

Collier County Public Schools

Mike Davis 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	12
Planning for Improvement	20
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	26

Mike Davis Elementary School

3215 MAGNOLIA POND DR, Naples, FL 34116

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

Demographics

Principal: Melissa Stamper

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (52%)
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	12
Planning for Improvement	20
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	26

Mike Davis Elementary School

3215 MAGNOLIA POND DR, Naples, FL 34116

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

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	88%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	92%

School Grades History

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

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.

Mike Davis Elementary School will provide a learning environment that will empower, inspire, and engage students while guiding our diverse population to create hope and academic success. This will be accomplished by all staff working to build positive supportive relationships with students and parents.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To educate future leaders by creating a positive and inspiring environment with opportunities for growth and 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
Stamper, Melissa	Principal	<p>Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making; verbalizes support of the MTSS process; ensures that MTSS is being implemented with fidelity; conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation; allows scheduling that supports common team planning and implementation of interventions; monitors curriculum, instruction, and assessment; ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation; communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities. Systems for monitoring will include, but not limited to: iObservation (FTEM), Canvas learning management system, data warehouse, and iReady.</p>
Lauriault, Judy	Assistant Principal	<p>Assists the principal in providing leadership and support of the MTSS process; regularly attends meetings to support and provide assistance/resources to teams as needed. Systems for monitoring will include, but not limited to: iObservation (FTEM), Canvas learning management system, data warehouse, and iReady.</p>
Doriety, Kimberly	Other	<p>Maintains a working knowledge of local, state, and federal laws and regulations related to compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), ESEA and English Language Learners (ELLs), as well as guidelines pertaining to eligibility, delivery of services, and individualized plan development. Attends all district required professional development activities aligned with specific position requirements, and demonstrates active participation and follow-through at the school(s) of assignment.</p> <p>Provides training and technical assistance in the use of the Enrich system, and consultation in the development of the Educational Plans (EP). Individual Educational Plans (IEP) and 504 plans according to individual student needs. Prepares, reviews and monitors the correct completion of educational documentation in student records pertaining to exceptional student (EP, IEP, 504) services to ensure compliance with federal, state, and local requirements. Participates in annual self-assessment monitoring of student records in compliance with all requirements of IDEA and its regulations; Florida Statutes related to Special programs for Exceptional students; and Exceptional Student Education/Florida Education Finance Program (ESE/ FEFP).</p> <p>Assists district and school- based administrators with F.T.E., student projections, compliance monitoring, and federal, state and local reports. Conducts meeting using components of effective meeting facilitation assisting IEP teams in reaching agreements that lead to education programs and beneficial outcomes for students.</p> <p>Gives information about organizations that offer support for parents of students with disabilities, information on agencies that can assist a student with a disability in transition from school, and offers parents training about Exceptional Student Education. Instructional Team Facilitators: Analyzes and</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		provides information about Core instruction; participates in student data collection.
Lefever, Rachael	School Counselor	Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students; provides interventions to link child-serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social needs.
Wherry, Meagan	Instructional Coach	Develops, leads, and evaluates CORE programs; models effective instruction and coaches teachers through the coaching cycle; identifies and analyzes literature on research-based intervention strategies; identifies systematic patterns of student need; assists with universal screening process; assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.
Paula, Charlene	Instructional Coach	Develops, leads, and evaluates CORE programs; models effective instruction and coaches teachers through the coaching cycle; identifies and analyzes literature on research-based intervention strategies; identifies systematic patterns of student need; assists with universal screening process; assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.
Pflaumer, Amy	Instructional Media	Fosters student achievement and development. Serves as an on-staff specialist with expertise in Library/Media services. Works with and through the department/grade level chairpersons, and all teachers and staff to support curriculum, technology, and student services. Collaborates with colleagues for the purpose of improving instruction and student performance. Adheres to the Code of Ethics and Principles of Professional Conduct of the Education Profession in Florida and the district's code of ethics policy, and the professional practices of the American Library Association Organizes and supervises use of the Library Media Center by all students and teachers, and supervises library personnel, media and equipment. Promotes and maintains a dynamic, richly diverse, up-to-date library collection in all formats; designed and continually evaluated to best support the school curriculum and meet the reading needs of the student community. Provides group and individual instruction to students in research, technology, reading selection, and information skills.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Melissa Stamper

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.*

3

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

46

Total number of students enrolled at the school

521

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.

6

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	80	81	86	91	82	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	509
Attendance below 90 percent	2	19	7	12	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	0	5	1	8	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	18	16	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Course failure in Math	0	7	25	19	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	16	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	8	15	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	15	29	40	40	65	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	224

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	8	5	9	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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	6	4	12	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
---------------------------------	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/27/2021

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	36	85	85	115	113	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	524
-----------------------------	----	----	----	-----	-----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

Attendance below 90 percent	8	6	3	10	3	2	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	0
-------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
--	---	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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	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	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	36	85	85	115	113	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	524
Attendance below 90 percent	8	6	3	10	3	2	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	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	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				47%	60%	57%	45%	61%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				50%	59%	58%	62%	62%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	51%	53%	54%	54%	48%
Math Achievement				58%	68%	63%	57%	69%	62%
Math Learning Gains				61%	64%	62%	66%	65%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	55%	51%	53%	55%	47%
Science Achievement				46%	59%	53%	51%	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	50%	61%	-11%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	43%	58%	-15%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2021					
	2019	37%	60%	-23%	56%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	64%	68%	-4%	62%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	48%	65%	-17%	64%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2021					
	2019	51%	67%	-16%	60%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	40%	56%	-16%	53%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tools used to collect the data below are iReady Diagnostics for ELA data in Grades K and 1. District Quarter Benchmark Assessments are used for data in Grades 3-5 for ELA and Math and Science for Grade 5.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	15	31	65
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	30	67
	Students With Disabilities	22	33	25
	English Language Learners	13	33	56
	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
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	13	36	52
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	39	50
	Students With Disabilities	9	14	38
	English Language Learners	8	27	40
	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
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	44	42	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	46	45	42
	Students With Disabilities	15	20	27
	English Language Learners	41	36	32
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	37	48	22
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	49	23
	Students With Disabilities	17	22	18
	English Language Learners	38	48	20
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	35	32	36
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	31	36
	Students With Disabilities	14	14	23
	English Language Learners	25	12	16
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	41	43	24
	Economically Disadvantaged	41	43	23
	Students With Disabilities	40	37	15
	English Language Learners	36	32	5

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	42	49	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	44	51	45
	Students With Disabilities	18	19	19
	English Language Learners	19	20	9
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	61	76	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	60	74	42
	Students With Disabilities	53	63	13
	English Language Learners	48	60	23
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	40	51	54
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	51	57
	Students With Disabilities	12	24	25
	English Language Learners	22	20	19

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	18	47	55	29	58	45	25				
ELL	44	62	64	49	67	50	53				
BLK	44	59		42	59		50				
HSP	53	73		57	73	64	61				
WHT	54			54							
FRL	52	67	68	53	68	61	58				
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	33	48	42	45	56	36	33				
ELL	42	47	47	54	57	59	38				
BLK	34	38	50	56	71	71	43				
HSP	51	54	50	58	59	51	47				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
WHT	41	46		65	46						
FRL	46	50	44	58	61	52	46				
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	47	53	33	47	41	21				
ELL	35	58	62	43	55	54	12				
BLK	42	60	45	54	64	40	52				
HSP	47	63	57	58	67	58	49				
WHT	36			43							
FRL	45	62	53	57	66	54	50				

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	61
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	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	484
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

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	56
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	55
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	63
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	54
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	61
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?

ELA and Math proficiency trends demonstrated a decrease among Grades 3 and 4. In Grade 5 ELA and Math proficiency increased, however ELA proficiency was below the district average. ESE proficiency trends demonstrate a decrease in overall proficiency in ELA, Math, and Science. ELL proficiency trends in ELA and Science have demonstrated an increase, however Math has decreased. The greatest decrease was evident in 3rd grade math proficiency at 48%. The lowest proficiency was evident in 4th grade ELA at 43%

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance was the Lowest 25% gains in reading, scoring at 46%.

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

The factors that contributed to this decline resulted from the need for a more systemic approach to interventions and standards focused tier one instruction.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the overall increase in third grade math proficiency. Third grade math proficiency was 64% compared to the state average of 62%.

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

Changes that were implemented to help struggling math students included the continued morning interventions with time allocated for remedial math instruction.

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

Our main focus for improving students is to implement the MTSS process with fidelity in order to make informed instructional decisions, as well as implement research based interventions in a timely manner. Focus will be used as the primary tool to house data.

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 Learning opportunities provided to support teachers and leaders include Focus and MTSS training, iReady Deep Dive into Data, as well as ELA and Math trainings.

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

Regularly scheduled Academic Committee meetings and MTSS meetings will be implemented to ensure improvement.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

The overall proficiency levels of students in the statewide standardized English Language Arts assessment is a concern. The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2021 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment is at 50%. In addition, the percentage of students in Kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2020-2021 end of year screenings and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized grade 3 English Language Arts assessment was 36%.

Focusing differentiated interventions can assist to help increase proficiency. Using multiple assessment pieces from district benchmark scores, iReady, and weekly tests on the Florida Standards, careful monitoring of student progress throughout the year can be used to make adjustments to grouping as needed, and meet the needs of each individual student.

Measurable Outcome:

The intended outcome of providing and monitoring differentiated reading interventions is to increase the number of students that are proficient in reading from 50% to 53%. The Measurable Outcome that the school plans to achieve is to increase the percentage of third, fourth, and fifth grade scoring Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment by 3 percentage points. This would be seen both in improvement in an increase in points awarded in the overall school grade, as well as an increase in grade level data. In addition, the measurable outcome for students in grades K-2 is to increase the percentage of proficiency on the iReady Diagnostic assessment by 3 percentage points and decrease the percentage of students who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized grade 3 English Language Arts assessment from 36 to 33% or lower.

Monitoring:

Professional Learning Community meetings will be held monthly to closely monitor student achievement data. The primary platform that will be used to monitor student progress is the district's Data Warehouse platform. This strategy will allow teachers to track student data in regards to their iReady scale scores and district benchmark scores. By recording all of the student data in one platform, students performance will be graphed and discussed during PLC meetings. Likewise, if a student is not showing improvement in a reading intervention group, using the MTSS process to identify additional ways to provide support, or adjusting groupings to meet student needs will be brainstormed and implemented. Throughout the year, teachers will continue to work with students to record and track their own progress of the standards. This will give students the opportunity to take greater ownership of their learning and know where they are currently performing.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Charlene Paula (paulach@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Professional Learning Community meetings will be held regularly to closely monitor student achievement data. The primary platform that will be used to monitor student progress is the district's Data Warehouse platform.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

This strategy will allow teachers to track student data in regards to their iReady scale scores, district benchmark scores, and standards mastery scores in one location. By recording all of the student data in one platform, students performance will be graphed and discussed during PLC meetings. Likewise, if a student is not showing improvement in a reading intervention group, using the MTSS process to identify additional ways to provide support, or adjusting groupings to meet student needs will be brainstormed and implemented.

Throughout the year, teachers will continue to work with students to record and track their own progress of the standards. This will give students the opportunity to take greater ownership of their learning and teachers and students will both know where they are currently performing and the goals that they are working toward reaching.

Action Steps to Implement

Utilizing the MTSS process to identify additional students, resources, and staff based on data.

Person Responsible Melissa Stamper (stampeme@collierschools.com)

Changing the process and the data collections tools for progress monitoring in order to support student achievement.

Person Responsible Charlene Paula (paulach@collierschools.com)

Goal setting and data chats implementation on a weekly basis.

Person Responsible Judy Lauriault (laurij2@collierschools.com)

Including all relevant staff members in Tier 2 and Tier 3 PLCs to solicit input from all staff members involved with the students.

Person Responsible Judy Lauriault (laurij2@collierschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

The school performed lower than the district average in mathematics proficiency, earning a 53%. Upon analyzing grade level data, trends emerged between third and fourth grade. Third grade data decreased in proficiency in mathematics for students from 67% to 48%. Fourth grade data decreased in proficiency in mathematics for students from 50% to 44%. Targeting both core instruction in the math block and determining effective math support for students will help the school achieve its goal in improving mathematics proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

The intended outcome is to increase the overall proficiency in Mathematics by a minimum of 3% with 56% of students being proficient in mathematics for the 2021-2022 school year. Additionally, the overall improvement in mathematics core instruction and needs based interventions would increase the learning gains of all, including those in the lowest 25% and increase the number of students earning a level 4 or 5 on the mathematics state assessment.

Monitoring:

Bi-weekly formative assessments will be administered in grades 3-5 in order to collect data and drive instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Stamper (stampeme@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Data will be analyzed during Professional Learning Communities monthly with the Leadership Team.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

This process will assist in both better tracking of student progress and more responsive targeted instruction to increase student proficiency in mathematics.

Evidence-based Strategy:

After quarterly district math benchmarks, data dialogue meetings will take place with each grade level team to determine patterns outlining areas of strength and continuous improvement. Individual data chats will be held with students to review performance and to set new goals going forward specific to math sub skills and domains.

Action Steps to Implement

Administering standards based data collection tools for progress monitoring in order to support student achievement.

Person Responsible

Meagan Wherry (wherrm@collierschools.com)

Goal setting and data chats implementation on a biweekly basis.

Person Responsible

Melissa Stamper (stampeme@collierschools.com)

Increasing the frequency of PLCs related to math formative and summative assessments in order to consistently address math data and the instructional implications.

Person Responsible

Judy Lauriault (laurij2@collierschools.com)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our ELL students in Grades 3 and 4 scored low in their proficiency levels in the ELA FSA. Grade 3 was 20% proficient and Grade 4 was 7% proficient.

Measurable Outcome: The intended outcome of providing and monitoring differentiated reading interventions is to increase the number of students proficient in ELA for Grades 3 and 4 by increasing their proficiency by 5%. This would be seen both in improvement in an increase in points awarded in the overall school grade, as well as an increase in grade level data.

Monitoring: This area will be monitored in the following ways for the desired outcome.
 1. Progress Monitoring through District Benchmark Assessments, HMH Module Assessment, and iReady Assessment data is analyzed and discussed in monthly PLC meetings along with action steps for continued improvement.
 2. Administration is a part of collaborative planning sessions along with teachers and coaches. Pacing and alignment of standards is discussed, student work samples analyzed, and best practices discussed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Melissa Stamper (stampeme@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Our main focus for improving students proficiency is to implement the MTSS process every six to eight weeks with fidelity in order to make informed instructional decisions, as well as implement research based interventions in a timely manner. Focus will be used as the primary tool to house data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This strategy will allow teachers to track student data in regards to their iReady assessment data, HMH Module assessment data, and district benchmark scores. Students performance will be graphed and discussed during PLC monthly meetings. Likewise, if a student is not showing improvement in a reading intervention group, using the MTSS process to identify additional ways to provide support, or adjusting groupings to meet student needs will be brainstormed and implemented. Intervention teachers will meet regularly to drive their small group instruction through data analysis in order to ensure we are closing the achievement gaps for each student.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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.

When compared to all elementary schools state-wide, it falls into the high category. Mike Davis Elementary reported 1.0 incidents per 100 students and ranked #970 out of 1,395 elementary schools state-wide. The school rank #25 out of 27 elementary schools in the county. The primary area of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year will be incidents of physical attacks. The school leadership team, administration, and PBIS school-wide committee meets regularly to monitor discipline data and develop individualized positive behavior intervention plans and supports for students.

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.

The school builds positive relationships with parents, families, and community members in multiple ways. Throughout the year, parents have the opportunity to participate in many school wide virtual events including the Annual Title 1 Meeting held in August, Literacy Night, Math Night, Meet the Teacher, Student-Led Conferences. Throughout these events families partner with the school to take an active part in learning about their child's school's education, and spending time building positive family relationships through school based events.

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

Stakeholders which contribute to promoting a positive culture and environment at the school include members of the leadership team, teachers, students, parents, and staff.

Parents have multiple opportunities to participate throughout the year at the school in their child's education. Teachers and administration build strong relationships with parents and families through positive communication. Each family is personally contacted by his or her teacher during the first weeks of school, through Curriculum Night, before or after school conference, Webex video conferencing or a phone call home.

Additional strategies to promote a positive culture and maximize parent communication has included increasing staff use of Parent Link, Twitter and Facebook through the Leadership Social Media Team.

Through the Twitter and Facebook platforms family members are given access into a window of their child's classroom. Here they are able to see snapshots of lessons and learning going on in the classrooms, highlighting student accomplishments and video-clip of active learning.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$336,311.64
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0531 - Mike Davis Elementary School	Title, I Part A	3.0	\$241,241.48
			<i>Notes: 3.0 Resource Teachers Salaries and benefits Benefits - Retirement (10.82%), Social Security/Medicare (7.65%), Workers Compensation (.40%), Group health insurance \$9,681 & Life insurance \$70</i>			
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0531 - Mike Davis Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$1,117.60
			<i>Notes: Coach pre-extension</i>			
	5100	510-Supplies	0531 - Mike Davis Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$562.44
			<i>Notes: Classroom Supplies</i>			
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0531 - Mike Davis Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$90,462.54
			<i>Notes: Academic Coach 1.0 Salaries and benefits Benefits - Retirement (10.82%), Social Security/Medicare (7.65%), Workers Compensation (.40%), Group health insurance \$9,681 & Life insurance \$70</i>			
	6150	510-Supplies	0531 - Mike Davis Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$2,927.58
			<i>Notes: PI Supplies</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$0.00
					Total:	\$336,311.64