

Collier County Public Schools

Parkside Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 21 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 33 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 33 |

Parkside Elementary School

5322 TEXAS AVE, Naples, FL 34113

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

Demographics

Principal: Sara Johnnessee

Start Date for this Principal: 8/24/2021

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: B (54%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southwest |
| Regional Executive Director | |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | SIG Cohort 3 |
| 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 | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 21 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 33 |

Parkside Elementary School

5322 TEXAS AVE, Naples, FL 34113

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

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 | 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 | 97% |

School Grades History

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

As a school community we will foster an environment where students are able to develop character traits that exemplify respect, kindness, and good judgment. As educators we will provide purposeful, differentiated, and interactive learning experiences which will encourage students to challenge themselves and reach their full potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empowering students for lifelong 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 | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|----------------------|---------------------|--|
| Fike, Melanie | 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. Responsible for monitoring the outcome of ELA achievement data. Focused support given to implementation of curriculum, adjustments, and effective teaching strategies to increase overall student performance in grades pre-kindergarten, kindergarten and first grade.. Systems for monitoring will include, but are not limited to: iObservation (FTEM), lesson planning program, data warehouse, and iReady.</p> |
| Moore, Rachel | Assistant Principal | <p>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 .Responsible for monitoring the outcome of Science achievement data. Focused support given to fourth and fifth grade implementation of curriculum, adjustments, and effective teaching strategies to increase overall student performance in grades four and five. Systems for monitoring will include, but not limited to: iObservation (FTEM), lesson planning program, data warehouse, iReady.</p> |
| Wind, Tiffany | Assistant Principal | <p>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. Focused support given to implementation of curriculum, adjustments, and effective teaching strategies to increase overall student performance in grades two and three. Systems for monitoring will include, but not limited to: iObservation (FTEM), lesson planning program, data warehouse, iReady.</p> |
| Cunningham, Patricia | Reading 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 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.</p> |
| Ortiz, Christie | Math 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 | Position 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. |
| Ware, David | Science 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. |
| Milfort, Tiffany | Other | Works collaboratively with district and school-based leadership teams including academic coaches, to review the fidelity of Tier 3 intervention implementation prior to referral for evaluation. 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. 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 Program (ESE/FEFP). 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. 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. |
| Grant, Jennifer | 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 |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|----------------|---|
| | | and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social needs; regularly attends MTSS meetings. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/24/2021, Sara Johnnessee

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

47

Total number of students enrolled at the school

585

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

0

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

10

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 | 102 | 79 | 102 | 98 | 87 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 560 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 10 | 9 | 9 | 12 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Course failure in ELA | 2 | 27 | 25 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 |
| Course failure in Math | 1 | 19 | 19 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 14 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 |
| 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 | 38 | 15 | 40 | 32 | 14 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 164 |

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 | 7 | 5 | 8 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |

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 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| 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

Friday 9/17/2021

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 | 61 | 101 | 91 | 114 | 101 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 567 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 9 | 8 | 10 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| 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 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| 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 | 61 | 101 | 91 | 114 | 101 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 567 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 9 | 8 | 10 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| 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 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| 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 | | | | 49% | 60% | 57% | 45% | 61% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 57% | 59% | 58% | 52% | 62% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 51% | 51% | 53% | 37% | 54% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 66% | 68% | 63% | 62% | 69% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 64% | 64% | 62% | 62% | 65% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 59% | 55% | 51% | 59% | 55% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 43% | 59% | 53% | 57% | 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 | 44% | 58% | -14% | 58% | -14% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -52% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 46% | 60% | -14% | 56% | -10% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -44% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 66% | 68% | -2% | 62% | 4% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 48% | 65% | -17% | 64% | -16% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -66% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 74% | 67% | 7% | 60% | 14% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -48% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 43% | 56% | -13% | 53% | -10% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

K-2:

Reading Progress Monitoring Tool: I-Ready Diagnostic, Window 1,2,3

Math Progress Monitoring Tool: End of Year District Benchmark

3-5th grade:

ELA and Math

District Benchmark Assessments for Fall and Winter Window.

Florida APM Tool for Spring Window

Science

District Benchmark Assessments

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 13% | | 47% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 13% | | 23% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 7% | | 23% |
| | English Language Learners | 13% | | 42% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| | | | | |

| Grade 2 | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 17% | | 61% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 16% | | 61% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0% | | 45% |
| | English Language Learners | 6% | | 48% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| | | | | |
| Grade 3 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 39% | 41% | 33% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 36% | 41% | 32% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 25% | 43% | 0% |
| | English Language Learners | 25% | 27% | 16% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 58% | 56% | 21% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 56% | 55% | 20% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 57% | 43% | 0% |
| | English Language Learners | 53% | 46% | 13% |
| | | | | |

| Grade 4 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 40% | 35% | 42% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 40% | 36% | 41% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 17% | 0% | 31% |
| | English Language Learners | 16% | 17% | 30% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 48% | 50% | 22% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 51% | 51% | 21% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 22% | 41% | 13% |
| | English Language Learners | 37% | 39% | 17% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Grade 5 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 52% | 53% | 48% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 54% | 55% | 51% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 8% | 0% | 0% |
| | English Language Learners | 36% | 38% | 34% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 55% | 54% | 41% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 55% | 56% | 44% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 17% | 0% | 0% |
| | English Language Learners | 48% | 47% | 30% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students | 47% | 57% | 63% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 48% | 56% | 64% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 8% | 14% | 29% |
| | English Language Learners | 25% | 42% | 50% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |

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 | 12 | 25 | | 22 | 19 | 20 | 7 | | | | |
| ELL | 42 | 64 | 53 | 50 | 58 | 24 | 56 | | | | |
| BLK | 37 | 59 | | 47 | 59 | | 71 | | | | |
| HSP | 47 | 60 | 64 | 56 | 59 | 29 | 60 | | | | |
| WHT | 60 | | | 60 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 46 | 62 | 64 | 53 | 61 | 28 | 64 | | | | |
| 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 | 10 | 40 | 46 | 41 | 64 | 58 | 5 | | | | |
| ELL | 45 | 57 | 50 | 66 | 64 | 57 | 36 | | | | |
| BLK | 51 | 54 | | 66 | 67 | 58 | 48 | | | | |
| HSP | 49 | 58 | 48 | 65 | 62 | 59 | 42 | | | | |
| WHT | 46 | | | 69 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 49 | 57 | 52 | 66 | 64 | 61 | 43 | | | | |
| 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 | 5 | 29 | 30 | 26 | 35 | 45 | 14 | | | | |
| ELL | 35 | 43 | 32 | 59 | 56 | 62 | 41 | | | | |
| BLK | 36 | 51 | 44 | 55 | 61 | 60 | 36 | | | | |
| HSP | 47 | 52 | 34 | 64 | 62 | 60 | 61 | | | | |
| WHT | 42 | | | 50 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 45 | 52 | 36 | 62 | 61 | 59 | 57 | | | | |

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 | 55 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 66 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 442 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|--|-----|
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 23 |
| 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 | 52 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | 53 |
| 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 | 56 |
| 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 | |
|--|-----|
| 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 | 60 |
| 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 | 56 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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?

Based on FY21 FSA data, PSE showed a decline in reading proficiency overall, from 49% to 46%. Third and fourth grade reading proficiency declined, and math proficiency declined from 66% to 54%. Students that are identified as ESE showed a significant decline in making math and reading gains.

Students identified as ELL students showed an increase in making reading gains by 9% while showing a decrease in making math gains by 16%.

The percentage of students proficient in Science increased overall, to 63%, and for all of the following subgroups: students identified as free and reduced lunch, ESE, and English Language Learners.

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

Based off of the 2019 FSA data, the areas that showed the greatest areas for improvement were increasing science performance from the 2018-2019 years, which reflected a 14% drop during that time period, as well as stagnant performance from the 2018-2019 school year indicated learning gains for the math lowest 25% stayed at 59%. During the FY 2019 school year, for the ESSA Data Review, the subgroup of students with disabilities was at 39%, below the Federal Index threshold.

When looking at the progress monitoring data from the 2021 school year, students with disabilities underperformed in all content areas when compared to the grade level overall proficiency in the areas of reading, math, and science, as well as learning gains when compared to other subgroups. This indicates that this is still an area of concern for the upcoming 2021-2022 school year.

Additionally, English Language Learners underperformed compared to all student groups in all content areas when looking at overall proficiency. When looking at gains for English Language

Learners, students show the area of greatest need for improvement in the area of math, particularly in fifth grade. Looking at the FSA 2021 data set of 5th grade students, 52% of students identified as English Language Learners scored at a level 3 or higher in ELA, while 50% of English Language Learners scored at a level 3 or higher in math. This discrepancy indicates a priority need to examine the strategies implemented in the fifth grade mathematics block, for English Language Learners.

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 to this need for improvement include, but are not limited to: separate planning of support by resource, ELL and ESE teachers, need to improve content knowledge in the conceptual understanding of the math concepts embedded in the fifth grade math standards skillset, need to improve application and questioning skills within lesson planning to increase and improve the amount of engagement of all students, across content areas, particularly of students identified in the subgroups ESE and ELL.

Actions Necessary:

Lesson planning schedules including grade level ESE, ELL and Resource teacher support, increasing the collaboration between content and support area teachers.

Increased support from academic coaches in the area of mathematics to increase understanding of mathematical standards involving both the conceptual and computational understanding of the skills, student misunderstandings, and opportunities for precise scaffolding.

Increased support from academic coaches in the area of reading, to increase the amount of student engagement and language development opportunities for students in the ELA block. This includes incorporating multiple opportunities to expose students to on grade level text to: read, write, listen and speak on topics that develop students depth and breadth of content knowledge while developing critical thinking skills. Incorporating and planning collaborative structures within lesson plans to provide students the opportunity to repeatedly show evidence of what they know and are learning.

Increased progress monitoring by leadership team, to adjust and monitor effectiveness of strategies to increase student achievement and learning gains in all content areas.

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

The data that showed the most improvement from the 2018-2019 FSA was an increase in students making a reading gain from 52-57% and reading lowest 25% making a gain from 37-51%.

The trend continued when looking at the 2021 FSA data indicated an increased trend in student performance for reading gains overall and for the lowest 25%, with 50% making a gain, and 63% of the lowest 25% making a reading gain.

Science performance was the area of greatest decline from the 2018-2019 FSA year, however the 2021 FSA data reflected a 19% increase in overall proficiency from 43% to 62% proficient.

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

Contributing factors that led to these improvements in both the area of reading and science:

Reading:

Increased monitoring of students in the MTSS process, unified systems of monitoring student

performance within the tiered process.

Scheduling of effective reading endorsed teachers with students showing reading deficits.

Shift in building wide priority to greater support the MTSS process in primary grades, including implementation of research based reading interventions

Increased opportunities to work on grade level text, particularly for students receiving tier 2 intervention

Science:

Increased focus on 4th grade Earth and Space Standards

Increased time dedicated to hands-on investigations and linking those experiences to Nature of Science standards

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

Reading:

Continued monitoring of students in the MTSS process, unified systems of monitoring student performance

Increased adjustments and re-grouping of students, when student performance stagnates

Increased collaborative planning of on grade level ELA lessons focused on questioning and student engagement

Science: Science instruction delivered on grade level texts, increased collaboration between students, one hands-on experience planned within each unit.

5th grade will also deliver 4th grade Earth and Space Lessons and 3rd Grade Life Science Lessons

4th grade will also deliver 3rd grade Life Space Standards

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.

Professional Development Opportunities based on both content knowledge, application implementation, and student knowledge to build relationships.

Content Based Professional Development Opportunities:

ELA: B.E.S.T Standards and HMH Curriculum Adoption Professional Development

Tier 2 and Tier 3 Reading Intervention Training for Resource and Reading Teachers

ALEKS Training and HMH Curriculum Support

Application Implementation Professional Development Opportunities:

Ongoing Progress Monitoring Meetings to provide data analysis based on:

I-Ready Diagnostic Data, HMH End of Module Assessment Data, District Benchmark Analysis

WIDA Can-Do Descriptors Training

Relationship Building and Pedagogical Professional Development Opportunities:

New Teacher Meetings Monthly- Variety of Topics, Classroom Management, Engagement, Planning

Cooperative Learning Structure Training to Increase Student Engagement

Connect For Success- relationship building and goal setting

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

Connect for Success-is a district initiative increasing the opportunity for students to establish relationships and the feeling of community at every CCPS school. Students will engage in Connect for Success twice weekly, on Tuesday and Thursday mornings with their classrooms teachers. Additionally, all school staff, both instructional, and non instructional will be assigned to a classroom. During this time students will engage in opportunities to develop learner qualities, goal setting, organizational practices, and share with their class group ways that they are developing positive character within self and relationally to be successful in school and beyond.

All instructional staff will also be assigned to a team that shares responsibility in supporting in Parkside Elementary School's Improvement Plan through a variety of roles including the following:

Leadership: Family and Community Outreach, Student Leadership

Culture: Motivation Movers, PBIS

Academics: Success Squad

These teams will allow greater collaboration across grade levels, content areas, and support staff, to engage different perspectives and create greater accountability between and within one another at PSE.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | <p>Math was identified as a critical need area as a result of the year over year trends when looking at comparative data in both math proficiency, gains, and gains of students performing in the lowest 25%.</p> <p>All of the components showed a decline, respectively. FY19-FY21 data reflected overall math proficiency decreased from 66-54%, students making gains decreased from 64%-61% and students in the lowest 25% went from 59% making a gain to 30% making a gain. This reflected a 29% drop in this particular area, showing a need to focus on overall math instruction with a tailored focus to increasing the learning gains of students performing in the lowest 25%.</p> <p>When looking at student performance by ESSA Subgroups students identified as ESE, underperformed when compared to school averages, and students identified as ELL students showed greater gains in reading than in math. This also reflects a need for greater intentional planning, monitoring and adjustments for students in the area of mathematics.</p> |
| Measurable Outcome: | <p>During the FY22 school year, PSE will increase it's math learning gains of the lowest 25% from 30% to a minimum of 50%, resulting in a minimum of 20% increase. PSE will also increase it's math performance in all other math related graded cells by a minimum of 5% as well. This will result in a minimum of 59% of students being proficient in math, and 66% of students making a learning gain in math.</p> <p>This area of focus will be monitored through multiple ways in order to ensure the desired outcome is met for the FY22 school year.</p> <p>Collaborative Math Planning: Christie Reid:</p> <p>During math planning monitoring of module assessments, student misconceptions, analysis of student work.</p> <p>Administrators will also participate in collaborative math planning, dependent on assigned grade levels.</p> <p>On-going Monitoring: End of Module Assessments through HMH Curriculum, Differentiated Standards Based Monitoring through the Alek's platform</p> |
| Monitoring: | <p>District Benchmark Monitoring: Quarter Benchmark 1, Quarter Benchmark 2, and Quarter Benchmark 3</p> <p>*During these times leadership team members meet to analyze data and plan next steps that can result in instructional, structural, staffing, and student adjustments.</p> <p>Data Analysis Chats: Teachers & Grade Level Teams</p> <p>FTEM Math Observations: Melanie Fike, Rachel Moore, Tiffany Wind</p> <p>During math observations monitoring of effective implementation of lesson plans, adjustments and use of high yield engagement strategies, feedback delivered and shared with individual teachers.</p> |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | <p>Melanie Fike (fikeme@collierschools.com)</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| Evidence-based Strategy: | The evidence based strategy that is being implemented for the area of focus is collaborative planning. This strategy has been chosen due to numerous topics that can be covered in order to ensure alignment of instruction in response to student performance to promote academic achievement. |
| | During this school year, the FTEM element chosen for Parkside Elementary School is using questioning to help student elaborate on content, which will be a focus point during our collaborative planning meetings. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | This evidence based strategy was chosen after reflecting on the FY 20-21 math results, which indicated the largest decline in the area of student performance in the lowest 25%. When reflecting on data, observations, and input from teams, Parkside Elementary identified the area of collaborative planning as the area to focus on for the upcoming year. During this time, staff will be able to identify the demands of the standard, content limits, and plan for ways to support effective student instruction and delivery of content. |

Action Steps to Implement

Collaborative Math Planning

During collaborative math planning agendas will be sent to grade level teams in advanced, teachers will be responsible for bringing the HMH materials to planning, the team will engage in discussion to identify the key elements of the delivery of instruction, misconceptions will be addressed, and pre-planned questions will be developed to increase student engagement of mathematical concepts through collaborative structures and opportunities to work through mathematical problems.

Math Coach- Christie Reid-responsible for math agendas

Principal- Melanie Fike-oversees K & 1 Math Planning and Lesson Plans

Assistant Principal-Tiffany Wind-oversees 2 & 3 Math Planning and Lesson Plans

Assistant Principal-Rachel Moore-oversees 4 & 5 Math Planning and Lesson Plans

Person Responsible Melanie Fike (fikeme@collierschools.com)

Master Schedule Design to Increase the Math Block for On Grade Level Instruction & Instructional Support

The school wide master schedule was designed to increase the math block by thirty additional minutes. This time will give teachers opportunities to address identified underperforming standards through targeted on grade level differentiated instruction by class. Grade level teams will plan for this time using the HMH resources, identifying gaps in vertical alignment and providing students the opportunity to master grade level mathematical concepts.

Scheduling support was designed to provide classrooms instructional support with additional staffing to allow greater interactions and monitoring of student performance and give students increased opportunity to have scaffolded support and to help clarify misconceptions and provide students additional small group opportunities for repeated practice.

Person Responsible Melanie Fike (fikeme@collierschools.com)

School Wide Data Tracking System: Math

Data tracking will be implemented from the building, grade level, and individual level, with a focus on learning gains and increased understanding of both conceptual and procedural understanding of mathematics. Student data will be tracked both in school wide common areas, through grade level recognition, and in individual data binders.

Within the school data tracking will be compared with district performance during benchmark testing during the fall, winter, and early spring, with the opportunity to make building wide structural and instructional adjustments based on student performance after reflecting on a needs assessment.

In between benchmark testing, end of Module tests will be analyzed and tracked to determine student understanding of standards within modules, additionally student performance will be analyzed through the use of common assessments and tracked by grade level to determine core areas in need of reteaching, small group compositions and individual student needs.

Person Responsible Melanie Fike (fikeme@collierschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

During the FY21 school year FSA data indicated a 3% decline in overall FSA proficiency, from 49% to 46% in grades 3-5. While learning gains and gains of low 25% of students increased, students were still not making enough gains to increase building wide proficiency.

Grade Level ELA Breakdown is reflected as follows:

FY21-Grade 3 Proficiency 47%

FY21-Grade 4 Proficiency 35%

FY21-Grade 5 Proficiency 55%

Area of Focus**Description and Rationale:**

Additionally when analyzing end of year FY21 I-Ready data, students in grades K-2 reflected the following:

FY21-Kindergarten- 88% on grade level, and 0% of students performing 2 or more grade levels below

FY21-First Grade-48% on grade level, and 0% of students performing 2 or more grade levels below

FY21-Second Grade-61% on grade level, and 8% of students performing 2 or more grade levels below

This is the rationale for supporting instructional practice relating ELA, ensuring students are exposed to on grade level instruction, and given opportunities to increase their learning gains to develop proficiency on grade level texts. Additionally, students receiving explicit reading interventions, need ongoing progress monitoring and adjustment of instruction to ensure the achievement gap closes, and learning gains are made at a pace so that students are able to read and comprehend on grade level to the demands of the B.E.S.T Standards.

PSE will increase it's FSA ELA proficiency overall by 5%. This will result in a minimum of 51% of our students meeting proficiency in the area of ELA for the FY21-22 school year.

Grade Level Breakdowns:

Grade 3: ELA Proficiency will increase by a minimum of 6%, from 47% to 53%.

Grade 4: ELA Proficiency will increase by a minimum of 6% , from 47% to 53%, when looking at cohort data. (Incoming 4th Grade-47% proficient)

Measurable Outcome:

Grade 5: ELA Proficiency will increase by a minimum of 11%, from 35% to 46%, when looking at cohort data. (Incoming 5th Grade-35% proficient)

K-2 Grade Level Breakdown Measurable Goals Are As Follows:

Kindergarten: During FY22 school year increase proficiency by 5%, from 88% to 93%.

First Grade: During FY22 school year increase proficiency by 15% from 48% to 63%.

Second Grade: During FY22 school year, increase proficiency by 5%, from 61% to 66%.

This area of focus will be monitored through multiple ways in order to ensure the desired outcome is met for the FY22 school year.

Monitoring:

Collaborative ELA Planning:

Module assessments reviewed and questions developed, student misconceptions

discussed, and teachers analysis student work.

Administrators will participate in collaborative ELA planning, dependent on assigned grade levels.

On-going Monitoring: End of Module Assessments through HMH Curriculum, Differentiated Standards Based Monitoring through the I-ready program.

District Benchmark Monitoring: Quarter Benchmark 1, Quarter Benchmark 2, and Quarter Benchmark 3

*During these times leadership team members meet to analyze data and plan next steps that can result in instructional, structural, staffing, and student adjustments.

Data Analysis Chats: Teachers & Grade Level Teams

FTEM ELA Observations: Melanie Fike, Rachel Moore, Tiffany Wind

During ELA observations monitoring of effective implementation of lesson plans, adjustments and use of high yield engagement strategies, feedback delivered and shared with individual teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melanie Fike (fikeme@collierschools.com)

The evidence based strategy that is being implemented for the area of focus is collaborative planning. This strategy has been chosen due to numerous topics that can be covered in order to ensure alignment of instruction in response to student performance to promote academic achievement.

Evidence-based Strategy:

During this school year, the FTEM element chosen for Parkside Elementary School is using questioning to help student elaborate on content, which will be a focus point during our collaborative planning meetings.

Collaborative Planning will be an opportunity to address high yield instructional strategies, engagement opportunities, identify areas to adjust instruction, and plan next steps for instructional delivery based on data analysis, teacher reflection and observational feedback.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

This evidence based strategy was chosen after reflecting on the FY 20-21 data reading proficiency declined by 3%, while student learning gains and gains of students in the low 25% increased. When reflecting on data, observations, and input from teams, Parkside Elementary identified the area of collaborative planning as the area to focus on for the upcoming year. During this time, staff will be able to identify the demands of the standard, content limits, and plan for ways to support effective student instruction and delivery of content. Ongoing data analysis will also drive instructional planning of our additional thirty minute reading block, to ensure students are receiving instruction that promotes learning gains at a rate that will close the achievement gap.

Action Steps to Implement

Collaborative Planning Framework: Teachers will prepare by reading and annotating texts sets and preparing areas to focus discussion on, misconceptions, complex vocabulary, higher order thinking questions, and collaborative structures for engaging students on grade level texts.

Reading Coach will work with grade level teams to identify key points of misconception, ensure all

elements of effective literacy instruction are planned for and discussed including: foundational skills, vocabulary, text comprehension related to multiple standard sets, and integrated opportunities to increase embedded written opportunities for students to respond to text during the literacy block.

Reading Coach- Dr. Patricia Cunningham -responsible for K-5 collaborative planning, agendas

Principal- Melanie Fike-oversees K & 1 ELA Planning and Lesson Plans

Assistant Principal-Tiffany Wind-oversees 2 & 3 ELA Planning and Lesson Plans

Assistant Principal-Rachel Moore-oversees 4 & 5 ELA Planning and Lesson Plans

Person Responsible Melanie Fike (fikeme@collierschools.com)

Power-Up Time to Support Learning Gains of all Students in ELA

Power-Up Time is an additional 30 minute block of time built into the daily schedule that allows students the opportunity to work on grade level reading standards on grade level texts. During this time teachers are able to plan and deliver additional instruction to students in the different domains of literacy including but not limited to: phonological awareness, phonics, vocabulary, comprehension of informational and literature texts, and opportunities to participate in analytic writing in response to the demands of multiple texts.

Reading Coach- Dr. Patricia Cunningham -responsible for K-5 collaborative planning, agendas

Principal- Melanie Fike-oversees K & 1 ELA Planning and Lesson Plans

Assistant Principal-Tiffany Wind-oversees 2 & 3 ELA Planning and Lesson Plans

Assistant Principal-Rachel Moore-oversees 4 & 5 ELA Planning and Lesson Plans

Person Responsible Melanie Fike (fikeme@collierschools.com)

Master schedule created to maximize supports from Resource, ESE, and ELL teachers in each grade level with staggered ELA blocks.

This time will give teachers opportunities to address identified underperforming standards through targeted on-grade level differentiated instruction by class. Grade level teams will plan for this time using the HMH resources and I-Ready Resources, identifying gaps in vertical alignment and providing students the opportunity to master grade level literacy concepts.

Scheduling support was designed to provide classrooms instructional support with additional staffing to allow greater interactions and monitoring of student performance and give students increased opportunity to have scaffolded support and to help clarify misconceptions and provide students additional small group opportunities for repeated practice.

Staggered blocking of Power-Up time, allows students receiving Resource, ESE, and ELL support to have increased opportunities to work on grade level instruction in a smaller group settings.

Person Responsible Melanie Fike (fikeme@collierschools.com)

Professional Development

Throughout the year professional development will be delivered from district support in the ELA department from Teaching and Learning, as well as from the school's reading coach. Topics covered from the district support include:

Implementation and Understanding of the B.E.S.T. Standards
Training on the new HMH Reading Curriculum

Training on new curriculum guides and maps
Training on the components of the ELA Literacy Block

Training provided from Reading Coach:
Overview of I-Ready, and continuous support with B.E.S.T. Standards
Training on analyzing I-Ready Data and Instructional Support
Differentiated support dependent on grade level teams and needs of students

Person
Responsible Melanie Fike (fikeme@collierschools.com)

#3. Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus | After analyzing FY 20 3-5 FSA data, different patterns of student performance across grade levels and identified sub-groups of students. While math performance of the lowest 25% of students declined significantly, reading gains improved while reading proficiency declined, and science performance improved. |
| Description and Rationale: | The inconsistencies across content domains indicate that there are many opportunities for staff to share best practices and strategies with one another to replicate improved performance across different grade levels and content areas. Increasing the opportunities for staff and students to participate in leadership and decision making at Parkside Elementary will allow teachers to take greater ownership, accountability, and responsibility for the learning of all. |
| Measurable Outcome: | <p>We will increase opportunities for leadership and decision making for staff and students, resulting in a 5% increase in learning gains across the areas of math and reading.</p> <p>This area of focus will be monitored through multiple ways in order to ensure the desired outcome is met for the FY22 school year:</p> <p>Faculty Meetings: Staff Input on School Improvement Plan, Accountability of Action Team Initiatives Tied to School Improvement Plan Goals,</p> <p>Action Team Monthly Meetings, Agendas, School Initiatives,</p> |
| Monitoring: | <p>On-going Monitoring of Academic Data: End of Module Assessments through HMH Curriculum, Differentiated Standards Based Monitoring through the I-ready program. District Benchmark Monitoring: Quarter Benchmark 1, Quarter Benchmark 2, and Quarter Benchmark 3 Data Analysis Chats: Teachers & Grade Level Teams</p> <p>Action Teams will be monitored by members of the school Leadership Team: Family and Community Outreach Team: Science Coach: David Ware Student Leadership: Guidance Counselor: Jen Grant Motivation Movers: Reading Coach: Dr. Patricia Cunningham Positive Behavior Intervention Support: Assistant Principal: Rachel Moore & Tiffany Wind Success Squad: Math Coach: Christie Reid</p> |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Melanie Fike (fikeme@collierschools.com) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Building school culture through leadership development of students and staff is shown to have significant impacts on student achievement, by increasing the social emotional sense of belonging of stakeholders, increasing opportunities for dependent leadership, and increasing internal motivation, and increased accountability of all involved. Increased opportunities by investing and increasing opportunities for staff and students to lead, student learning gains will increase in the areas of reading and math. |
| Rationale for Evidence- | The rationale for selecting this specific strategy was to increase opportunities for students and staff to participate in leadership opportunities, and become invested in school wide initiatives to celebrate student success across the areas of ELA and Mathematics. While FSA data is reported for grades 3-5, increased student performance is needed across K-2, |

based Strategy: assisting in closing the achievement gap and increasing the longitudinal overall performance of students at Parkside Elementary School. These opportunities will assist ensuring that all of our students K-5 are increasing in their learning gains, resulting in long term sustainable increases of student proficiency in grades 3-5 in the areas of reading and math.

Action Steps to Implement

Development of Action Teams to Promote Academic Learning Gains for Students in all Areas

At the beginning of the academic year action teams were developed to include all school staff members, across grade levels and content areas to support and promote student achievement. During pre-service week, teams met to review the School Improvement Plan and ways that their team could support student achievement.

Person Responsible Melanie Fike (fikeme@collierschools.com)

Monthly Action Team Meetings Addressing Opportunities for School-Wide Initiatives

Each action team works within their group to develop school-wide initiatives of projects to support student learning in the area of reading and math. Within these monthly meetings, distributive and shared leadership roles are modeled, with multiple members of the group having the opportunity to lead throughout the year. Members share agenda items, plan next steps, assign team members specific roles, create timelines, and communicate with other staff to ensure the effective delivery and implementation of team initiatives promoting school-wide improvement in the area of reading and math.

Examples of events action teams are planning for the FY21 School Year:

Family Academic Nights

School Wide Celebrations focused around ELA and Math

Increased Recognition of Student Achievement and Learning Gains

School Wide Vertical Opportunities for Students to Share Data Binders

Person Responsible Melanie Fike (fikeme@collierschools.com)

Quarterly School-Wide Data Sharing during Faculty Meetings within Action Teams

Every quarter school-wide data will be shared with faculty and staff regarding the overall performance of students in the areas of reading and mathematics. This data will include information from district benchmark tests, culminating ELA tasks, I-Ready usage and performance, school-wide mastery of fact fluency by grade level and teacher, ALEK's usage for students in grades 4 and 5.

After sharing this data, action teams can work collaboratively to adjust and provide support in their specific area to assist in supporting new adjustments. to help student learning and continue to support students making gains in the area of reading and math.

Person Responsible Melanie Fike (fikeme@collierschools.com)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Looking at FY21 school data, PSE increased its overall science proficiency from 43% during the FY19 school year, to 62%. This resulted in a 19% increase in PSE science proficiency. This was identified as an area to continue to implement the support and evidence based strategies implemented during the past year, in order to replicate and sustain this level of student achievement in the area of science. This includes continuing to implement that same evidence based strategies and support of the science coach. |
| Measurable Outcome: | <p>During the FY22 school year, PSE will maintain it's overall science proficiency of 62% as evidenced by the NGSSS Assessment by implementing a targeted focus on content specific vocabulary and rigorous learning opportunities for students.</p> <p>This area of focus will be monitored through multiple ways in order to ensure the desired outcome is met for the FY22 school year.</p> <p>Collaborative Science Planning: David Ware During science planning monitoring of end of unit assessments, student misconceptions, analysis of student work. Administrators will also participate in collaborative science planning, dependent on assigned grade levels.</p> <p>On-going Monitoring: End of Unit Assessments through GradeCam analytics to identify: standards mastered, and need of reteaching</p> |
| Monitoring: | <p>District Benchmark Monitoring: Quarter Benchmark 1, Quarter Benchmark 2, and Quarter Benchmark 3 *During these times leadership team members meet to analyze data and plan next steps that can result in instructional, structural, staffing, and student adjustments.</p> <p>Data Analysis Chats: Teachers & Grade Level Teams</p> <p>FTEM Math Observations: Melanie Fike, Rachel Moore, Tiffany Wind During science observations monitoring of effective implementation of lesson plans, adjustments and use of high yield engagement strategies, feedback delivered and shared with staff.</p> |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | [no one identified] |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>Teachers will be provided assistance through our academic coach to maximize current resources, to provide students concrete, hands-on learning opportunities to solidify their thinking of abstract concepts and ideas through personal experiences. Teachers will provide opportunities for students to expand writing opportunities through written reflections of the scientific process through grade appropriate lab reports and reflections. Increased emphasis on nature of science standards will be covered throughout the school year. This will be implemented through the collaborative planning process</p> |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>Data shows that students need more exposure to complex science vocabulary. It also shows that they are struggling with the complexity of the questions being asked. Students need literacy support during their science block to help them understand that literacy strategies are transferable across content areas.</p> <p>Students need more opportunities with building background knowledge. By providing</p> |

students increased opportunity with hands-on science activities they will be able to build more background knowledge and real-life applications of the concepts that are taught.

Action Steps to Implement

Develop a collaborative planning framework for coaches to guide discussion with teachers with coaches and administration in attendance. During collaborative planning, we will be actively working with teachers to ensure that they are exposing students to on-grade level texts, higher order questioning, and complex vocabulary, which will increase the rigor in their learning.

Person Responsible David Ware (wareda@collierschools.com)

Collaborative planning discussions will include analysis of weekly/unit assessments to disaggregate the data to determine which concepts need reteaching.

Person Responsible David Ware (wareda@collierschools.com)

Utilize passages and question stems to provide more literacy/vocabulary exposure in Science.

Person Responsible David Ware (wareda@collierschools.com)

Create coaching schedule to assist in providing hands-on learning experiences for students.

Person Responsible David Ware (wareda@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.

Throughout the FY 22 school year Parkside Elementary School will be focusing on reducing the overall number of administrative referrals resulting in in-school suspensions and out of school suspensions. During the FY20 school year, Parkside Elementary School had 8 events that resulted in in-school suspension, and 8 events that resulted in out-of-school suspension. The school will also continue to promote positive school culture through the Positive Behavior Intervention Support plan and continue to monitor student discipline data on an ongoing schedule including review of positive referrals and opportunities for student recognition, and work with the problem solving team to place tier 2 and tier 3 behavior interventions in place for students that may need additional support in regulating their behavior.

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.

There are multiple ways that Parkside Elementary School will build positive school culture and environment, with implementing district-based initiatives and school-led initiatives. District-wide, Collier County Schools will be implementing Connect for Success for the FY22 academic school year. During this time, all students and staff will engage in twice weekly fifteen minute learning sessions, building a sense of community and developing interpersonal and leadership skills within their classroom.

Additionally at Parkside, all staff members are part of Action Teams that comprise staff members from all different grade levels and content areas. Within these teams, members develop a school wide initiatives across the areas of academics, culture and leadership to promote inclusivity, recognize student achievement, and build strong relationships with the school community.

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

Melanie Fike, Principal: Oversees, monitors, and ensures the implementation of all school identified priorities in the area of relationship building and programming directly addressing positive school culture including but not limited to: Teacher Leadership Opportunities to engage in decision making and school wide opportunities to promote: academic, culture, and leadership both within and amongst students and staff, Positive Behavior Intervention Support,

Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | | | | \$78,459.77 |
|---|----------|--|---|-----------------|-----|-------------|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | 6100 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 0551 - Parkside Elementary School | Title, I Part A | 1.0 | \$76,768.96 |
| | | | Notes: Salaries and benefits for 1.0 Math Coach Benefits - Retirement (10.82%), Social Security/Medicare (7.65%), Workers Compensation (.40%), Group health insurance \$9,681 & Life insurance \$70 | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------|---------------|---|--|-----------------|-----|---------------------|
| | 6400 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 0551 - Parkside Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$1,690.81 |
| | | | Notes: Pre-Extension for coaches | | | |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | | | | \$186,447.15 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | 5100 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 0551 - Parkside Elementary School | Title, I Part A | 2.0 | \$141,777.65 |
| | | | Notes: Salaries and benefits for 2.0 Resource teachers Benefits - Retirement (10.82%), Social Security/Medicare (7.65%), Workers Compensation (.40%), Group health insurance \$9,681 & Life insurance \$70 | | | |
| | 6150 | 160-Other Support Personnel | 0551 - Parkside Elementary School | Title, I Part A | 0.5 | \$18,927.20 |
| | | | Notes: Salaries and benefits for .50 PI Assistant Benefits - Retirement (10.82%), Social Security/Medicare (7.65%), Workers Compensation (.40%), Group health insurance \$9,681 & Life insurance \$70 | | | |
| | 5100 | 140-Substitute Teachers | 0551 - Parkside Elementary School | Title, I Part A | 0.5 | \$18,927.20 |
| | | | Notes: Salaries and benefits for .50 Tutor Benefits - Retirement (10.82%), Social Security/Medicare (7.65%), Workers Compensation (.40%), Group health insurance \$9,681 & Life insurance \$70 | | | |
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 0551 - Parkside Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$3,712.93 |
| | | | Notes: Supplies | | | |
| | 6150 | 160-Other Support Personnel | 0551 - Parkside Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$2,602.17 |
| | | | Notes: PI Supplies | | | |
| | 6150 | 160-Other Support Personnel | 0551 - Parkside Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$500.00 |
| | | | Notes: Translation Services | | | |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Leadership: Leadership Development | | | | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science | | | | \$90,262.84 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | 6400 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 0551 - Parkside Elementary School | Title, I Part A | 1.0 | \$90,262.84 |
| | | | Notes: Salaries and benefits for 1.0 Science Coach Benefits - Retirement (10.82%), Social Security/Medicare (7.65%), Workers Compensation (.40%), Group health insurance \$9,681 & Life insurance \$70 | | | |
| Total: | | | | | | \$355,169.76 |