

Collier County Public Schools

Mike Davis 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 | 13 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 21 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 21 |

Mike Davis Elementary School

3215 MAGNOLIA POND DR, Naples, FL 34116

<https://www.collierschools.com/mde>

Demographics

Principal: Melissa Stamper

Start Date for this Principal: 6/29/2020

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (46%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southwest |
| Regional Executive Director | |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | N/A |
| * 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 Collier 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 | 13 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 21 |

Mike Davis Elementary School

3215 MAGNOLIA POND DR, Naples, FL 34116

<https://www.collierschools.com/mde>

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School PK-5 | Yes | 92% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 93% |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Collier 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.

Mike Davis Elementary School will provide a learning environment that will empower, inspire, and engage students while guiding our diverse population to create hope and academic success. This will be accomplished by all staff working to build positive supportive relationships with students and parents.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To educate future leaders by creating a positive and inspiring environment with opportunities for growth and 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 |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| Stamper, Melissa | Principal | <p>Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making; verbalizes support of the MTSS process; ensures that MTSS is being implemented with fidelity; conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation; allows scheduling that supports common team planning and implementation of interventions; monitors curriculum, instruction, and assessment; ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation; communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities. Systems for monitoring will include, but not limited to: iObservation (FTEM), Canvas learning management system, data warehouse, and iReady.</p> |
| Doriety, Kimberly | Other | <p>Maintains a working knowledge of local, state, and federal laws and regulations related to compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), ESEA and English Language Learners (ELLs), as well as guidelines pertaining to eligibility, delivery of services, and individualized plan development. Attends all district required professional development activities aligned with specific position requirements, and demonstrates active participation and follow-through at the school(s) of assignment.</p> <p>Provides training and technical assistance in the use of the Enrich system, and consultation in the development of the Educational Plans (EP). Individual Educational Plans (IEP) and 504 plans according to individual student needs. Prepares, reviews and monitors the correct completion of educational documentation in student records pertaining to exceptional student (EP, IEP, 504) services to ensure compliance with federal, state, and local requirements. Participates in annual self-assessment monitoring of student records in compliance with all requirements of IDEA and its regulations; Florida Statutes related to Special programs for Exceptional students; and Exceptional Student Education/Florida Education Finance Program (ESE/ FEFP).</p> <p>Assists district and school- based administrators with F.T.E., student projections, compliance monitoring, and federal, state and local reports. Conducts meeting using components of effective meeting facilitation assisting IEP teams in reaching agreements that lead to education programs and beneficial outcomes for students.</p> <p>Gives information about organizations that offer support for parents of students with disabilities, information on agencies that can assist a student with a disability in transition from school, and offers parents training about Exceptional Student Education. Instructional Team Facilitators: Analyzes and provides information about Core instruction; participates in student data collection.</p> |
| Wherry, Meagan | Instructional Coach | <p>Develops, leads, and evaluates CORE programs; models effective instruction and coaches teachers through the coaching cycle; identifies and analyzes literature on research-based intervention strategies; identifies systematic patterns of student need; assists with universal screening process; assists in the design and</p> |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------|---------------------|---|
| | | implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring. |
| Lauriault, Judy | Assistant Principal | Assists the principal in providing leadership and support of the MTSS process; regularly attends meetings to support and provide assistance/resources to teams as needed. Systems for monitoring will include, but not limited to: iObservation (FTEM), Canvas learning management system, data warehouse, and iReady. |
| Pflaumer, Amy | Instructional Media | Fosters student achievement and development. Serves as an on-staff specialist with expertise in Library/Media services. Works with and through the department/grade level chairpersons, and all teachers and staff to support curriculum, technology, and student services. Collaborates with colleagues for the purpose of improving instruction and student performance. Adheres to the Code of Ethics and Principles of Professional Conduct of the Education Profession in Florida and the district's code of ethics policy, and the professional practices of the American Library Association Organizes and supervises use of the Library Media Center by all students and teachers, and supervises library personnel, media and equipment. Promotes and maintains a dynamic, richly diverse, up-to-date library collection in all formats; designed and continually evaluated to best support the school curriculum and meet the reading needs of the student community. Provides group and individual instruction to students in research, technology, reading selection, and information skills. |
| Lefever, Rachael | School Counselor | Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students; provides interventions to link child-serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social needs. |
| Paula, Charlene | Instructional Coach | Develops, leads, and evaluates CORE programs; models effective instruction and coaches teachers through the coaching cycle; identifies and analyzes literature on research-based intervention strategies; identifies systematic patterns of student need; assists with universal screening process; assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/29/2020, Melissa Stamper

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.*

3

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

51

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|---|
| 2020-21 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (46%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southwest |
| Regional Executive Director | |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |

| | |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Status | N/A |
| * 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 | 36 | 85 | 85 | 115 | 113 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 524 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 | 6 | 3 | 10 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |

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 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

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

Thursday 7/23/2020

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 | 80 | 87 | 119 | 113 | 95 | 114 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 608 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 19 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |

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 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Prior Year - Updated

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|-----|-----|----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 80 | 87 | 119 | 113 | 95 | 114 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 608 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 19 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |

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 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 47% | 60% | 57% | 38% | 56% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 50% | 59% | 58% | 53% | 62% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 46% | 51% | 53% | 59% | 57% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 58% | 68% | 63% | 49% | 67% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 61% | 64% | 62% | 64% | 67% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 53% | 55% | 51% | 60% | 58% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 46% | 59% | 53% | 41% | 54% | 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 | 50% | 61% | -11% | 58% | -8% |
| | 2018 | 40% | 59% | -19% | 57% | -17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 43% | 58% | -15% | 58% | -15% |
| | 2018 | 39% | 60% | -21% | 56% | -17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 37% | 60% | -23% | 56% | -19% |
| | 2018 | 53% | 59% | -6% | 55% | -2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -16% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -2% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 64% | 68% | -4% | 62% | 2% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 51% | 67% | -16% | 62% | -11% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 13% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 48% | 65% | -17% | 64% | -16% |
| | 2018 | 44% | 67% | -23% | 62% | -18% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 51% | 67% | -16% | 60% | -9% |
| | 2018 | 67% | 68% | -1% | 61% | 6% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -16% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 7% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 40% | 56% | -16% | 53% | -13% |
| | 2018 | 49% | 58% | -9% | 55% | -6% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -9% | | | | |
| 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 | 33 | 48 | 42 | 45 | 56 | 36 | 33 | | | | |
| ELL | 42 | 47 | 47 | 54 | 57 | 59 | 38 | | | | |
| BLK | 34 | 38 | 50 | 56 | 71 | 71 | 43 | | | | |
| HSP | 51 | 54 | 50 | 58 | 59 | 51 | 47 | | | | |
| WHT | 41 | 46 | | 65 | 46 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 46 | 50 | 44 | 58 | 61 | 52 | 46 | | | | |
| 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 | 22 | 47 | 53 | 33 | 47 | 41 | 21 | | | | |
| ELL | 35 | 58 | 62 | 43 | 55 | 54 | 12 | | | | |
| BLK | 42 | 60 | 45 | 54 | 64 | 40 | 52 | | | | |
| HSP | 47 | 63 | 57 | 58 | 67 | 58 | 49 | | | | |
| WHT | 36 | | | 43 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 45 | 62 | 53 | 57 | 66 | 54 | 50 | | | | |

| 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 | 14 | 48 | 53 | 35 | 59 | 50 | | | | | |
| ELL | 28 | 44 | 61 | 43 | 66 | 67 | 17 | | | | |
| BLK | 35 | 57 | 75 | 43 | 57 | 56 | 37 | | | | |
| HSP | 39 | 51 | 51 | 51 | 68 | 65 | 38 | | | | |
| WHT | 38 | 55 | | 43 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 38 | 53 | 59 | 49 | 65 | 60 | 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) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 54 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 69 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 430 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 43 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 52 |
| 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 | 53 |
| 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 | 55 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 50 |
| 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 | 53 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance was the Lowest 25% gains in reading, scoring at 46%. The factors that contributed to this decline resulted from the need for a more systemic approach to interventions and standards focused tier one instruction.

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 largest drop was in ELA Reading Gains. They dropped 12% from 2018-2019. There was not a solid system in place for MTSS which contributed to this gap. Effective interventions were not being implemented in a timely manner.

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.

ELA Achievement had the greatest gap when compared to the state, scoring 10 percentage points below. Third grade reading proficiency was 50% compared to the state average of 58%. Fourth grade reading proficiency was 43% compared to the state average of 58%. Fifth grade reading proficiency was 37% compared to the state average of 56% with the greatest achievement gap. This gap in achievement is due to the historically low performance in the 5th grade cohort in which there has been a trending decrease in achievement.

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 the overall increase in third grade math proficiency. Third grade math proficiency was 64% compared to the state average of 62%. Changes that were implemented to help struggling math students included the continued Rise and Shine morning interventions with time allocated for remedial math instruction.

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

One potential area of concern based on the EWS data is the number of students scoring a Level 1 on the statewide assessment. Third grade had six students, fourth grade had nine-teen, and fifth grade had the greatest number at 28 students scoring a level 1 on the statewide assessment. The grand total of students scoring at a level 1 is 63 students.

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

1. ELA Proficiency/Achievement
2. Math Gains
3. ELA Lowest 25% Gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

The overall proficiency levels of students in ELA is a concern. This is the area that reflects the widest achievement, as we are scoring 10 points below the state average for proficiency levels. When disaggregating grade level data, fifth grade data showed a 16% year over year drop in those meeting standards and a 12% drop for students who made a gain (50%). Since overall school reading proficiency is at 47%, focusing differentiated interventions can assist to help increase proficiency. Using multiple assessment pieces from district benchmark scores, iReady, running records, and weekly tests on the Florida Standards, careful monitoring of student progress throughout the year can be used to make adjustments to grouping as needed, and meet the needs of each individual student.

Measurable Outcome:

The intended outcome of providing and monitoring differentiated reading interventions is to increase the number of students that are proficient in reading to 52%. This would be seen both in improvement in an increase in points awarded in the overall school grade, as well as an increase in grade level data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Charlene Paula (paulach@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Professional Learning Community meetings will be held regularly to closely monitor student achievement data. The primary platform that will be used to monitor student progress is the district's Data Warehouse platform.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

This strategy will allow teachers to track student data in regards to their iReady scale scores, Fountas and Pinnell Guided Reading Levels, district benchmark scores, and standards mastery scores in one location. By recording all of the student data in one platform, students performance will be graphed and discussed during PLC meetings. Likewise, if a student is not showing improvement in a reading intervention group, using the MTSS process to identify additional ways to provide support, or adjusting groupings to meet student needs will be brainstormed and implemented. Throughout the year, teachers will continue to work with students to record and track their own progress of the Florida standards. This will give students the opportunity to take greater ownership of their learning and teachers and students will both know where they are currently performing and the goals that they are working toward reaching.

Action Steps to Implement

Utilizing the MTSS process to identify additional students, resources, and staff based on data.

Person Responsible

Melissa Stamper (stampeme@collierschools.com)

Changing the process and the data collections tools for progress monitoring in order to support student achievement.

Person Responsible

Charlene Paula (paulach@collierschools.com)

Goal setting and data chats implementation on a weekly basis.

Person Responsible

Judy Lauriault (laurij2@collierschools.com)

Including all relevant staff members in Tier 2 and Tier 3 PLCs to solicit input from all staff members involved with the students.

Person Responsible

Judy Lauriault (laurij2@collierschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

The school performed lower than the district average in mathematics proficiency, earning a 58%. Upon analyzing grade level data, trends emerged between fourth and fifth grade. Fifth grade data decreased in learning gains in mathematics for students in the lowest 25% from 70% to 63% and decreased achievement by 16% from 67% to 51%. Fourth grade data indicated slight increases in achievement, gains and lowest 25% gains; however, achievement was only 48%. Targeting both core instruction in the math block and determining effective math support for students in the lowest 25% will help the school achieve its goal in improving mathematics proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

The intended outcome is to increase the overall proficiency in Mathematics by a minimum of 5% with 63% of students being proficient in mathematics for the 2019-2020 school year. Additionally, the overall improvement in mathematics core instruction and needs based interventions would increase the learning gains of all, including those in the lowest 25% and increase the number of students earning a level 4 or 5 on the mathematics state assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Meagan Wherry (wherrm@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Bi-weekly formative assessments will be administered in grades 3-5 in order to collect data and drive instruction. Data will be analyzed during Professional Learning Communities with the Leadership Team.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

This process will assist in both better tracking of student progress and more responsive targeted instruction to increase student proficiency in mathematics.

Evidence-based Strategy:

After quarterly district math benchmarks, data dialogue meetings will take place with each grade level team to determine patterns outlining areas of strength and continuous improvement. Individual data chats will be held with students to review performance and to set new goals going forward specific to math sub skills and domains.

Action Steps to Implement

Administering standards based data collection tools for progress monitoring in order to support student achievement.

Person Responsible

Meagan Wherry (wherrm@collierschools.com)

Goal setting and data chats implementation on a biweekly basis.

Person Responsible

Melissa Stamper (stampeme@collierschools.com)

Increasing the frequency of PLCs related to math formative and summative assessments in order to consistently address math data and the instructional implications.

Person Responsible

Judy Lauriault (laurij2@collierschools.com)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | For students scoring in the Lowest 25th Percentile in ELA, 46% made gains, compared to the state scoring at 53%. This is a critical area of focus, as we are trying to close the achievement gaps for students who are historically low performing. Fifth grade showed the biggest drop in Lowest 25% gains, going from 53% in 2018 to 37% in 2019. |
| Measurable Outcome: | The intended outcome of providing and monitoring differentiated reading interventions is to increase the number of students making gains in the Lowest 25 from 46% to 51%. This would be seen both in improvement in an increase in points awarded in the overall school grade, as well as an increase in grade level data. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Melissa Stamper (stampeme@collierschools.com) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Our main focus for improving students making gains in the Lowest 25 is to implement the MTSS process with fidelity in order to make informed instructional decisions, as well as implement research based interventions in a timely manner. Data Warehouse will be used as the primary tool to house data. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | This strategy will allow teachers to track student data in regards to their iReady scale scores, Fountas and Pinnell Guided Reading Levels, district benchmark scores, and standards mastery scores in one location. By recording all of the student data in one platform, students performance will be graphed and discussed during PLC meetings. Likewise, if a student is not showing improvement in a reading intervention group, using the MTSS process to identify additional ways to provide support, or adjusting groupings to meet student needs will be brainstormed and implemented. Intervention teachers will meet regularly to drive their small group instruction through data analysis in order to ensure we are closing the achievement gaps for each student. |

Action Steps to Implement

Regularly scheduled PLC meetings and MTSS meetings

Person Responsible Melissa Stamper (stampeme@collierschools.com)

Regularly scheduled PLC meetings with intervention teachers.

Person Responsible Melissa Stamper (stampeme@collierschools.com)

Additional professional development will be conducted to improve the process of data driven decision making.

Person Responsible Judy Lauriault (laurij2@collierschools.com)

Restructured 5th grade team to include effective teachers.

Person Responsible Melissa Stamper (stampeme@collierschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

n/a

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.

The school builds positive relationships with parents, families, and community members in multiple ways. Throughout the year, parents have the opportunity to participate in many school wide virtual events including the Annual Title 1 Meeting held in August, Literacy Night, Math Night, Meet the Teacher, Student-Led Conferences. Throughout these events families partner with the school to take an active part in learning about their child's school's education, and spending time building positive family relationships through school based events.

Parents have multiple opportunities to participate throughout the year at the school in their child's education. Teachers and administration build strong relationships with parents and families through positive communication. Each family is personally contacted by his or her teacher during the first weeks of school, through Webex video conferencing or a phone call home.

This year, the additional strategies to maximize parent communication has included increasing staff use of Parent Link, Twitter and Facebook. Through the Twitter and Facebook platforms family members are given access into a window of their child's classroom, able to see snapshots of lessons and learning going on in the classrooms, highlighting student accomplishments and video-clip of active learning.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|----------|---|--------------|----------------|-----|--------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | | | | \$228,525.05 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |

| | | | | | | |
|--------|----------|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-------|--------------|
| | 5100 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 0531 - Mike Davis Elementary School | Title, I Part A | 600.0 | \$159,882.38 |
| | 6400 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 0531 - Mike Davis Elementary School | Title, I Part A | 600.0 | \$68,642.67 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | | | | \$86,421.95 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 6400 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 0531 - Mike Davis Elementary School | Title, I Part A | 600.0 | \$86,421.95 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | | | | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | | | | \$314,947.00 |