b>	71% proficiency 2019
<b>Description and Rationale:</b>	69% proficiency 2018 76% proficiency 2017 Although there was a slight increase in proficiency for 2019, we would like to continue the positive trend in order to meet/exceed our 2017 76% proficiency.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Increase the % of 3-5 proficient students from 71/% to 76% as measured by the FY21 ELA FSA.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Lisa Murphy (lisajm@leeschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Writing in response to reading
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Teachers will incorporate writing breaks at regular intervals in all content areas. Writing in response to reading allows students to process the content they are learning at a deeper level.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. During PLCs, teachers will plan on ways to incorporate daily opportunities for students to use writing to inform and writing to learn in all content areas.
2. Teachers will have ongoing training on High Yield Strategies.
3. Strategic planning quarterly with district and school based Reading coach.

**Person Responsible** Lisa Murphy (lisajm@leeschools.net)

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

<b>Area of Focus</b>	
<b>Description and Rationale:</b>	Total of 8 students issued consequence of OSS/ISS for the 2018-19 school year.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Continue to implement behavior prevention systems in 100% of classrooms and at school level to maintain low OSS/ISS rate as compared to the 2018-19 school year.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Lisa Murphy (lisajm@leeschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	PBS strategies/incentives
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	We are consistently a Gold Level PBS school based on our PBS strategies and school wide behavior plan.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Staff members assigned mentor students identified by school counselor and/or behavior specialist
2. Weekly small group social groups with school counselor and/or behavior specialist
3. Consistent school wide behavior plan and expectations

**Person Responsible** Lisa Murphy (lisajm@leeschools.net)

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

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:**

We cannot educate students that are absent from school.

**Measurable Outcome:**

Decrease the number of chronically absent students (below 90%) from 46 students to 23 students as measured by the CASTLE early warning system by June, 2021.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Lisa Murphy (lisajm@leeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Parent contact from administration to build relationship and provide support and interventions to reduce chronic absences.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

At the elementary level, students depend on their parents and/or guardians to provide transportation to school

#### Action Steps to Implement

1. Weekly data attendance printed from FOCUS and analysed for past students with chronic absences as well as students that have current chronic absences.
2. The school social worker will be a liason to the parents, teachers and administration with updates on attendance and parent communication.
3. Attendance concerns are to first be addressed by the classroom teacher and then administration will be contacted if attendance concerns continue.

**Person Responsible** Lisa Murphy (lisajm@leeschools.net)

#### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

1. **Fluency placement assessments**
2. **During intervention blocks, students will use the fluency components in Read 180 and HD Word.**
3. **During small group instruction, students will use fluency strategies such as choral reading, paired reading and repeated readings of passages.**
4. **Students will monitor and track their fluency rates.**
5. **Teachers will track and monitor fluency rates for targeted students bi-weekly.**
6. **Teachers will have ongoing training on High Yield Strategies.**
7. **Strategic planning quarterly with district and school based Reading coach.**

## 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 year, families and students will be invited to a virtual and modified open house in which classroom teachers will share the vision, mission, and culture of the school. Parents, teachers, students, community members and business partners are invited to SAC meetings and PTO meetings in which data for all student groups is presented. Stakeholders will participate as a result of Trafalgar Elementary's process for ensuring participation, such a invitations through the school newsletter, School Messenger and Peach Jar.

**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: Math	\$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: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>