The Alva School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

The Alva School

17500 CHURCH AVE, Alva, FL 33920

http://alv.leeschools.net/

Demographics

Principal: Nathan Shaker

Start Date for this Principal: 1/7/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	96%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (50%)
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

The Alva School

17500 CHURCH AVE, Alva, FL 33920

http://alv.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)
Combination School PK-8	No	69%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	30%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The Alva School will provide educational opportunities for academic excellence for all K-8 students in a safe, respectful, and productive learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Alva School is a place of excellence where all students are inspired to think and learn.

The school will design programs and learning opportunities that promote academic achievement and the personal and social growth of every student. As a richly diverse community of learners that values all its members, The Alva School will assume a central role in the community by linking parents, local agencies, and businesses to the school.

The Alva School will provide a safe and productive learning environment in which students can communicate effectively, think critically, solve problems, and are technologically literate through a variety of curricular and extra-curricular activities. Through a challenging course of study with high standards, students will become responsible learners who can work collaboratively, and be accountable for their own academic and developmental progress.

The Alva School students will become life-long learners who will be educated to make valuable contributions to society. Through the teamwork of the school, home, and community, every student will be well prepared for the demands of the future.

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
Barfield, Alice	Principal	Our Principal leads this school by ensuring every choice that is made is firmly grounded in what is best for kids. By hiring and retaining quality instructors and putting them in positions that align with their personal strengths, our principal ensures that our school is filled with instructional leaders that are able to sharpen their skills through team interactions Our Principal engages staff by weekly attending team/department meetings and PLCs so that our principal can hear where students are currently performing and any areas of need so that our principal can support both our teachers and students success in the classroom. Our Principal actively engages our community members by hosting events and inviting them into our school to strengthen bonds and community support.
Smith, Erica	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Smith is an instructional leader whose duties include supporting the elementary teachers and students by supporting the implementation of district resources and curriculum, organizing and supporting our MTSS process, and engaging community members to support school initiatives and goals. Mrs. Smith continually organizes and presents current elementary data to better inform school based decisions to the entire staff or during weekly department/grade level PLCs.
Langley, Beau	Teacher, K-12	Mr. Langley supports our middle level student population by engaging teachers, students, and families to offer the best opportunity for student success through his role in credit retrieval. Through his experiences and relationships, Mr. Langley is able to provide valuable insight when discussing interventions and decisions to ensure student success.
Strickland, Buddy	Other	As The Alva School's maintenance supervisor, Mr. Strickland ensures that our school is a functioning and safe environment for our students, staff and community. By attending leadership meetings, Mr. Strickland collaborates with the leadership team to ensures decisions maintain the safety, security, and functionality of our building including any concerns shared by teachers during their weekly PLC meetings.
Abrams, Shari	Teacher, ESE	In addition to filling the role of our K-2 Literacy Coach, Mrs. Abrams leads the exceptional student education department at The Alva School. By supporting diverse learners and their families, supporting instruction through coaching, and ensuring compliance with district, state, and federal initiatives and laws, she supports the leadership team with school-based decisions. The entire ESE team attends weekly PLC meetings for the population they service. In Mrs. Abrams case, she attends middle level and upper elementary PLC to offer support and ideas to general education teachers and align resources to address issues discussed during weekly meetings.
Stinson, Kim	Assistant Principal	As Assistant Principal focused on the Elementary Level and community involvement, Mrs. Stinson collaborates with parents, community members, school administration, teachers, and students to ensure that we meet school based and student goals for success. When attending grades k-5 PLC

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		meetings, Mrs. Stinson actively listens to needs, success, and concerns and offers knowledge or ideas at the table, and then later works with administration to align resources as needed to ensure student learning.
Cangialosi, Erica	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Cangialosi is an instructional leader whose duties include supporting the middle level teachers and students by supporting the implementation of district resources and curriculum, supporting our gifted process and instruction, and engaging community members to support school initiatives and goals. Mrs. Cangialosi continually organizes and presents current middle level data to better inform school based decisions to the entire staff or during weekly department/grade level PLCs.
Smith, Holly	Assistant Principal	As Assistant Principal focused on the Middle Level and Building Maintenance, Mrs. Mathews collaborates with school and district staff, school administration, parents, teachers, and students to ensure that we meet school and student goals for safety, security, and student success. When attending grades 6-8/department PLC meetings, Mrs. Mathews actively listens to the needs, success, and concerns and offers knowledge or ideas at the table, and then later works with administration to align resources as needed to ensure student learning and safety.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 1/7/2020, Nathan Shaker

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
65

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No

2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	96%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (50%)
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 10/26/2020

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	59	61	84	94	74	101	221	205	208	0	0	0	0	1107
Attendance below 90 percent	12	7	9	14	16	18	21	21	30	0	0	0	0	148
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	36	21	45	0	0	0	0	103
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	15	12	26	80	64	73	0	0	0	0	270

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	5

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	3	0	0	0	0	14

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	59	61	84	94	74	101	221	205	208	0	0	0	0	1107
Attendance below 90 percent	12	7	9	14	16	18	21	21	30	0	0	0	0	148
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	36	21	45	0	0	0	0	103
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	15	12	26	80	64	73	0	0	0	0	270

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	5

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	3	0	0	0	0	14

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	55%	62%	61%	51%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	60%	59%	51%	52%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	53%	54%	45%	51%	51%
Math Achievement	64%	62%	62%	58%	52%	58%
Math Learning Gains	70%	61%	59%	63%	51%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	49%	52%	62%	50%	50%
Science Achievement	51%	54%	56%	45%	45%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	70%	78%	78%	62%	65%	75%

	EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey									
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									**Total**
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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	62%	58%	4%	58%	4%
	2018	59%	55%	4%	57%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	55%	-3%	58%	-6%
	2018	60%	53%	7%	56%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	52%	54%	-2%	56%	-4%
	2018	46%	52%	-6%	55%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
06	2019	53%	52%	1%	54%	-1%
	2018	47%	51%	-4%	52%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
07	2019	51%	51%	0%	52%	-1%
	2018	50%	50%	0%	51%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	56%	57%	-1%	56%	0%
	2018	59%	56%	3%	58%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	63%	61%	2%	62%	1%
	2018	56%	58%	-2%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	59%	62%	-3%	64%	-5%
	2018	60%	58%	2%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	44%	58%	-14%	60%	-16%
	2018	40%	57%	-17%	61%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				
06	2019	56%	47%	9%	55%	1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	53%	41%	12%	52%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
07	2019	64%	57%	7%	54%	10%
	2018	70%	65%	5%	54%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
08	2019	64%	60%	4%	46%	18%
	2018	48%	47%	1%	45%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	62%	50%	12%	53%	9%
	2018	55%	52%	3%	55%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	41%	46%	-5%	48%	-7%
	2018	53%	48%	5%	50%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	65%	67%	-2%	71%	-6%
2018	67%	66%	1%	71%	-4%
Compare		-2%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	59%	41%	61%	39%
2018	100%	60%	40%	62%	38%
Compare		0%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	50%	-50%	57%	-57%
2018					

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	15	44	48	33	61	69	14	35			
ELL	33	59	57	50	69	77	36				
BLK	27	41		39	57	71		55			
HSP	59	63	58	65	77	73	51	66	53		
MUL	53	25		33	50						
WHT	55	60	64	67	69	55	52	71	57		
FRL	48	61	62	59	67	60	41	64	44		

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	15	41	45	28	55	54	10	25			
ELL	25	36	45	39	56	50					
BLK	41	54	55	26	42		40				
HSP	50	52	57	61	66	53	49	68	47		
MUL	44			67							
WHT	54	55	48	63	68	56	58	68	54		
FRL	45	48	48	54	63	52	47	62	42		

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	19	42	40	28	49	50	22	33			
ELL	29	44	40	33	61	73					
BLK	42	43	43	39	69	73	26				
HSP	47	52	43	50	62	62	35	52	59		
MUL	57	60		43	70						
WHT	54	51	45	62	64	61	49	65	58		
FRL	44	44	44	49	58	63	39	53	57		

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	63
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	80
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	629
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	58
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	48
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	64
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	40
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	61
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	59
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.

Utilizing CASTLE and CIMS School Data, we learned that though our students making learning gains, especially in the bottom 25% in English Language Arts increased and matched or out performed both the district and state, the data component that showed the lowest performance is The Alva School's percent of students meeting ELA proficiency. Our students with disabilities averaged only 15% proficiency for the second year and black students declined from 41% to 27% proficiency contributed to the overall school average of 55% proficiency. Though this average was a three percent increase from last years 52% proficiency, this rate of increase is under performing when compared with the state and district increases. ELA has been targeted through district remedial programs that are proven effective, but take time. Many of our ESE students are entering these programs more than

three years below grade level. More time is needed to support the key building block standards that are essential building blocks for grade level application and analysis. Student in both of these subgroups additionally, need more time building up background knowledge and clearing up misconceptions with content understanding. Grade level teams will need to work together with special education staff and supports to ensure that students are having adequate instruction on grade level standards while receiving below grade level instruction meant to fill in holes and close gaps.

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 would be The Alva School's overall proficiency in Science from 56% to 51%. Though Alva enjoyed 62% proficiency in 5th grade, 8th grade's drop to 41% proficiency negatively impacted the overall proficiency score in Science. The leadership team believes that this low performance was due to this being the first school year for the course change to Physical Science. When reviewing the district baseline to end of the year data, 8th grade students at the Alva school started with 22% proficiency, rising to 30% mid-year, and rising to 40% proficiency on the end of the year district science assessment. This end of the year score strongly correlates with the State Assessment, but also shows growth throughout the school year with content only 22% of our students where familiar with at the start of the year. This group of students did not have comprehensive science at any grade level. The 8th grade Statewide Science Assessment was comprehensive with more than 74 percent of the test related to 6th and 7th grade comprehensive material. In addition, this group was part of the cohort that did not have the benefit of the Level 1 and Level 2 intensive reading programs to scaffold the critical gaps in foundational reading skills. For our students who are not reading proficiently on grade level (only 55% overall) the inability to effectively read science passages filled with academic vocabulary is a significant hurdle to showing mastery.

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 grade level data component with the greatest gap between state and school average was 5th Grade Math proficiency of 44% compared to the state average 60% on the Florida Standards Assessment. Because our school is a K-8, we are able to offer an increased level of acceleration by allowing our proficient math students entering 5th grade an opportunity to take and later be assessed on 6th grade math standards. This opportunity decreases the number of highly proficient math students available to take the 5th grade math assessment. When those students are included as shown on the 5th grade Star Math mid year proficiency percentage of 60% and the end of the year proficiency percentage of 56%, almost half or our students are still missing key foundational and below grade level math skill sets that are necessary to accurately complete multi-step math problems. In addition, the math exam requires a higher reading level to complete multiple-step math problems, and many students did not take the time or effort necessary to comprehend accompanying text. For our SWD/504 students given the accommodation of having questions read aloud, this was the first year they did not have the opportunity to take the test online where they could press a button to have anything read loud multiple times simply by clicking a their mouse. These students did not consistently request for word problems to be read aloud and testing rooms were not staffed so that students could request the accommodation without wait time.

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

Utilizing CASTLE and CIMS School Data, we learned that the data component that showed the most improvement was The Alva School's ELA learning gains for the lowest 25% of our population. We enjoyed an overall increase from 50% to 60% on the English Language Arts Florida Standards Assessment,with our white and FRL subgroups increasing by more than 10 percentage points, and all

subgroups showing an increase in percentage points. The leadership team believes that this improvement was due to the second year of implementation of a comprehensive support program for foundational support for below grade level readers. With this second year, teachers increased their confidence and ability to Instruct these comprehensive programs with fidelity. In addition to the implementation of school wide programs of support, students were progress monitored every 4 weeks rather than quarterly. Students were then provided specific differentiated support according to not only their level of proficiency, but skill specific weaknesses and learning needs. The administration ensured that personal support moved as needed based upon data for high needs areas each quarter. In addition, students moved up or down in support rooms based upon triangulated trend data.

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

After reflecting on the Early Warning Systems data, The Alva School has identified the number of chronically absent students as an area of concern. According to Castle's Early Warning System, the Alva School's average exceeded the district's average of chronically absent students (below 90%) for almost all grade levels and every quarter. Because The Alva School recognizes "A missed school day is a lost opportunity for students to learn" resulting in a strong correlation between student attendance and student achievement, The Alva School's leadership team feels this area will need to be addressed this year. Through the use of consistent advanced attendance tracking, weekly progress calls home, attendance support meetings every 4 weeks, individual student attendance goal setting, class and grade level high attendance rewards The Alva School will work to ensure students and families are supported toward building consistency with school attendance.

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

1. ELA Proficiency
The Alva School will meet District Vision 2020 by increasing the percentage of students proficient in English Language Arts from 55% to 60% as measured by FY20 English Language Arts Florida Standards Assessment.

2. Science Proficiency
The Alva School will increase the percentage of students proficient in Science from 51% to 60% as measured by the FY20 Florida State Wide Science Assessment.

3. ESE Student Proficiency in Math
The Alva School will increase the percentage of students with disabilities proficient in Mathematics from 33% to 40% as measured by the FY20 Mathematics Florida Standards Assessment.

4. Percent of Chronically Absent Students
The Alva School will decrease the percentage of chronically absent students (below 90%) from 8 to 4% as measured by the CASTLE early warning system by May 2020.

5. Number of Students Receiving ISS/OSS
The Alva School will meet District Vision 2020 by decreasing the number of students receiving ISS and/or OSS from 49 to 42 as measured by SESIR reported to District Support Application System by May 2020.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Science proficiency was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed because this component showed the greatest decline from the prior year from 56% to 51% proficiency. Though Alva enjoyed 62% proficiency in 5th grade, 8th grade's drop to 41% proficiency negatively impacted the overall proficiency score in Science. When reviewing the district baseline to end of the year data, 8th grade students at the Alva school started with 22% proficiency, rising to 30% mid-year, and rising to 40% proficiency on the end of the year district science assessment. This correlates with end of the year data, but shows an alarmingly low level or proficiency coming from 7th grade. This area of focus impacts student learning and success as students move into the upper grades and college level courses where science understandings build and vocabulary expands making foundational understandings paramount.
Measurable Outcome:	The Alva School will increase the percentage of students proficient in Science from 51% to 60% as measured by the FY21 Florida Statewide Science Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alice Barfield (beth.barfield@glades-schools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students at The Alva School will increase their ability to read and understand science vocabulary by utilizing a Science Word Wall to support, encourage, and/or require students to use proper terms as they ask questions, design experiments, and argue with evidence. Students will utilize science vocabulary in speaking, reading, and writing experiences. The middle level science team will focus on "Writing to Raise Achievement" instructional strategy by composing at least one monthly academic writing experience where they will be challenged to explain the content that has been taught.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	"The specialized vocabulary knowledge in science represents the concept-laden hooks on which learning is hung" (Rupley 2010). Though this was the first year that the Statewide Science Assessment in 8th grade focused on Physical Science, this group was also part of the cohort that did not have the benefit of the Level 1 and Level 2 intensive reading programs to scaffold the critical gaps in foundational reading skills. For our students who are not reading proficiently on grade level (only 55% overall) the inability to effectively read science passages filled with academic vocabulary is a significant hurdle to showing mastery. 76% of surveyed of Alva teachers identified vocabulary instruction as a needed strategy. In addition, utilizing the strategy of "Writing to Raise Achievement" students will apply newly learned science vocabulary to a writing experiences that requires them to explain the content that they have been focused on.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Before School - The ELA (reading/writing) team shared Marzano's 6 Step Process for Building Vocabulary: Step 1: Explain, Restate, Show, Discuss, Refine and Reflect, and Apply. ELA team also shared student examples of "Writing to Raise Achievement": 1- Record 2- Compare 3- Revise 4- Combine 5- Review.

2. First week - Teachers begin teaching vocabulary strategies with science vocabulary. Teachers will model answering text-dependent questions verbally and through writing using Argument-Driven Inquiry (ADI).

3. Continuing - All teachers will continue to support reading strategies including identified vocabulary strategies in all content areas including science, reading, and language arts.

4. Weekly - PLC will review current science data including formative, summative, and Compass assessments.

5. Monthly - Administrative team will review PLC data and classroom walkthrough

Person Responsible   Alice Barfield (beth.barfield@glades-schools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ESE student proficiency in math was identified as a critical area of need because our ESE population significantly under-performed at 33% proficiency as compared to proficiency as a whole at 61%.Though the tested number of students are underrepresented, our multiracial subgroup was also identified by the state as an area of need showing a drop from 67%(2018) meeting math standards to 33% (2019) meeting math standards. Fifth Grade Math proficiency was at 44% compared to the state average 60% on the Florida Standards Assessment. 17% of this grade level in the 2019 school year were special education students. For SWD/504 students given the accommodation of having questions read aloud, this was the first year they did not have the opportunity to take the test online where clicking a mouse ensured oral presentation. According to documented accommodation records, these students did not consistently request for word problems to be read aloud.
Measurable Outcome:	The Alva School will increase the percentage of students with disabilities proficient in Mathematics from 33% to 40% as measured by the FY21 Mathematics Florida Standards Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alice Barfield (beth.barfield@glades-schools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Alva School teaches will increase rigor by utilizing "Higher Order Thinking Skills": Level 3: Strategic Thinking Level 4: Extended Thinking in guided practice opportunities for small groups,increase practice opportunities in cooperative learning groups and small group direct instruction with corrective feedback on math concepts, and increase student utilization of accommodations utilizing support/ESE staff.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According of John Hattie, feedback is one of the most powerful influences on improved academic achievement. When the teachers were polled on which strategy they believed would increase our student's math proficiency, 69% indicated corrective feedback. The Florida Department of Education published Accommodations: Assisting Students with Disabilities (2010) and determined to ensure that students with disabilities use accommodations, orientation and instruction needed to be taught so students know how when to use it. When we made the switch to FSA being paper based, we failed to teach how the accommodation would need to be applied independently. The ESE team believes giving additional corrective feedback not only on math concepts but their application of accommodations, the percent of students meeting grade level math proficiency will increase. By scaffolding HOT questions in small group instruction, even our lower level math students will be exposed to Level 3 and 4 questions.

Action Steps to Implement

1.Before School Training - ESE training where the 3Ts of Accommodations: tailoring, trialing, and training and co-teaching models. In addition, identification of our SWD and Multiracial Math data as being an area of focus and concern.
2.Continuous - additional practice opportunities with corrective feedback in small groups in the general education classroom.
3. Continuous - ESE/General Ed teachers will apply tailoring, training, and trialing of accommodations to ensure accommodations math student needs.
4. Weekly - ESE staff will attend weekly PLC where math data is reviewed and offer input into effective learning strategies.
5. Monthly - Administrative teams will review all currently available math data including formative,

summative, and Star data, and adjust schedules or match resources as math needs change. This review will include specifically reviewing our ESE and multiracial student data to determine areas of need.

Person Responsible   Alice Barfield (beth.barfield@glades-schools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus was identified as an area of critical need because even though our students making learning gains, especially in the bottom 25% in English Language Arts increased and matched or out performed both the district and state, the data component that showed the lowest performance is The Alva School's percent of students meeting ELA proficiency. Our students with disabilities averaged only 15% proficiency for the second year and black students declined from 41% to 27% proficiency contributed to the overall school average of 55% proficiency. Though this average was a three percent increase from last years 52% proficiency, this rate of increase is under performing when compared with the state and district increases. The Alva School recognizes that a student's ability to read proficiently impacts their success in all content areas as well as their ability to experience future success.
Measurable Outcome:	The Alva School will increase the percentage of students proficient in English Language Arts from 55% to 60% as measured by FY21 English Language Arts Florida Standards Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alice Barfield (beth.barfield@glades-schools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Alva School will Increase motivation to read by ensuring students are able to decode efficiently and apply reading strategies independently by prescriptively and progressively offering reading interventions with teachers who utilize a shared language to improve student outcomes . Teachers will utilize the highly effective instructional strategies of text dependent questioning and writing to raise achievement to increase encounters with highly rigorous close reading opportunities necessary to challenge students into grade level proficiency.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The Alva School's leadership team and ELA teachers felt that current interventions were effectively moving students toward proficiency as evidence by our learning gains, especially with our lowest 25% of students, including gains made by our student with disabilities. To accelerate the time needed for movement from level 1/2 to level 3 and decrease students receiving unnecessary supports, administration will create classrooms based on the most current student data, and differentiate the types of interventions even more precisely than in years past. Department/grade level meetings will include evaluating and determining the best placement for students. In addition,The Alva School has identified specific reading and writing acronyms and strategies that will be taught K-8 and across content areas. By implementing a shared language rather than a sea of jargon, our students/teachers will be able to connect ideas across content areas/grade levels. This consistency will increase comprehension for our students with disabilities.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Summer - Scheduling of ELA Interventions/Instruction: K-8 reading classes
2. First week back for teachers - each content area and grade level will receive professional development and resources on reading/writing acronyms and learning strategies.
3. Weekly- PLC will monitor student data and progressively place students into appropriate interventions by continually reviewing available data including formative, summative, and STAR data. Interventions will address phonics, fluency, vocabulary, or comprehension utilizing district adopted materials and school resources (HD Word, Boost, Stars and Cars, ReadWorks, etc.). The administration will monitor the implementation and effectiveness of interventions and support staff by attending PLC meetings
4. ESE Team will receive professional development to precisely identify reading deficiencies and track/ deliver services appropriately.

5. Monthly - The leadership team will meet with departments/grade levels to review current ELA proficiency data and make decisions to place supports to increase the implementation of a shared language and prescriptive instruction.

Person Responsible   Alice Barfield (beth.barfield@glades-schools.org)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Since becoming a K-8 school, we have introduced several behavioral supports and interventions to increase positive student behavior. The number of students receiving ISS/OSS is an area of focus for The Alva School because even though the occurrences are decreasing, we would like to accelerate the rate of decrease. During the 2018 school year, our student received 52 OSS/ISS. This was decreased to 49 OSS/ISS in 2019. With students and teachers becoming more familiar with the expectations, interventions, and supports, increased consistency in all grade levels and environments inside of The Alva School will decrease the number of students receiving ISS/OSS. The Alva School recognizes the importance of the social and emotional development of our students and its impact on their ability to develop into successful and responsible citizens. We also recognize that students must be in school to learn.
Measurable Outcome:	The Alva School will decrease the number of students receiving ISS and/or OSS from 49 to 42 as measured by SESIR reported to District Support Application System by May 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alice Barfield (beth.barfield@glades-schools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Alva School will more consistently employ Second Step to increase Social Emotional Learning in grades K-8.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Second Step provides a framework for students to gain the skills they need to become caring, confident, and capable learners and problem-solvers.When The Alva School began utilizing Second Step, the lessons were introduced and became a teaching expectation. Over the last two years, the fidelity in implementation has wavered. To reaffirm The School's commitment to the social and emotional development of our students, the administrative team decided the "why" and "how" for Second Step should be explained through a preschool training to increase teacher buy in and increase fidelity. When teachers at The Alva School were polled to identify strategies to decrease OSS/ISS, 47% of teachers identified increased integration of Second Step, second to the 76% that identified building positive relationships with students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Before School: Relaunch of Second Step Training where the why is described in greater detail.
2. First Week: Students will be explicitly taught the school expectations and routines
3. Daily: Gen Ed/ESE Teachers will support social-emotional development
4. Weekly: All means All, no opt-out approach to the teaching of Second Step lessons in grade K-8.
5. Bi-Weekly: Behavioral data will be reviewed in PLCs with instructional strategies/behavioral strategies discussed and supported. The administrative team will align supports as data determines a need for specific students/teachers.
Tiered Support:
*Supports in place Level 1 = PBIS School-wide expectations w/Rewards, Thumbs-up Rewards
*Supports in place Level 2 = Restorative Practices = LFL Reflections, Peer Mentor partnership, Work Detail, Check-in/Check-out, parent meetings
*Supports in place Level 3 = Right to Succeed Accountability Contracts, Individualized Goals Setting

Person Responsible	Alice Barfield (beth.barfield@glades-schools.org)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	After reflecting on the Early Warning Systems data, The Alva School determined a critical need and area to focus is the number of chronically absent students. According to Castle's Early Warning System, the Alva School's average exceeded the district's average of chronically absent students (below 90%) for almost all grade levels and every quarter. Because The Alva School recognizes "A missed school day is a lost opportunity for students to learn" resulting in a strong correlation between student attendance and student achievement, The Alva School's leadership team feels this area will need to be addressed this year.
Measurable Outcome:	The Alva School will decrease the percentage of chronically absent students (below 90%) from 8 to 4% as measured by the CASTLE early warning system by May 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alice Barfield (beth.barfield@glades-schools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Alva School will utilize PBIS (Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support) coupled with clear parent communication to decrease the percent of chronically absent students this year. The PBIS strategies will include weekly progress calls home, individual attendance goal setting, and class and grade level high attendance rewards. Clear attendance communication will be established through advanced attendance tracking and attendance support meeting every four weeks.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Through the use of consistent advanced attendance tracking, weekly progress calls home, attendance support meetings every 4 weeks, individual student attendance goal setting, class and grade level high attendance rewards, The Alva School will work to ensure students and families are supported toward building consistency with school attendance. Goal setting with rewards will be used to encourage attendance from students. Recognizing that students in grades K-8 are not in total control of their attendance, clear parent communication is being targeted through attendance tracking and meetings.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Before School - Administrative team will work with guidance counselor, attendance manager, and social worker to establish attendance tracking methods and procedures including tiered supports.
2. Daily - Teachers will take class/period attendance.
3. Weekly - The Administrative team will also review Attendance Verification.
4. Bi-Weekly - Attendance Reports will be reviewed by grade levels/departments biweekly during PLC meetings.
5. Monthly - Attendance rewards will be handed out to grade levels and classes. Parents will invited into attendance support meetings if percent in attendance drops below 90%
PBIS Tiered Support:
* Supports in place Level 1 = attendance incentives (goals set with each grade level), PBIS rewards, attendance letters
*Supports in place Level 2 = attendance contracts, Rise & Shine Club, parent conferences, Social Worker calls home, CST Meetings
*Supports in place Level 3 = Individual Daily Check-ins w/Mentor/calls home 1st period

Person Responsible	Alice Barfield (beth.barfield@glades-schools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The Alva School is implementing district initiatives to increase school safety and security through changes to the physical building, procedures, and instruction. With the continued full-time placement of a school resource officer, weekly planned lessons in grades K-8 will allow students to receive safety and social-emotional instruction using reported school issues or current community issues. In addition, the school resource officer is extending the Cadet Program to grades 4-5 and continuing in grades 6-8 as a club offered to teach students responsibility, respect, and citizenship. To increase our school's ability to ensure the mental health of our student population, our school has been afforded an additional full-time guidance counselor to the elementary level. This counselor will be able to focus on our younger students to hopefully prevent the day to day issues that our middle-level guidance counselor spends most of her day navigating through. Our tech specialist and administration continue to perfect school-wide procedures to ensure student safety in the event of specific safety concerns including the Zone Maps.

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.

During the 2020-2021 school year, The Alva School will invite parents to participate in school-based activities that allow them to deepen their understanding of student's goals, curriculum and procedures. To start this school year, our families and students will be invited to Open House and/or 6th grade Boot Camp where our staff will start to share the mission, vision, culture and procedures of The Alva School. During these events there will be a planned rotation into our computer lab where parents and students will learn how to navigate and locate important information on our school's website and explore Home Connect, Parent Link, and create necessary FOCUS account. Cultural education events offered throughout the school year will be advertised on the school's website, with paper invitations being sent home with students prior to school events. Parents will be invited to join SAC and PTO at the start of the school year, and will continue to be reminded of upcoming events and meeting through Parent Link, the schools website, and flyers sent home with students. To gain insight into possible strategies to meet SIP goals, a Google Form survey was sent to teachers and support staff at the beginning of the year and input was reported in planning portion of the SIP. During SAC meetings members will help develop our School Improvement Plan through a series of SAC meetings at the beginning of the year, and then support our school's progress toward School Improvement Plan goals as current data and progress towards benchmarks are shared. The ESE Team will work with general education teachers and administrators to asses student's needs using the ESE survey sent home at the conclusion of the 2018-2019 school year and current student data and plan 3 parent information nights.

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:	**$18,507.58**