

Collier County Public Schools

Lely Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	22

Lely Elementary School

8125 LELY CULTURAL PKWY, Naples, FL 34113

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

Demographics

Principal: Sharon Wheeler

Start Date for this Principal: 8/26/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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 (49%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Lely Elementary School

8125 LELY CULTURAL PKWY, Naples, FL 34113

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	77%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	79%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	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.

Providing an engaging environment through the use of digital learning, investigation and differentiation to support the needs of our diverse learners so they can responsibly interact and unlock their academic potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To cultivate an empowering, mindful community of learners through motivation and innovative thinking.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Holland, Holley	Principal	The principal oversees daily operations and teaching and learning. Principal analyzes multiple data points to make adjustments (staffing, instruction, professional learning needs, etc.). Principal also seeks input from all stakeholders through collaborative planning, SAC meetings, faculty meetings, and one on one data meetings with teachers.
Wheeler, Sharon	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal assists with the daily operations and supports teaching and learning. AP participates in collaborative planning, observations, and makes recommendations for adjustments.
Jones, Patti	Math Coach	The math coach facilitates math planning, coaching cycles with teachers, math incentives, and supports other school initiatives.
Pelletier, Karen	Reading Coach	The reading coach facilitates ELA planning, coaching cycles, reading incentives, progress monitoring, and supports other school initiatives.
Bockius-Smith, Tanja	School Counselor	The school counselor supports social and emotional learning of students, provides supports to families and supports other school initiatives such as PBIS and Leader in Me.
Morse, Laura	Other	The ESE program specialists supports exceptional student education instruction, compliance, parent supports for students with special needs, and supports other school initiatives

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/26/2021, Sharon Wheeler

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

1

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

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

Total number of students enrolled at the school

492

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

7

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22**

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	78	78	71	83	74	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	469	
Attendance below 90 percent	7	14	13	14	11	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	
One or more suspensions	0	3	9	8	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	
Course failure in ELA	3	11	21	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	
Course failure in Math	3	5	23	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	10	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	6	16	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	19	17	20	19	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	2	5	14	11	5	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	2	3	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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

Sunday 9/19/2021

2020-21 - 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	60	74	91	78	86	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	469
Attendance below 90 percent	70	3	9	9	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - 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	60	74	91	78	86	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	469
Attendance below 90 percent	70	3	9	9	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	2	5	14	11	5	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	2	3	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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 Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				51%	60%	57%	54%	61%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				50%	59%	58%	57%	62%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	51%	53%	44%	54%	48%
Math Achievement				57%	68%	63%	53%	69%	62%
Math Learning Gains				49%	64%	62%	49%	65%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	55%	51%	46%	55%	47%
Science Achievement				51%	59%	53%	49%	60%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	52%	61%	-9%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	48%	58%	-10%	58%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	60%	-12%	56%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	59%	68%	-9%	62%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	64%	65%	-1%	64%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2021					
	2019	46%	67%	-21%	60%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	46%	56%	-10%	53%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Iready grades K-2

FSA and benchmark tests grades 3-5

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	16	35	58
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	33	100
	Students With Disabilities	0	18	25
	English Language Learners	13	27	44
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	38	61	65
	Economically Disadvantaged	34	61	60
	Students With Disabilities	29	57	30
	English Language Learners	15	40	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	36	42	34
	Economically Disadvantaged	32	37	28
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	14	23	9
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	58	56	21
	Economically Disadvantaged	52	52	15
	Students With Disabilities	17	14	0
	English Language Learners	24	32	9
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	39	48	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	32	42	44
	Students With Disabilities	16	28	21
	English Language Learners	38	50	60
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	51	49	27
	Economically Disadvantaged	46	44	21
	Students With Disabilities	37	50	29
	English Language Learners	36	60	10

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	45	45	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	38	37
	Students With Disabilities	20	25	23
	English Language Learners	30	26	30
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	42	46	27
	Economically Disadvantaged	37	40	22
	Students With Disabilities	36	33	23
	English Language Learners	30	32	15
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	45	41	41
Science	Economically Disadvantaged	33	35	35
	Students With Disabilities	33	25	23
	English Language Learners	30	26	26
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	45	41	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	35	35

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	15	25	33	25	35	30	27				
ELL	38	32	25	32	43	27	32				
BLK	26	38		33	48		35				
HSP	47	41		45	50		45				
WHT	71	67		64	50		55				
FRL	39	36	29	41	45	19	35				
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	17	41	53	25	50	50	9				
ELL	33	42	50	43	46	40	27				
BLK	36	33	42	42	40	40	37				
HSP	47	49	46	57	50	44	39				

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
WHT	72	73		73	61		84				
FRL	43	48	44	49	47	39	36				
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	14	39	53	26	46	47	7				
ELL	34	49	48	42	49	50	25				
BLK	52	56	43	39	45	38	31				
HSP	47	53	48	46	45	52	42				
WHT	67	62		71	60		74				
FRL	50	55	43	47	47	47	41				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	75
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	363
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	42
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
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%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The trend across all grade levels, subgroups and content areas is the lack of gains. Less than 50% of students made gains in both ELA and math in 5th grade. When analyzing iReady data, less than 63% made typical gains and less than 27% reached the Stretch goal in iReady which would allow for closing of the gap.

Proficiency in ELA substantially decreased in 3rd grade and proficiency in math substantially decreased in 3rd and 4th grade math.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

- * ELA gains
- * Math gains
- * Gains for Students with Disabilities

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Contributing factors include limited gains overall, but specifically with the Low 25% (many of which were SWD) ELA and Math.

We would need to ensure that the ESE teachers have ample time to focus on their ESE students in both reading and math. We would need to ensure resource teachers were scheduled and trained to support the other low 25% students during DI time. In collaborative planning, we would also need to intentionally plan scaffolds to support the low 25% and all students with on grade level text.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

5th grade improved their ELA and Math proficiency through benchmark assessments as well as FSA.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Strategic reading and math coach placement in classrooms for student and teacher support.

We adjusted current year coaching cycles and support based on data and classroom observations.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Teams will have weekly ELA and math collaborative planning facilitated by an administrator and a coach. The planning will focus on the "how" and possible scaffolds needed. Increased classroom observations with specific feedback will ensure implementation of plans.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Job embedded professional learning will be a focus in grades 3,4,5 with focused coach support. All grade levels will receive support from coaches through the facilitation of collaborative planning. We will also focus on powerful practices with mini professional learning sessions presented by effective teachers such as summarization, class discussions, and monitoring.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

We will continue to highlight best practices and the results of the best practices through the Leader in Me Model of See Do Get.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus	Less than 50% of students made gains in ELA in 5th grade.
Description and Rationale:	Less than 26% of students met their stretch iReady goal that would help us to close the gap of proficiency in grades 3,4,5.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the school year 21-22, at least 58% of all students will make gains in ELA on FSA.
Monitoring:	iReady diagnostics (3 times a year), iReady progress monitoring weekly with lessons passed. Module assessments (every 3 weeks), and quarterly benchmarks will be used to monitor progress toward the desired outcome. Weekly classroom observations will be used to monitor to ensure actions steps are implemented.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Holley Holland (hollanho@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence based strategy of summarization will be used on a daily basis. Students will annotate text and then use summarization strategies daily as they relate to the essential question or text. This strategy helps make student thinking and learning visible and able to be monitored.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Summarization has a .79 effect size on student achievement according to Hattie. This strategy can be used across all subject areas.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly discussion and planning of daily summarization during collaborative planning.

Person Responsible Karen Pelletier (pellek@collierschools.com)

Strategies for summarizing will be a part of each professional learning session and powerful practices.

Person Responsible Karen Pelletier (pellek@collierschools.com)

Summarization strategies will be observed in classrooms on a weekly basis to ensure implementation.

Person Responsible Holley Holland (hollanho@collierschools.com)

Class and partner discussions will be utilized to facilitate summarization and will be intentionally planned during collaborative planning.

Person Responsible Holley Holland (hollanho@collierschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Less than 50% of students in 5th grade made gains in math, especially students in the Low 25% with a majority of the Low 25% being students with disabilities.

Measurable Outcome: By the end of the 21-22 school year, at least 54% of all students will make gains in math according to the FSA.

Quarterly Benchmarks and unit assessments data will be monitored for progress toward the desired outcome.

Monitoring: ALEKS reports will be monitored weekly for progress.
Classroom observations will be conducted weekly to ensure implementation of action steps.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Holley Holland (hollanho@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence based strategy that will be implemented to support gains in math is eliciting and using evidence of student thinking. Teachers will engage students in showing their work and discussing mathematical problems with partners.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The strategy of eliciting and using evidence of student thinking is a high yields strategy from the National Council of Teacher of Mathematics. This strategy will make student thinking visible so that teachers can monitor and adjust on the spot. This strategy also aligns with our focus on classroom discussion.

Action Steps to Implement

During weekly collaborative planning, there will be intentional discussions of how to elicit student thinking and monitor for understanding. Use of white boards, math notebooks, and class discussions will be purposefully planned each day.

Person Responsible Patti Jones (jonespa@collierschools.com)

Weekly classroom observations will be completed by administration to ensure the use of this strategy.

Person Responsible Holley Holland (hollanho@collierschools.com)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our ESSA subgroup of Students with Disabilities was below 41% proficient in the last year ESSA groups were identified (2018-19). In year 20-21, only 8% (1 out of 13) of SWD students made gains in ELA and only 23% (3 out of 13) made gains in math.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the year, 50% of students with disabilities (SWD) will make learning gains in ELA and Math according to FSA scores in 2022.
Monitoring:	iReady Growth 3 times a year, quarterly benchmark scores, and module assessments data of SWD students will be monitored. Bi-weekly classroom observation of ESE inclusion support will be monitored to ensure implementation of action steps.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Holley Holland (hollanho@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Explicit/direct instruction will be the evidenced based strategy used with students with disabilities. This will include modeling, multiple exposures, scaffolding, and corrective feedback.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The Meadows Center for Preventing Educational Risk research indicates that the effect size for explicit instruction is 1.22 and Hattie states that direct instruction has a .82 effect size.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional Learning will be provided to all staff on direct/explicit instruction including videos of it in action. Coaches will also model this process during coaching cycles. Coaching cycles will also include inclusion teachers supporting SWD.

Person Responsible Laura Morse (morsel@collierschools.com)

Observation feedback will be provided on a bi-weekly basis to teachers of students with disabilities to monitor implementation of direct instruction support.

Person Responsible Holley Holland (hollanho@collierschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Based on statewide school incident rankings, Lely Elementary has 0.2 incidents per 100 students and when compared to all elementary schools statewide, Lely Elementary is ranked 293 out of 1,395 elementary schools and is ranked in the low category for the number of incidences occurring in a school year. During the 2021-2022 school year, the school will focus on decreasing the number of discipline referrals (incidents) that involve abusive behavior and fighting. Monitoring of discipline referrals (incidents) will take place twice monthly by analyzing each incident and addressing targeted areas of concerns (who, what, when, where) and how these concerns are negatively impacting the school's culture and environment.

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.

School staff, students and parents participate in surveys throughout the year to provide feedback in the areas of safety, sense of belonging and involvement. Schools staff and parents review the surveys to celebrate success and improve areas needed.

Parent meetings will be held at both morning and evening times providing parents the opportunity to attend at their convenience, with translators available.

Parents have the opportunity to provide feedback at monthly SAC Meetings and through parent surveys. Parents can also schedule meetings with teachers and administration.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings are held monthly at LES. Parents have the opportunity to provide input in developing the annual parent involvement policy in addition to providing input on parent workshops and school functions. Parent surveys are reviewed for additional input.

Headstart services are provided on our campus. Parents and students are fully included in our school community and invited to participate in our events. Title I Parts A, C, D, SIG 1003g, UniSIG, Title II, Part A and Title IV are managed out of the same department. They share administrative staff so that oversight, coordination, budgeting, staffing, and monitoring are efficiently coordinated. Informal communications and monthly administrative meetings are held to discuss program needs, issues and coordinate efforts.

Parent meetings will be held at both morning and evening times providing parents the opportunity to attend at their convenience.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$117,599.31
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6150	510-Supplies	0381 - Lely Elementary School	Title, I Part A	0.2	\$925.41

			Notes: Purchase of bilingual books for checkout to foster literacy development in the home.			
	6300	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0381 - Lely Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$1,127.28
			Notes: Parent Engagement Events will be lead by teachers to support literacy at home.			
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0381 - Lely Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.2	\$96,362.49
			Notes: Resource Teacher			
	5100	150-Aides	0381 - Lely Elementary School	Title, I Part A	0.5	\$17,984.13
			Notes: Tutor for supplemental support			
	6400	750-Other Personal Services	0381 - Lely Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$1,200.00
			Notes: Guest teachers to provide PD			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$117,413.51
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6150	510-Supplies	0381 - Lely Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$2,053.18
			Notes: Family Engagement math activities will be provided to families.			
	5100	150-Aides	0381 - Lely Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$26,287.26
			Notes: Academic Tutor will provide supplemental math support.			
	6400	300-Purchased Services	0381 - Lely Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$83,942.28
			Notes: Math coach			
	5900	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0381 - Lely Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$2,691.13
			Notes: After school instructional staff			
	5900	150-Aides	0381 - Lely Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$1,291.97
			Notes: After school tutor			
	5900	510-Supplies	0381 - Lely Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$276.94
			Notes: After school student supplies			
	7800	750-Other Personal Services	0381 - Lely Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$870.75
			Notes: After school transportation			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$0.00
					Total:	\$235,012.82