

Collier County Public Schools

Lake Park Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Lake Park Elementary School

1295 14TH AVE N, Naples, FL 34102

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

Demographics

Principal: Katie Maya

Start Date for this Principal: 7/11/2011

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	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	73%
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (74%) 2017-18: A (76%) 2016-17: A (68%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Lake Park Elementary School

1295 14TH AVE N, Naples, FL 34102

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

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	No	46%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	42%

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.

To create a collaborative learning community that inspires success through high quality data driven instruction, purposeful learning and amazingly positive experiences for all stakeholders, in a safe and caring environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Success for every student...every day!

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
Marker, Christopher	Principal	<p>Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making; conducts root cause analysis to determine future instructional strategies and areas of focus using the See, Do, Get model, verbalizes support of the MTSS process; ensures that MTSS is being implemented with fidelity; allows scheduling that supports common team planning and implementation of interventions; monitors curriculum, instruction, assessments, and evidence of impact; ensures adequate professional development to support student achievement; communicates with parents plans and activities. Oversees the implementation of intentional and purposeful practices in each content area that will guide the selection of both instructional resources and strategies to maximize student achievement school-wide. Promotes a renewed emphasis on data-based reading instruction and intervention.</p>
Galloway, Heather	Assistant Principal	<p>Assists the principal in maintaining a common vision for use of data based decision making. Assists the principal in providing leadership and support of the MTSS process; conducts root cause analysis to determine future instructional strategies and areas of focus, ensures that MTSS is being implemented with fidelity; conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation; allows scheduling that supports common team planning and implementation of interventions; monitors curriculum, instruction, assessments, and evidence of impact; ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation; communicates with parents regarding school based MTSS plans and activities. Oversees the implementation of best practices in each content area that will guide the selection of both instructional resources and strategies to maximize student achievement school-wide; communicates with families regarding attendance and discipline.</p>
Arcand, Aimee	Other	<p>Develops, leads, and evaluates CORE programs; identifies and analyzes literature on research-based intervention strategies; identifies systematic patterns of student need; assists with universal screening process; assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery. Attends and supports collaborative planning and instructional delivery methods to ensure a laser focus on standards based instruction tailored to each students learning needs.</p>
Byington, Amy	Instructional Media	<p>Promotes literacy activities throughout the school; Plans, organizes, and facilitates literacy meetings and events; Participates in student data collection; integrates core instructional activities into Tier II and III instruction; collaborates with general education teachers through co-teaching models; provides support for the development and implementation reading interventions.</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Meister, Brittany	Other	Facilitates school procedures, training and activities regarding student academic achievement and student intervention and provides early intervening services for students in targeted area(s) of deficiency. Acts as the LEA in school based IEP and 504 meetings. Communicates with parents regarding student eligibility, consent for testing and student placement. Tracks student data to make informed decisions regarding student supports.
Saba, Janice	School Counselor	Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students, small and large groups; provides interventions to the school and families to support the child's academic, personal/social, career development, and community involvement; promotes social emotional learning lessons throughout the school; provides mentor opportunities for students in need.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/11/2011, Katie Maya

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.*

7

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

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Total number of students enrolled at the school

503

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

4

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

5

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	89	73	81	97	85	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	505
Attendance below 90 percent	4	7	6	6	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
One or more suspensions	0	4	1	5	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	9	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	4	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	1	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	4	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	46	78	108	83	90	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	490
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	0	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	46	78	108	83	90	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	490
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	0	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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				76%	60%	57%	75%	61%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				67%	59%	58%	68%	62%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55%	51%	53%	79%	54%	48%
Math Achievement				85%	68%	63%	87%	69%	62%
Math Learning Gains				84%	64%	62%	82%	65%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				79%	55%	51%	80%	55%	47%
Science Achievement				70%	59%	53%	63%	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	71%	61%	10%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	73%	58%	15%	58%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
05	2021					
	2019	87%	60%	27%	56%	31%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	80%	68%	12%	62%	18%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	92%	65%	27%	64%	28%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
05	2021					
	2019	86%	67%	19%	60%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-92%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	71%	56%	15%	53%	18%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Kindergarten-iReady QBA1, QBA2, QBA3

Grade 1- iReady QBA1, QBA2, QBA3

Grade 2- iReady QBA1, QBA2, QBA3

Grade 3- English Language Arts and Math QBA1, QBA2, QBA3

Grade 4- English Language Arts and Math QBA1, QBA2, QBA3

Grade 5- English Language Arts, Math, Science QBA1, QBA2, QBA3

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	43	64	84
	Economically Disadvantaged	39	62	100
	Students With Disabilities	25	56	42
	English Language Learners	0	0	33
	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	46	65	77
	Economically Disadvantaged	37	52	67
	Students With Disabilities	25	27	32
	English Language Learners	25	50	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	82	85	72
	Economically Disadvantaged	77	81	65
	Students With Disabilities	50	55	40
	English Language Learners	50	57	13
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	91	95	65
	Economically Disadvantaged	83	94	68
	Students With Disabilities	89	73	50
	English Language Learners	57	71	13
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	70	76	67
	Economically Disadvantaged	60	69	64
	Students With Disabilities	27	53	19
	English Language Learners	27	64	55
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	82	86	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	81	81	37
	Students With Disabilities	44	57	13
	English Language Learners	64	81	18

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	64	72	61
	Economically Disadvantaged	50	67	45
	Students With Disabilities	14	38	10
	English Language Learners	33	33	17
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	57	66	49
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	58	38
	Students With Disabilities	19	33	10
	English Language Learners	33	50	33
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	68	76	72
	Economically Disadvantaged	54	65	62
	Students With Disabilities	33	33	35
	English Language Learners	67	50	50

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	33	50	54	32	43	23	48				
ELL	41	64		55	73		45				
BLK	42	55		47	50		25				
HSP	77	80		74	87		94				
WHT	87	90		85	69		91				
FRL	68	74	64	69	67	33	70				
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	31	39	38	57	74	75	7				
ELL	43	63	64	54	79	71	43				
BLK	38	43	46	53	71	67	25				
HSP	69	50	46	80	85	77	50				

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	80			80							
WHT	86	78	67	93	86	88	84				
FRL	60	62	52	74	83	76	49				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	22	63	71	55	75	78	29				
ELL	36			64	90						
BLK	35	58	67	58	75	82					
HSP	62	61	91	80	79	75	38				
MUL	70			100							
WHT	85	75	88	92	83	79	78				
FRL	64	66	81	79	78	80	41				

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	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	70
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	549
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	58
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	50
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	79
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	84
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	65
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?

We saw a decrease in our math proficiency rates across all subgroups and grade levels from 2019-2021.

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

Math lowest 25%
Reading lowest 25%
Math overall gain

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

A learning gap due to virtual instruction during the pandemic from Spring 2020 continuing into the 20-21 school year. To address this need for improvement, students and teachers getting back to in person classroom instruction with more hands on learning experiences. Purposeful and intentional scheduling of push in support and grouping of students will close the achievement gap within classes to address the content areas with needs for improvement.

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

Grade 5 Science is trending upward with 80% proficiency, compared to a 70% proficiency rate in 2019.

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

Master science teacher, Ms. Barton, has an intensity for the content while teaching. She makes learning fun by incorporating music, song, and hand movements to assist students with retention of content.

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

Intentional and purposeful planning of hands on learning experiences along with standards based planning and instruction with push in support as needed. Intentional scheduling of students in order to close the achievement gap even further.

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.

PLC's that target our SIP goals, and the See, Do, Get Model to ensure we continue to have strong leadership, academics, and culture. PLC Focus-Get Your Teach On, The Art of Reading Comprehension, Leader in Me book study, and Thinking Maps. We will be working with Leader in Me coaches to begin our school lighthouse team in preparation for Leader in Me implementation.

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

Differentiated Instruction time scheduled in every classroom, intentional scheduling of support staff to include, ELL, Speech, ESE Inclusion, and non instructional staff. After school programs that target students in the L25%-Panther Pack.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on our school grade component data, math gains in the L25% category is an area of focus due to an overall decrease in all sub groups in all grade levels.

Measurable Outcome: By June 2022, students in the L25% category will increase their math gains from 33% to 70%, a total of 37 points.

Monitoring: The progress of our L25% making math gains will be monitored through the weekly review of data through grade level PLC's to include teacher and student data chats, quarterly MTSS, ongoing FTEM observations, quarterly benchmark data review, HMM data review during PLC's, monthly ALEKS data review at PLC's, quarterly FOCUS grade review, and leadership attending grade level planning sessions on a weekly basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Christopher Marker (markerch@collierschools.com)

Support students through a productive struggle in learning mathematics

Evidence-based Strategy: Build procedural fluency from conceptual understanding

Use and connect mathematical representations

Productive Struggle- teachers will consistently provide students, individually and collectively, with opportunities and supports to engage in productive struggle as they grapple with mathematical ideas and relationships

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Build Procedural and Conceptual Understandings-Build fluency with procedures on a foundation of conceptual understanding so that students, over time, become skillful in using procedures flexibly as they solve contextual and mathematical problems.

Connections to Mathematical Representations- Engage students in making connections among mathematical representations to deepen understanding of mathematics concepts and procedures and as tools for problem solving.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will plan and instruct using standards based, grade level, tasks, resources, and assessments to ensure all students are receiving rigorous instruction. Teachers will implement TNTP best practice strategies such as, Student Work Review Tools along with consistent teaching to grade level.

Person Responsible: Christopher Marker (markerch@collierschools.com)

Strategically scheduled students and support staff utilizing the push in model and the DI block to provide small group intervention and differentiation for all students that focus on the evidence based strategies above.

Person Responsible: Heather Galloway (galloh@collierschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area of focus was identified based on student performance on FSA from 2019-2021. It is imperative that all students make at least one year's gain in ELA to close the achievement gap and increase learning achievement. Achievement in ELA directly impact the success of students across all content areas
Measurable Outcome:	By June 2022, student L25% ELA scores will increase from 61% to 64%, a total of 3 points.
Monitoring:	The progress of our L25% reading will be monitored through the review of data during bi-weekly grade level PLC's to include teacher and student data chats, MTSS meetings/ review every six weeks, 21-22 FTEM focus-Using formative assessments to track student progress, quarterly benchmark data review, iReady data review, quarterly FOCUS grades, and leadership attending weekly grade level planning sessions.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christopher Marker (markerch@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use of Concept Maps Exit Slips Think Alouds -Use of a visual organizer that can enrich students' understanding of a new concept. Using a graphic organizer, students think about the concept in several ways. Most concept map organizers engage students in answering questions such as, "What is it? What is it like? What are some examples?" Concept maps deepen understanding and comprehension.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	-Use of written student responses to questions teachers pose at the end of a class or lesson. These quick, informal assessments enable teachers to quickly assess students' understanding of the material. -Use of think-alouds-With this strategy, teachers verbalize aloud while reading a selection orally. Their verbalizations include describing things they're doing as they read to monitor their comprehension. The purpose of the think-aloud strategy is to model for students how skilled readers construct meaning from a text.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will plan and instruct using standards based, grade level, tasks, resources, texts, and assessments to ensure all students are receiving rigorous instruction. Teachers will implement TNTP best practice strategies such as Intentional Thinking Maps and Student Work Review Tools along with consistent teaching to grade level standards.

Person Responsible Heather Galloway (galloh@collierschools.com)

Literacy coach and Administration present during ELA collaborative planning to ensure grade appropriate materials, rigorous texts are being used during teaching and learning to close the achievement gap for students in ELA. Focus on SIP while planning and review of formative assessment data and student progress.

Person Responsible Aimee Arcand (arcandai@collierschools.com)

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

Based on our school grade component data, the math gains overall category is an area of focus due to an overall decrease in sub groups and in grade levels 4 and 5.

Measurable Outcome: By June 2022, overall students making math gains will increase from 68% to 78%, a total of 10 points.

Monitoring: The progress of our students overall math gains will be monitored through the review of data at bi-weekly grade level PLC's, MTSS-every six weeks, 21-22 FTEM element-Using formative assessments to track student progress, quarterly benchmark data review, HMH data review, monthly ALEKS pie data review for grades 4 and 5, quarterly FOCUS grades, and leadership attending weekly grade level collaborative planning sessions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christopher Marker (markerch@collierschools.com)

Support students through a productive struggle in learning mathematics

Evidence-based Strategy:

Build procedural fluency from conceptual understanding

Use and connect mathematical representations

Productive Struggle- teachers will consistently provide students, individually and collectively, with opportunities and supports to engage in productive struggle as they grapple with mathematical ideas and relationships

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Build Procedural and Conceptual Understandings-Build fluency with procedures on a foundation of conceptual understanding so that students, over time, become skillful in using procedures flexibly as they solve contextual and mathematical problems.

Connections to Mathematical Representations- Engage students in making connections among mathematical representations to deepen understanding of mathematics concepts and procedures and as tools for problem solving.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will plan and instruct using standards based, grade level, tasks, resources, and assessments to ensure all students are receiving rigorous instruction. Teachers will implement TNTP best practice strategies such as Student Work Review Tools along with consistent teaching to grade level. Cambridge/ Core class builds and departmentalization with strong teachers teaching math.

Person Responsible

Christopher Marker (markerch@collierschools.com)

Strategically scheduled students and support staff utilizing the co-teach and push in model. Purposeful DI block to provide small group intervention and differentiation for all students.

Person Responsible

Heather Galloway (galloh@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.

Lake Park ranked 730 out of 1,395 elementary schools statewide. Lake Park reported .6 incidents per 100 students which places our school at a moderate incident rate level. Lake Park reported 3 violent incidents that include bullying, sex offense, and sexual harassment. Lake Park had 10 reported suspensions which ranks us 13/126 in the county.

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.

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. At Lake Park, a positive culture is created and reinforced through our PBIS system, Rocking Panthers, Connect for Success, and social emotional learning through Panorama playbook strategies.

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

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. All stakeholders are privileged to school information that relates to teaching and learning. Data and other pertinent information will be shared at PTO and SAC meetings. Our positive school culture and environment is a team effort where we believe all students can and will be successful. We provide intentional social emotional learning through our school wide PBIS, Panorama playbook strategies, and Connect for Success lessons. We believe a students' potential can only be realized in an environment where they are safe and feel safe. All stakeholders play a role in the social, emotional, and academic success of all students.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00