

Collier County Public Schools

# Pelican Marsh Elementary School



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>19</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>23</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# Pelican Marsh Elementary School

9480 AIRPORT RD N, Naples, FL 34109

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Rebecca Merhar**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/26/2021

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2020-21 Title I School</b>  | No  |
| <b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 61%   |
| <b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: A (77%)<br>2017-18: A (76%)<br>2016-17: A (78%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southwest   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   |   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   |   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |   |

## 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](http://www.floridacims.org).

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>19</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

## Pelican Marsh Elementary School

9480 AIRPORT RD N, Naples, FL 34109

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

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | No                     | 38%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 37%  |

### School Grades History

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

### 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.**

Pelican Marsh Elementary School provides a positive, nurturing environment committed to achieving excellence. All students are challenged to reach their maximum potential through a strong foundation of rigorous instruction and shared practices, enabling them to become successful, life-long learners.

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

Pelican Marsh Elementary is a community that honors all learners and works in partnership with parents and community members ensuring students' 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   |
|------------------------|---------------------------|---|
| Merhar, Rebecca        | Principal                 | Both the Principal and Assistant Principal share the responsibility of providing instructional leadership. School leaders attend weekly Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) with grade level teams, review weekly lesson plans, observe classroom instruction, monitor the implementation of the curriculum, and develop schedules to ensure a safe and orderly learning environment.<br><br>School leaders meet regularly with teachers to discuss their ideas regarding instructional decisions and school operation through common planning meetings, PLCs, team meetings, MTSS, the School Advisory Council, and the Faculty Advisory Council. Additionally, school leaders meet informally with teachers and teams to get their perspective on various instructional decisions to meet the needs of all students. |
| Alamo, Melissa         | Assistant Principal       | Manages school operations in the absence of the Principal. Provides leadership to teachers and team leaders concerning instructional programs. Assists the Principal in the supervision of all school programs. Is a member of the Leadership Team and strives to acquire knowledge in the area of literacy, supports and guides teams for ongoing collaboration. Seeks input from stakeholders before making decisions and works collaboratively with school staff. Supports District and school SEL initiatives.  |
| Cassilly, Robyn        | Reading Coach             | Supports all instructional staff with English Language Arts instruction, analyzes data, and monitors student achievement. Works collaboratively with teams and/or individuals to gather input for decision making.  |
| Craft Mueller, Cynthia | Teacher, ESE              | Supports MTSS school procedures, professional learning and activities regarding student academic and behavioral achievement, and student intervention in an efficient, professional manner. Works collaboratively with our school based leadership team to monitor fidelity of MTSS implementation. Maintains a working knowledge of local, state, and federal laws and regulations related to compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), as well as guidelines pertaining to eligibility, delivery of services, and individualized plan development. Additionally, facilitates gifted education eligibility and education plans for gifted students.  |
| Ward, Julie            | School Counselor          | Assists the Principal in maintaining a positive school climate and culture of character within the school. Serves as on-staff resource with expertise in student services. Works collaboratively with teams and/or individuals to gather input for decision making. Supports District and school SEL initiatives.   |
| Lawler, Kathleen       | ELL Compliance Specialist | Supports teachers of English Language Learners with instruction, analyzes data and monitors student achievement. Works collaboratively with teams and/or individuals to gather input for decision making.   |

## Demographic Information



**Principal start date**

Thursday 8/26/2021, Rebecca Merhar

**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.*

9

**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**

47

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

705

**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.**

1

**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                              | 119         | 111 | 106 | 104 | 119 | 122 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 681   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 1           | 9   | 8   | 5   | 4   | 5   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 32    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 1   | 4   | 1   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6     |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0   | 4   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 6   | 7   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 13    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 8   | 8   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

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

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

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 8/26/2021

**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               | 79          | 101 | 99 | 110 | 124 | 106 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 619   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 1           | 2   | 2  | 2   | 5   | 1   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 13    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0   | 0  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0   | 0  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0   | 0  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0   | 0  | 0   | 1   | 1   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0   | 0  | 0   | 1   | 1   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |

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

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

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**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               | 79          | 101 | 99 | 110 | 124 | 106 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 619   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 1           | 2   | 2  | 2   | 5   | 1   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 13    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0   | 0  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0   | 0  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0   | 0  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0   | 0  | 0   | 1   | 1   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0   | 0  | 0   | 1   | 1   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |

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

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

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

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

## 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             |        |          |       | 86%    | 60%      | 57%   | 82%    | 61%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 74%    | 59%      | 58%   | 76%    | 62%      | 55%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 59%    | 51%      | 53%   | 59%    | 54%      | 48%   |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 91%    | 68%      | 63%   | 88%    | 69%      | 62%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 80%    | 64%      | 62%   | 77%    | 65%      | 59%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 70%    | 55%      | 51%   | 66%    | 55%      | 47%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 77%    | 59%      | 53%   | 81%    | 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 | 88%    | 61%      | 27%                        | 58%   | 30%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 79%    | 58%      | 21%                        | 58%   | 21%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -88%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 83%    | 60%      | 23%                        | 56%   | 27%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -79%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 95%    | 68%      | 27%                        | 62%   | 33%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 86%    | 65%      | 21%                        | 64%   | 22%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -95%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 86%    | 67%      | 19%                        | 60%   | 26%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -86%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 76%    | 56%      | 20%                        | 53%   | 23%                     |
| 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 is used to monitor grades Kindergarten through 2nd. District quarter benchmarks are used to monitor grades 3-5.

| Grade 1                  |                               |             |             |              |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall        | Winter      | Spring       |
| English Language<br>Arts | All Students                  | (42/99)42%  | (62/100)62% | (85/99)86%   |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | (12/37)32%  | (17/35)49%  | (1/1) 100%   |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | (1/7) 14%   | (2/6) 33%   | (5/8) 63%    |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | (1/10) 10%  | (2/10) 20%  | (6/9) 67%    |
|                          |                               |             |             |              |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall        | Winter      | Spring       |
| Mathematics              | All Students                  | 0           | 0           | 0            |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 0           | 0           | 0            |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 0           | 0           | 0            |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 0           | 0           | 0            |
|                          |                               |             |             |              |
| Grade 2                  |                               |             |             |              |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall        | Winter      | Spring       |
| English Language<br>Arts | All Students                  | (50/98) 51% | (73/98) 74% | (84/101) 83% |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | (13/37) 35% | (22/38) 58% | (6/6) 100%   |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | (2/9) 22%   | (2/7) 29%   | (3/7) 43%    |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | (1/16) 6%   | (7/16) 44%  | (11/16) 69%  |
|                          |                               |             |             |              |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall        | Winter      | Spring       |
| Mathematics              | All Students                  | 0           | 0           | 0            |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 0           | 0           | 0            |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 0           | 0           | 0            |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 0           | 0           | 0            |
|                          |                               |             |             |              |

| Grade 3                  |                               |              |              |              |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall         | Winter       | Spring       |
| English Language<br>Arts | All Students                  | (86/107) 80% | (93/106) 88% | (79/109) 72% |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | (26/42) 62%  | (31/41) 76%  | (25/44) 57%  |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | (5/14) 36%   | (7/12) 58%   | (5/12) 42%   |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | (9/19) 47%   | (9/16) 56%   | (6/20) 30%   |
|                          |                               |              |              |              |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall         | Winter       | Spring       |
| Mathematics              | All Students                  | (96/107) 90% | (97/107) 91% | (85/109) 78% |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | (37/42) 88%  | (37/42) 88%  | (28/44) 64%  |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | (11/14) 79%  | (9/12) 75%   | (7/12) 58%   |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | (12/19) 63%  | (13/17) 76%  | (8/20) 40%   |
|                          |                               |              |              |              |
| Grade 4                  |                               |              |              |              |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall         | Winter       | Spring       |
| English Language<br>Arts | All Students                  | (85/117) 73% | (96/120) 80% | (88/119) 74% |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | (25/45) 56%  | (29/45) 64%  | (27/46) 59%  |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | (5/15) 33%   | (5/15) 33%   | (3/14) 21%   |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | (7/14) 50%   | (8/15) 53%   | (8/14) 57%   |
|                          |                               |              |              |              |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall         | Winter       | Spring       |
| Mathematics              | All Students                  | (95/117) 81% | (90/120) 75% | (76/119) 64% |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | (31/45) 69%  | (24/45) 53%  | (21/46) 46%  |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | (7/15) 47%   | (6/15) 40%   | (1/14) 7%    |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | (8/14) 57%   | (8/15) 53%   | (5/14) 36%   |
|                          |                               |              |              |              |

| Grade 5               |                            |              |              |              |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall         | Winter       | Spring       |
|                       | All Students               | (89/109) 82% | (93/112) 83% | (78/113) 69% |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | (25/36) 69%  | (27/38) 71%  | (20/40) 50%  |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | (4/7) 57%    | (5/7) 71%    | (3/6) 50%    |
|                       | English Language Learners  | (4/10) 40%   | (3/9) 33%    | (2/8) 25%    |
| Mathematics           | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall         | Winter       | Spring       |
|                       | All Students               | (92/109) 84% | (97/111) 87% | (76/113) 67% |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | (28/36) 78%  | (30/38) 79%  | (21/40) 53%  |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | (4/7) 57%    | (5/7) 71%    | (2/6) 33%    |
|                       | English Language Learners  | (6/10) 60%   | (5/9) 56%    | (3/8) 38%    |
| Science               | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall         | Winter       | Spring       |
|                       | All Students               | (84/108) 78% | (87/111) 78% | (84/112) 75% |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | (23/35) 66%  | (25/38) 66%  | (23/40) 57%  |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | (5/7) 71%    | (5/7) 71%    | (4/6) 67%    |
|                       | English Language Learners  | (3/10) 30%   | (3/9) 33%    | (2/8) 25%    |

## 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                                       | 50       |        |             | 50        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 76       | 77     |             | 71        | 62      |              | 67       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 77       |        |             | 85        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 71       | 67     | 64          | 73        | 58      |              | 61       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 90       | 79     | 45          | 94        | 79      | 77           | 90       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 71       | 64     | 50          | 80        | 57      | 50           | 69       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 53       | 54     | 52          | 69        | 74      | 70           | 21       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 61       | 52     | 42          | 70        | 61      | 56           | 44       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 82       |        |             | 100       |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 58       | 70     |             | 83        | 90      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |

| 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 |
| HSP                                       | 80       | 73     | 70          | 82        | 80      | 69           | 58       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 94       | 91     |             | 94        | 91      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 90       | 74     | 57          | 94        | 80      | 64           | 85       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 79       | 71     | 60          | 84        | 78      | 71           | 60       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 40       | 53     | 54          | 53        | 45      | 32           | 30       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 49       | 61     | 55          | 54        | 62      | 50           | 29       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 77       | 73     |             | 100       | 100     |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 38       |        |             | 46        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 76       | 79     | 73          | 80        | 76      | 74           | 67       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 82       |        |             | 82        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 87       | 76     | 46          | 93        | 78      | 62           | 90       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 68       | 70     | 61          | 80        | 73      | 70           | 68       |         |           |                   |                     |

### 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  | 72   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 0    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 65   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 577  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 50   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       |      |
| English Language Learners   |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 70   |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | NO   |



| English Language Learners  |     |
|--|-----|
| 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   | 81  |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                  |     |
| Black/African American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                |     |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 66  |
| 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   | 79  |
| 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                                | 63 |
| 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?

Our Low 25% Math proficiency show the lowest performance. Specifically, we see a decline of 74 to 69% in math gains by our HSP subgroup.

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

Our Low 25% Math gains showed the greatest decline from the previous year. Factors that may have contributed to this decrease are the inconsistency of services due to staffing and focused strategies from service providers.

#### 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 long-term sub in a departmentalized grade level. Math Morning club attendance will be monitored and implemented by staff with fidelity.

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

Science proficiency increased from 77-83%. 5th grade is departmentalized, with a master teacher providing instruction in specific content areas.

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

Contributing factors include a thorough review of 3rd and 4th grade standards, scientific demonstrations, and incorporating USA test prep as a spiral review.

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

Acceleration strategies include differentiation for all learners, push in support from resource team, progress monitoring of end of module and quarterly assessment data and incorporating student academic notebooks.

#### 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 focused on FTEM Element #6 Helping students process new content and utilizing morning math clubs and DI time to scaffold grade level math support and mastery of grade level standards for Low 25%.

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

Scaffolded support that is direct and purposeful by master teachers teaching content areas within their area of expertise.

### **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Upon review of the 2020/2021 FSA data, the ELA Low 25% of student gains has decreased from 59% to 50%. The inconsistency of support of a highly-qualified teacher for two classrooms was identified as an area of concern that directly impacted support for students in the Low 25%. The need for differentiated instruction and support, ongoing progress monitoring by a highly-qualified teacher is critical and essential to improve student performance.

**Measurable Outcome:** By June 1st as determined by FY22 FSA results, the Low 25% ELA student gains will increase by 3% (50%-53%) by participating in daily targeted instruction to include fluid small group instruction during the DI block with strategic scheduling for support staff to push in, MTSS Tiered Intervention instruction, administer iReady Diagnostic and district quarter benchmark assessments.

**Monitoring:** Monitoring will come from quarterly data analysis of students in the lowest 25%, followed by adjustments to differentiated and core instruction based on results from district benchmark assessments and iReady Diagnostic Assessments. Monitoring will occur during bimonthly grade level PLC's to determine appropriate adjustments in groups to ensure that all students in the Low 25% are making adequate progress.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Rebecca Merhar (merharre@collierschools.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Standards-based instruction will occur by providing the identified Low 25% with district-adopted instructional materials aligned with their grade level proficiency. Differentiated instruction and interventions will be implemented by classroom teachers with support from strategic scheduling of ESE inclusion teachers and Reading Coach. Targeted instruction will result in an increased performance on formative and summative assessments, iReady Diagnostic Assessments, quarterly benchmark assessments, and FSA ELA scores.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Extensive review of FY20 FSA data identified a decline in the performance of the Low 25% in ELA. Evidence indicated a need for support staff to collaborate with classroom teachers and the need to incorporate collaborative structures to increase student discussions. Strategic scheduling of additional support during the ELA instructional block, which includes staggered DI blocks in all grade levels, and the utilization of collaborative structures to increase student processing of knowledge

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Identification of Low 25% in ELA.
2. Schoolwide master schedule created to allow strategic scheduling of support staff.
3. Classroom observations will include evidence of helping students process new content with the focus on collaborative structures.
4. PLC's to analyze formative student assessment data and determine adjustments in instructional model.
5. Continue professional development on standards-based instruction and school-wide deliberate practice goal.
6. Vertical Articulation Committees to focus on school-wide trends and implementation of best teaching practices.

**Person Responsible** Rebecca Merhar (merharre@collierschools.com)

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Upon review of the 2020/2021 FSA data, the Math Low 25% of student gains has decreased from 70% to 58%. The inconsistency of support of a highly-qualified teacher for two classrooms was identified as an area of concern that directly impacted support for students in the Low 25%. The need for differentiated instruction and support, ongoing progress monitoring by a highly-qualified teacher is critical and essential to improve student performance.

**Measurable Outcome:** By June 1st as determined by FY22 FSA results, the Low 25% Math student gains will increase by at least 3% (58%-61%) by participating in daily targeted instruction to include fluid small group instruction during the DI block two days per week with strategic scheduling for support staff to push in, MTSS Tiered Intervention instruction, Waggle (K-3) and ALEKS (4-5) progress reports, and district quarter benchmark assessments.

**Monitoring:** Monitoring will come from quarterly data analysis of students in the lowest 25%, followed by adjustments to differentiated and core instruction based on results from district benchmark assessments, Waggle and ALEKS reports. Monitoring will occur during bimonthly grade level PLC's to determine appropriate adjustments in groups to ensure that all students in the Low 25% are making adequate progress.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Melissa Alamo (alamom@collierschools.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Standards-based instruction will occur by providing the identified Low 25% with district-adopted instructional materials aligned with their grade level proficiency. Differentiated instruction and interventions will be implemented by classroom teachers with support from strategic scheduling of ESE inclusion teachers. Targeted instruction will result in an increased performance on formative and summative assessments, Waggle and ALEKS progress, quarterly benchmark assessments, and FSA Math scores.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Extensive review of FY20 FSA data identified a decline in the performance of the Low 25% in Math. Evidence indicated a need for support staff to collaborate with classroom teachers and the need to incorporate collaborative structures to increase student discussions. Strategic scheduling of additional support during the Math instructional block, which includes staggered DI blocks in all grade levels with two days of math to reteach and scaffold grade level standards, and the utilization of collaborative structures to increase student processing of knowledge.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Identification of Low 25% in Math.
2. School-wide master schedule created to allow strategic scheduling of support staff.
3. Classroom observations will include evidence of helping students process new content with the focus on collaborative structures.
4. PLC's to analyze formative student assessment data and determine adjustments in instructional model.
5. Continue professional development on standards-based instruction and school-wide deliberate practice goal.
6. Vertical Articulation Committees to focus on school-wide trends and implementation of best teaching practices.
7. Implement Morning Math Club for students in Low 25%.

**Person Responsible** Melissa Alamo (alamom@collierschools.com)

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

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus</b>                              | Upon review of the 2020/2021 FSA data, the Math overall gains has decreased from 80% to 73%. The need for differentiated instruction and support, ongoing progress monitoring by highly-qualified teachers is critical and essential to improve student performance.  |
| <b>Description and Rationale:</b>                 |   |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | By June 1st as determined by FY22 FSA results, Math overall gains will increase by at least 3% (73%-76%) by participating in daily targeted instruction to include fluid small group instruction during the DI block two days per week with strategic scheduling for support staff to push in, MTSS Tiered Intervention instruction, Waggle (K-3) and ALEKS (4-5) progress reports, and district quarter benchmark assessments.   |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | Monitoring will come from quarterly data analysis of students followed by adjustments to differentiated and core instruction based on results from district benchmark assessments, and Waggle and ALEKS reports. Monitoring will occur during bimonthly grade level PLC's to determine appropriate adjustments in groups to ensure that all students are making adequate progress.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Melissa Alamo (alamom@collierschools.com)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | Standards-based instruction will occur by providing students with district-adopted instructional materials aligned with their grade level proficiency. Differentiated instruction and interventions will be implemented by classroom teachers with support from strategic scheduling of ESE inclusion teachers. Targeted instruction will result in an increased performance on formative and summative assessments, Waggle and ALEKS progress, quarterly benchmark assessments, and FSA Math scores.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | Extensive review of FY20 FSA data identified a decline in the performance of students making gains in Math. Evidence indicated a need for support staff to collaborate with classroom teachers and the need to incorporate collaborative structures to increase student discussions. Strategic scheduling of additional support during the Math instructional block, which includes staggered DI blocks in all grade levels with two days of math to reteach and scaffold grade level standards, and the utilization of collaborative structures to increase student processing of knowledge. |

**Action Steps to Implement**

- 1.School-wide master schedule created to allow strategic scheduling of support staff.
- 2.Classroom observations will include evidence of helping students process new content with the focus on collaborative structures.
- 3.PLC's to analyze formative student assessment data and determine adjustments in instructional model.
- 4.Continue professional development on standards-based instruction and school-wide deliberate practice goal.
5. Vertical Articulation Committees to focus on school-wide trends and implementation of best teaching practices.

**Person Responsible** Melissa Alamo (alamom@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.

**Pelican Marsh Elementary is ranked #1 out of 1,395 elementary schools in the state and is #1 out of 27 elementary schools in the school district. All three reported incidents are rated very low in comparison to the state. Students receiving In School Suspension increased from 12 to 23 students. School culture and environment will be monitored by reviewing PBIS data on a monthly basis which includes Positive Referrals, and Referrals which include location, gender, grade levels and disaggregated data by subgroups including students with IEPs.**

#### **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.**

At Pelican Marsh Elementary, it is important for families and the school to work together and share responsibility for student success. We value family members' expertise about their children and always work as a team to ensure the best for each and every child. Our school community is committed to providing a quality learning environment focused on building a positive culture, academic success, relationships, and the development of the whole child. In partnership with our families and community, we create a culture where everyone is a digital learner, a teacher, and a leader. Pelican Marsh offers incentive programs such as Reading Counts, Florida Reading Association Books (Grades K-2), and the annual Sunshine State Young Reader's Award Program (Grades 3-5).

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

Pelican Marsh has a very engaged and dedicated PTO and School Advisory Council with representatives from all stakeholder groups. Through parent involvement events, school committees, and a daily focus on student success as a priority, Pelican Marsh has a positive school culture and environment.