Estates Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Estates Elementary School

5945 EVERGLADES BLVD N, Naples, FL 34120

https://www.collierschools.com/ees

Demographics

Principal: Jill Rexford

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Estates Elementary School

5945 EVERGLADES BLVD N, Naples, FL 34120

https://www.collierschools.com/ees

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	76%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	78%

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.

Working together with the community open-mindedly to develop a positive, nurturing environment, and responsible and respectful citizens who are lifelong learners dedicated to productivity within a global society

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing engaged, enriched, and successful students for the world of tomorrow.

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
Rexford, Jill	Principal	Oversee a data-driven focus on school improvement, ensure instruction of a viable and guaranteed curriculum, facilitate continuous development of teachers and staff, build a community of care and collaboration, maintain core values, and manage resources
Anderson, Lindsey	Assistant Principal	Support the principal's vision of a data-driven focus on school improvement, instruction of a viable and guaranteed curriculum, continuous development of teachers and staff, a community of care and collaboration, core values, and resource management
Sweeney, Jenn	Reading Coach	Support instruction of a viable and guaranteed curriculum and continuous development of teachers and staff in the areas of English Language Arts
Mederos, Lucy	Other	Support instruction of a viable and guaranteed curriculum and a community of care and collaboration for our special education students

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 8/1/2016, Jill Rexford

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.*
5

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

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

58

Total number of students enrolled at the school

777

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

6

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

12

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	135	141	128	111	123	143	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	781
Attendance below 90 percent	7	18	16	12	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	5	15	36	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Course failure in Math	4	5	22	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	5	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	6	4	10	3	5	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	2	6	2	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	6	4	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	82	112	109	108	124	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	648
Attendance below 90 percent	4	14	11	7	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
One or more suspensions	2	1	2	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	1	2	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	6	6	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	82	112	109	108	124	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	648
Attendance below 90 percent	4	14	11	7	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
One or more suspensions	2	1	2	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	1	2	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	6	6	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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				62%	60%	57%	61%	61%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				59%	59%	58%	61%	62%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	51%	53%	60%	54%	48%
Math Achievement				74%	68%	63%	75%	69%	62%
Math Learning Gains				76%	64%	62%	76%	65%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				72%	55%	51%	64%	55%	47%
Science Achievement				52%	59%	53%	53%	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	60%	61%	-1%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	66%	58%	8%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2021					
	2019	57%	60%	-3%	56%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2021					
	2019	60%	68%	-8%	62%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	82%	65%	17%	64%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2021					
	2019	73%	67%	6%	60%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	52%	56%	-4%	53%	-1%
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 for K-2 and district quarterly benchmark assessments for 3-5

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	30	53	74
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	12	50
	Students With Disabilities	19	33	50
	English Language Learners	29	51	71
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	34	57	72
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	26	54
	Students With Disabilities	25	40	55
	English Language Learners	32	54	58
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	63	68	67
	Economically Disadvantaged	55	57	43
	Students With Disabilities	45	45	43
	English Language Learners	56	65	62
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	76	75	42
	Economically Disadvantaged	82	57	25
	Students With Disabilities	70	72	21
	English Language Learners	69	71	40

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	60	63	61
	Economically Disadvantaged	47	46	29
	Students With Disabilities	30	39	25
	English Language Learners	54	62	59
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	71	72	42
	Economically Disadvantaged	47	54	36
	Students With Disabilities	43	61	17
	English Language Learners	66	67	38

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	63	69	60
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	43	8
	Students With Disabilities	32	56	
	English Language Learners	56	67	52
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	74	74	36
	Economically Disadvantaged	62	54	8
	Students With Disabilities	75	59	11
	English Language Learners	69	71	30
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	65	65	59
	Economically Disadvantaged	23	36	33
	Students With Disabilities	25	41	26
	English Language Learners	60	61	55

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	38	64		51	27		9				
ELL	51	78	83	66	66	64	47				
BLK	71	80		74	80		60				
HSP	65	81	87	70	70	71	61				
WHT	74	57		77	57		54				
FRL	64	77	73	68	68	67	54				
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	26	36	38	44	72	67	13				
ELL	40	49	38	61	73	68	33				
BLK	43	57		70	76						
HSP	60	55	41	74	77	69	48				

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
MUL	85	70		92	70						
WHT	71	69	40	75	77	82	62				
FRL	57	58	43	71	76	71	45				

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	21	44	50	38	61	53	18				
ELL	53	70	67	58	57	43					
BLK	48	50		63	75		33				
HSP	61	62	65	77	76	65	49				
MUL	83			83							
WHT	62	61	60	74	77	64	69				
FRL	59	58	58	73	74	63	49				

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	69
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	66
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	548
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
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	65
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	73
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	72
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	64
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	67
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?

Science achievement has had a gradual increase over the three years, but we have not reached our highest proficiency of 60% since 2017. Black and Hispanic students have had a steady increase of both reading and math gains and reading and math gains of the lowest 25%.

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

Math proficiency, math gains, and math gains of the lowest 25%

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

Over 50% of our students were virtual when school began in August last year. Because of technology issues and distractions at home, engagement and accountability for learning were not as high. No students are participating virtually this year. We have a continued focused on grade level collaborative planning for core instruction, implementation of morning math interventions, coaching cycles based on experience, ongoing progress monitoring, and observation feedback from administration.

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

Reading overall gains and reading gains of the lowest 25%

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

We had a change to our reading coach position during the 2019-2020 school year. She has been able to improve the collaborative planning meetings and planning processes.

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

Students are clustered by academic levels so that teachers can push students, increase rigor, and provide enrichment opportunities so that students can make gains.

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.

Cambridge training/strategies
We will use Title 1 funds to pay for guest teachers so that all teachers new to Estates Elementary can participate in instructional rounds during the month of October. We will focus on our school wide deliberate practice of "Helping Students Process New Content" as well as monitoring techniques. Our Focused Teacher Evaluation Model is structured around student evidence and teacher monitoring for the desired effect of each element. This professional development opportunity will strengthen teachers' comfort level and use of our instructional and evaluation model that uses evidence-based strategies for learning.

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

We have teacher led professional development sessions monthly. Topics are selected based on teacher strengths and school needs. Students are in holding areas before school so no funding is needed. This allows us to sustain this practice.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our math achievement dropped from 74% in 2019 to 72% in 2021.
Measurable Outcome:	During the 2021-2022 school year, an increase of 3% on math achievement school grade category is expected. This would mean an increase from 72% of students scoring a 3 or higher to 75% of students scoring a 3 or higher on the math FSA in grades 3,4, and 5.
Monitoring:	During weekly grade level collaborative planning, we (teachers, coach, and administration) plan which tier 1 common assessment will be given to monitor progress and take a data point for the learning goal being taught. The next week we discuss the data we collected and if we need to embed more practice in homework, small group instruction, or whole group review. The data point we collect is also recorded on the teachers' core data spreadsheets that are housed in Office365 TEAMS. After students take their quarterly district benchmark, we discuss and analyze the grade level average, district comparisons, item analysis, and FSA projections so we can select the standards and item types that need reteaching. During our weekly leadership team meetings, we identify students who are not making adequate progress and gaps in instruction to intervene properly. During our monthly FTEM observations, we observe instruction and give teachers actionable feedback.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lindsey Anderson (anderl1@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Collaborative structures: • Peer-to-Peer professional learning opportunities will be offered to support implementation of best practices • Instructional rounds opportunities will include collaborative structures as look for's (student evidence) 2. Digital Resources: • Grade Cam used for assessments with ability for item analysis. • Continued implementation of IDI trainings and resources. 3. Cambridge strategies: • Strategies are discussed during planning meetings. 4. Effective implementation of research based tiered-interventions: •Morning math interventions for students with lowest performing students on FSA and post-tests the previous year. The effectiveness of these interventions are monitored daily through informal assessments taken by the intervention teacher. Adjustments to instruction are made accordingly. 5. Math coach will continue to support all grade levels in an effort to support and maintain performance levels, but with an increased focus on third grade math to support this goal of increasing math achievement to 75% during the 2021-2022 school year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence collected from FTEM Observations, teacher data chats, and grade level/ teacher planning sessions and coaching cycles will be used to monitor progress towards our goals. We will closely review Tier 1 assessment data as well as quarterly benchmark data during grade level planning meetings and make instructional adjustments/ increase supports with these evidence-based strategies as needed. Data tied to these interventions will be reviewed for adjustments at grade level planning meetings.

Action Steps to Implement

Design master schedule to include grade level common planning.

Person Responsible   Lindsey Anderson (anderl1@collierschools.com)

Focused Teacher Evaluation Model Observations: Administration is able to observe instruction and leave focused feedback for improvement.

Person Responsible   Jill Rexford (rexfoj@collierschools.com)

Continue weekly planning days with academic coaches focused on rigorous standards-based instruction and data tracking

Person Responsible   Lindsey Anderson (anderl1@collierschools.com)

Ensure continued use of district-approved resources by monitoring teacher Canvas platform as lesson plans, and regular FTEM observations.

Person Responsible   Jill Rexford (rexfoj@collierschools.com)

Quarterly data analysis of district provided common benchmark assessments and resulting instructional adjustment based on subskill needs or standards analysis. Math and reading coach will continue to develop 14 day remediation cycles for students- these are daily practice problems/passages designed to address standards weaknesses as seen in benchmark results.

Person Responsible   Lindsey Anderson (anderl1@collierschools.com)

Continue to use teacher observations and timely feedback as a method for promoting instructional growth. Professional learning will be designed based on needs observed during observations. Teachers will also be invited to present to their colleagues once we identify innovative practices through observations.

Person Responsible   Jill Rexford (rexfoj@collierschools.com)

Admin and coaches present for all collaborative planning meetings

Person Responsible   Lindsey Anderson (anderl1@collierschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Although we had an increase in reading proficiency when comparing 18-19 to 20-21 school grade data, it is still one of our lowest reporting categories.
Measurable Outcome:	During the 2021-2022 school year, an increase of 3% on ELA achievement school grade category is expected. This would mean an increase from 69% of students scoring a 3 or higher to 72% of students scoring a 3 or higher on the ELA FSA in grades 3,4, and 5.
Monitoring:	During weekly grade level collaborative planning, we (teachers, coach, and administration) plan which tier 1 common assessment will be given to monitor progress and take a data point for the learning goal being taught. The next week we discuss the data we collected and if we need to embed more practice in homework, small group instruction, or whole group review. The data point we collect is also recorded on the teachers' core data spreadsheets that are housed in Office365 TEAMS. After students take their quarterly district benchmark, we discuss and analyze the grade level average, district comparisons, item analysis, and FSA projections so we can select the standards and item types that need reteaching. During our weekly leadership team meetings, we identify students who are not making adequate progress and gaps in instruction to intervene properly. During our monthly FTEM observations, we observe instruction and give teachers actionable feedback.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jill Rexford (rexfoj@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Collaborative structures: • Peer-to-Peer professional learning opportunities will be offered to support implementation of best practices • Instructional rounds and side-by-side coaching opportunities will include collaborative structures as look for's (student evidence)- Guest teachers to support this effort will be provided through Title I Funding as outlined in our school's Curriculum Needs Assessment. 2. Digital Resources: • Grade Cam used for paper assessments. This tool offers item analysis by Florida standard. • Continued implementation of IDI trainings and resources. 3. Cambridge strategies: • Over 50% of teachers have already attended Cambridge trainings. • Strategies are discussed during weekly collaborative planning meetings. 4. Effective implementation of research based tiered-interventions: • Highly effective reading teachers using LLI and iReady tools for instruction for interventions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence collected from FTEM Observations, teacher data chats, and grade level/ teacher planning sessions and coaching cycles will be used to monitor progress towards our goals. We will also closely review Tier 1 assessment data as well as quarterly benchmark data during grade level planning meetings and make instructional adjustments/ increase supports with these evidence-based strategies as needed. Data tied to student interventions will be kept in the Data Warehouse and tied to specific students and their Student Success Plans. This data will be reviewed for adjustments at each monthly grade level MTSS meeting.

Action Steps to Implement

Design master schedule to include grade level common planning.

Person Responsible Lindsey Anderson (anderl1@collierschools.com)

Focused Teacher Evaluation Model observations: Administration is able to observe instruction and leave focused feedback for improvement.

Person Responsible Jill Rexford (rexfoj@collierschools.com)

Continue weekly planning days with academic coaches focused on rigorous standards-based instruction and data tracking

Person Responsible Lindsey Anderson (anderl1@collierschools.com)

Ensure continued use of district-approved resources by monitoring teacher Canvas platform as lesson plans, and regular FTEM observations.

Person Responsible Jill Rexford (rexfoj@collierschools.com)

Quarterly data analysis of district provided common benchmark assessments and resulting instructional adjustment based on subskill needs or standards analysis. Math and reading coach will continue to develop 14 day remediation cycles for students- these are daily practice problems/passages designed to address standards weaknesses as seen in benchmark results.

Person Responsible Jenn Sweeney (sweenj1@collierschools.com)

Continue to use teacher observations and timely feedback as a method for promoting instructional growth. Professional learning will be designed based on needs observed during observations. Teachers will also be invited to present to their colleagues once we identify innovative practices through observations.

Person Responsible Jill Rexford (rexfoj@collierschools.com)

Admin and coaches present for all collaborative planning meetings

Person Responsible Lindsey Anderson (anderl1@collierschools.com)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Although our science proficiency has increased over the last several years, we have not reached our highest proficiency since 2017.
Measurable Outcome:	During the 2021-2022 school year, an increase of 3% on science achievement school grade category is expected. This would mean an increase from 59% of students scoring a 3 or higher to 62% of students scoring a 3 or higher on the science statement achievement in grade 5.
Monitoring:	During weekly grade level collaborative planning, we (teachers, coach, and administration) plan which tier 1 common assessment will be given to monitor progress and take a data point for the learning goal being taught. The next week we discuss the data we collected and if we need to embed more practice in homework, small group instruction, or whole group review. The data point we collect is also recorded on the teachers' core data spreadsheets that are housed in Office365 TEAMS. After students take their quarterly district benchmark, we discuss and analyze the grade level average, district comparisons, item analysis, and FSA projections so we can select the standards and item types that need reteaching. During our weekly leadership team meetings, we identify students who are not making adequate progress and gaps in instruction to intervene properly. During our monthly FTEM observations, we observe instruction and give teachers actionable feedback.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lindsey Anderson (anderl1@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Collaborative structures: • Peer-to-Peer professional learning opportunities will be offered to support implementation of best practices • Instructional rounds and side-by-side coaching opportunities will include collaborative structures as look for's (student evidence)- Guest teachers to support this effort will be provided through Title I Funding as outlined in our school's Curriculum Needs Assessment. 2. Digital Resources: • Grade Cam used for paper assessments. This tools offers item analysis by Florida standard. • Continued implementation of IDI trainings and resources. 3. Cambridge strategies: • Over 50% of teachers have already attended Cambridge trainings. • Strategies are discussed during weekly collaborative planning meetings.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence collected from FTEM Observations, teacher data chats, and grade level/ teacher planning sessions and coaching cycles will be used to monitor progress towards our goals. We will also closely review Tier 1 assessment data as well as quarterly benchmark data during grade level planning meetings and make instructional adjustments/ increase supports with these evidence-based strategies as needed.

Action Steps to Implement

Design master schedule to include grade level common planning.

Person Responsible	Lindsey Anderson (anderl1@collierschools.com)

Focused Teacher Evaluation Model observations: Administration is able to observe instruction and leave focused feedback for improvement.

Person Responsible   Jill Rexford (rexfoj@collierschools.com)

Continue weekly planning days with academic coaches focused on rigorous standards-based instruction and data tracking

Person Responsible   Lindsey Anderson (anderl1@collierschools.com)

Ensure continued use of district-approved resources by monitoring teacher Canvas platform as lesson plans, and regular FTEM observations.

Person Responsible   Jill Rexford (rexfoj@collierschools.com)

Quarterly data analysis of district provided common benchmark assessments and resulting instructional adjustment based on subskill needs or standards analysis.

Person Responsible   Lindsey Anderson (anderl1@collierschools.com)

Continue to use teacher observations and timely feedback as a method for promoting instructional growth. Professional learning will be designed based on needs observed during observations. Teachers will also be invited to present to their colleagues once we identify innovative practices through observations.

Person Responsible   Jill Rexford (rexfoj@collierschools.com)

Admin and coaches present for all collaborative planning meetings

Person Responsible   Lindsey Anderson (anderl1@collierschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

Estates Elementary fell into the low category for school incident ranking. We reported 0.3 incidents per 100 students. This rate is less than the statewide elementary school rate of 1.0 incidents per 100 students. We will monitor the school culture and environment through the use of the Panorama Student voice survey and the Employee Voice survey. During our monthly threat assessment team meetings, we identify students who are not meeting expectations. We discuss next steps for supporting student needs. The PBIS committee meets monthly to review discipline and behavior data. They create an action plan to minimize undesired behaviors.

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.

Each year we have a theme to motivate our staff and students and generate enthusiasm for the year ahead. This year it is "Imagine the PossibilitiEES at Estates Elementary School" (EES). The theme is intertwined into everything we do (morning news, car line banner, thank you cards, bulletin boards, spirit shirts, etc.) We are implementing "Connect for Success" which is a district developed curriculum intended to improve relationships and a sense of belonging for all students. We have a social committee that works to improve and maintain staff morale and a PTO that supports teachers and student learning.

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

Leadership team-weekly agenda has school culture section so we are deliberate about maintaining a positive culture and environment
Social committee chair: Rebecca Wuss-meets with committee monthly to create morale boosting activities for staff
PTO-board of four members-monthly celebrations like National Tea Day and National Chips and Dip day, staff member of the week gifts, fundraising used on student resources
News Crew-Shelley Kirk-the theme and PBIS goals are celebrated on the morning news
Connect for Success-Lindsey Anderson/Jill Rexford monitor the implementation of this district program

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$90,632.36
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0511 - Estates Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	$77,872.54
			Notes: Math/Science Coach: Marissa Rockwell			
	6400	750-Other Personal Services	0511 - Estates Elementary School	Title, I Part A	0.0	$5,873.35
			Notes: Guest Teachers for Professional Development			

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0511 - Estates Elementary School	Title, I Part A	0.0	$5,094.80
		Notes: Math/Science Coach Pre-extension				
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0511 - Estates Elementary School	Title, I Part A	0.0	$1,791.67
		Notes: Math/Science Coach Post-extension				
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**				**$213,593.44**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0511 - Estates Elementary School	Title, I Part A	0.6	$45,116.13
		Notes: Judy Feldon: Resource Teacher				
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0511 - Estates Elementary School	Title, I Part A	0.5	$44,190.86
		Notes: Amber Stocker: Resource Teacher				
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0511 - Estates Elementary School	Title, I Part A	0.4	$27,910.77
		Notes: Erin Gaudio: Resource Teacher				
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0511 - Estates Elementary School	Title, I Part A	0.4	$25,986.53
		Notes: Nicole Miners: Resource Teacher				
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0511 - Estates Elementary School	Title, I Part A	0.2	$16,547.48
		Notes: Shelley Kirk: Resource Teacher				
	5100	150-Aides	0511 - Estates Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	$43,512.80
		Notes: Marguerite Dagher: Academic Tutor				
	6400	750-Other Personal Services	0511 - Estates Elementary School	Title, I Part A	0.0	$5,873.35
		Notes: Guest Teachers for Professional Development				
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0511 - Estates Elementary School	Title, I Part A	0.0	$2,916.87
		Notes: Reading Coach Pre-extension				
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0511 - Estates Elementary School	Title, I Part A	0.0	$1,538.65
		Notes: Reading Coach Post-extension				
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science**				**$90,632.36**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0511 - Estates Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	$77,872.54
		Notes: Marissa Rockwell: Math/Science Coach				
	6400	750-Other Personal Services	0511 - Estates Elementary School	Title, I Part A	0.0	$5,873.35

			Notes: Guest teachers for professional development			
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0511 - Estates Elementary School	Title, I Part A	0.0	$5,094.80
			Notes: Math/Science Coach Pre-extension			
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0511 - Estates Elementary School	Title, I Part A	0.0	$1,791.67
			Notes: Math/Science Coach Post-extension			
					Total:	**$394,858.16**