

Collier County Public Schools

Big Cypress 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	25
Budget to Support Goals	26

Big Cypress Elementary School

3250 GOLDEN GATE BLVD W, Naples, FL 34120

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

Demographics

Principal: Brandon Carter

Start Date for this Principal: 7/23/2020

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	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	89%
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: B (57%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: A (65%)
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	26

Big Cypress Elementary School

3250 GOLDEN GATE BLVD W, Naples, FL 34120

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

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	62%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	57%

School Grades History

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

Nurturing and motivating all students to achieve success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The BCE family is committed to an environment where all students are empowered to explore, motivated to learn, determined to succeed, and prepared to lead.

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
Carter, Brandon	Principal	Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school based MTSS plans and activities. Additionally, the Principal, in collaboration with the Leadership Team, provides professional development on purposeful differentiation both in the planning process and implementation in the classroom. Lesson plans, SSPs, and classroom application are monitored.
Fields, Barbara	Assistant Principal	Assists the Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities.
Charles, Mary	Reading Coach	Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ program; identifies and analyzes literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis (iReady); participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment, implementation, and monitoring.
Green, Pam	School Counselor	Participates in student data collection, integrates behavioral intervention materials/activities into instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching, PBIS strategies and interventions.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/23/2020, Brandon Carter

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.*

2

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.*

15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

60

Total number of students enrolled at the school

769

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

3

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

2

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	134	124	133	116	118	142	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	767
Attendance below 90 percent	8	10	13	13	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	1	14	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	2	6	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	7	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	9	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
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	1	4	1	4	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	5	11	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
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

Monday 9/6/2021

2020-21 - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	79	138	117	139	154	161	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	788
Attendance below 90 percent	4	7	5	8	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	3	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	79	138	117	139	154	161	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	788
Attendance below 90 percent	4	7	5	8	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	3	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	
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				69%	60%	57%	67%	61%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				67%	59%	58%	55%	62%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	51%	53%	38%	54%	48%
Math Achievement				67%	68%	63%	75%	69%	62%
Math Learning Gains				45%	64%	62%	63%	65%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				27%	55%	51%	53%	55%	47%
Science Achievement				71%	59%	53%	61%	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	65%	61%	4%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	66%	58%	8%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2021					
	2019	75%	60%	15%	56%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	71%	68%	3%	62%	9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	59%	65%	-6%	64%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
05	2021					
	2019	65%	67%	-2%	60%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

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.

i-Ready data was used for Kindergarten through 2nd grade for the English Language Arts. Grades 3 through 5 used District Quarter Benchmark testing for all three quarters for English Language Arts, Math and 5th grade Science.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(39/129) 30%	(59/132) 45%	(90/131) 69%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(22/82) 27%	(32/85) 38%	(8/13) 62%
	Students With Disabilities	(2/15) 13%	(1/14) 7%	(8/17) 47%
	English Language Learners	(1/23) 4%	(4/23) 17%	(12/23) 52%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	(39/106) 37%	(67/104) 64%	(77/110) 70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(22/68) 32%	(40/65) 62%	(9/11) 82%
	Students With Disabilities	(2/14) 14%	(2/12) 17%	(6/15) 40%
	English Language Learners	(9/34) 26%	(14/31) 45%	(16/31) 52%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	(78/122) 64%	(74/118) 63%	(70/126) 56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(55/87) 63%	(54/82) 66%	(47/87) 54%
	Students With Disabilities	(9/13) 69%	(6/12) 50%	(3/12) 25%
	English Language Learners	(9/23) 39%	(10/22) 45%	(8/22) 36%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	(85/117) 73%	(93/118) 79%	(50/120) 42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(58/85) 68%	(63/82) 77%	(33/84) 39%
	Students With Disabilities	(7/13) 54%	(9/12) 75%	(5/12) 42%
	English Language Learners	(14/23) 61%	(15/22) 68%	(3/22) 14%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	(71/138) 51%	(75/143) 52%	(77/141) 55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(44/94) 47%	(46/99) 46%	(49/96) 51%
	Students With Disabilities	(3/22) 14%	(4/24) 17%	(5/23) 22%
	English Language Learners	(9/27) 33%	(7/25) 28%	(7/24) 29%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	(85/137) 62%	(97/140) 69%	(51/139) 37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(53/93) 57%	(62/97) 64%	(28/94) 30%
	Students With Disabilities	(6/23) 26%	(9/23) 39%	(4/23) 17%
	English Language Learners	(13/27) 48%	(19/24) 79%	(6/23) 26%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	(81/153) 53%	(88/159) 55%	(101/163) 62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(49/105) 47%	(55/110) 50%	(68/114) 60%
	Students With Disabilities	(3/19) 16%	(4/19) 21%	(5/19) 26%
	English Language Learners	(4/22) 18%	(4/22) 18%	(7/22) 32%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	(98/154) 64%	(104/158) 66%	(70/156) 45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(60/105) 57%	(63/109) 58%	(41/110) 37%
	Students With Disabilities	(7/18) 39%	(9/19) 47%	(4/19) 21%
	English Language Learners	(7/22) 32%	(7/21) 33%	(5/22) 23%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	(88/154) 57%	(86/159) 54%	(93/155) 60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(53/105) 50%	(53/110) 48%	(58/108) 54%
	Students With Disabilities	(5/19) 26%	(1/18) 6%	(5/18) 28%
	English Language Learners	(10/22) 45%	(6/21) 29%	(7/21) 33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	16	56	76	30	56	58	21				
ELL	53	48	38	57	55	50	42				
BLK	31	39		38	33		32				
HSP	62	67	60	61	58	60	54				
MUL	80			80							
WHT	67	71	64	71	51	27	66				
FRL	59	62	57	58	46	42	49				
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	25	46	47	41	38	43	27				
ELL	56	73	72	56	46	32	54				
BLK	68	62		53	38	30	45				
HSP	64	63	63	62	43	19	66				
MUL	83	79		67	36						
WHT	73	70	50	74	48	44	78				
FRL	64	61	50	60	44	25	65				
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	27	32	31	48	51	45	16				
ELL	58	67	47	68	72	61					
BLK	54	46		59	57	58	36				
HSP	63	59	42	70	64	55	52				
MUL	87			93							
WHT	72	53	25	81	64	50	69				
FRL	62	53	43	70	60	53	55				

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	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	66
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	469

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
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	51
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	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	61
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	80
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	60
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	55
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?

Math gains for the lowest 25% has consistently been the lowest performing data component for Big Cypress. In comparison to our other subject areas however we improved the most in math gains within the lowest 25%, which increased by 19 points. The percentage of students scoring level 1 and 2 on State Assessments did not decrease overall from the SY19 testing year. Our ESE subgroup did decrease in level 1 and 2. However, students scoring 3,4 and 5 overall did not increase in math. We did see an increase of students moving from a level 2 to a 3 in math overall. In i-Ready data we do see that our first grade students are struggling with phonics skills. This was our biggest shift for students scoring below the grade level. These students are now our 2nd graders and we are seeing the same trend this school year as we track their SY22 beginning baseline data.

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

Our greatest need for improvement is in Math specifically our lowest 25% even though they increased by 19 points from SY19 to SY21. This is a trend for Big Cypress. In addition our Science scores declined 14 points for SY19 to SY21 making this our greatest drop.

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

In Science the lack of hands on experiences during the virtual period was a barrier. As students began to come back to school shared materials were difficult to use due to Covid protocols. Many of our students remained virtual for the beginning of the year which added to the inability to do hands on science with students. Many of our lowest 25% remained virtual for the beginning of the year which added to the barrier of working with students within a real classroom rather than in a virtual setting. This we believe impacted our math and science scores. Students struggled with math fluency across the grade levels. School wide math fluency goals are in place and tracked placing a bigger focus on fluency and number sense. Alignment of how to address word problems with common vocabulary in addition to math labs added to our campus are actions we have taken to address the need for math improvement across the school.

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

The area that showed the most improvement was math gains in the lowest 25%. From SY19 to SY21 they increased by 19 points.

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

We began a school wide aligned goal to focus on specific math facts (fluency) per grade level that was known school wide by students, staff and parents. Fluency was tracked and math flashcards provided and promoted. Student participated 2-5 in math contests with the principal. We offered morning math intervention groups and implemented ALEKS in 5th grade with fidelity.

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

The school wide aligned goals per grade level have been put into place again this year. We have increased the expectations of the rigor of the quantity of fact fluency per quarter. Flashcards for all grade levels including Kindergarten are being provided and the expectation is that students practice in holding. Math intervention groups are still being held with a targeted student group. We have created Math 360 Labs for reinforcement, practice and collaboration. ALEKS for 5th grade will continue and 4th grade has been added. Science Labs have been added to allow for more hands-on experiences. These labs will be stocked with needed supplies. Students and teachers are tracking science standards in their STEAM class through leadership portfolios and science notebooks. Each grade level is creating vocabulary lists to tie in 5th grade content.

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.

The math action team meets monthly to discuss alignment of math expectations for each grade level. This action team has a representative from every grade level. The action team discuss standard based strategies and presents these expectations and strategies to their grade level teams. A pineapple board has been created for staff to highlight a strategy in their room for other staff members to come in and experience. Staff members will work together on the Math 360 Labs in order to collaborate on lessons. Videos on structures and lab experiences are highlighted in the staff newsletter that goes out weekly. The science action team is meeting monthly to work on research based structures for science. They are also working on creating a list of science vocabulary words for each grade level that is tied to the 5th grade content to share with their teams.

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

In upcoming years, we plan to keep our Math 360 labs open as well as our Science Labs. We will continue our Mathletes for our morning intervention groups and our Lunch Bunch groups for our Science interventions. We will continue to provide math flashcards for all grade levels and will continue to track math fluency school wide with Math WIGS through the Leader in Me Model.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will continue to focus on our i-Ready data and track our 50 minute time on task weekly along with the 75% passing rate per grade level. This has been our WIG (Wildly Important Goal) for two years. We started last year with tracking school wide, grade level and class. We are bringing that down to the student this year. Students will track their progress toward i-Ready passing rate and time on task in their Leadership Portfolio and have individual data chats with their teacher once a week on their progress toward the goal. We will focus on foundational skills in K-2, ESE, ELL and lowest 25% during our Direct Instructional time. Our school with element of professional growth for our teachers is aligned with tracking student progress as well.
Measurable Outcome:	BCE's Reading proficiency will move from 62% to 66% by the end of the school year as evident by our FSA scores.
Monitoring:	The tracking of the school WIG will be monitored in our weekly WIG meetings per grade level team. Each teacher will have an opportunity to talk to their data with the administration. The grade level goal will be on display on bulletin boards in our main hallway and the individual classes will also be tracked on those bulletin boards. Teachers will monitor students and the Reading Coach will monitor classes by checking reports weekly within the i-Ready platform. Students will track their own i-Ready data in their Leadership Portfolios and teachers will conduct weekly data chats with individual students. Administration and the Reading Coach will pull individual portfolios when in classrooms for students to present. Parents will also be invited to Portfolio Chats conducted by their student every quarter.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brandon Carter (carteb@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to model proficiency in reading teachers will be using shared reading. Shared Reading is an interactive reading experience that occurs when students join in or share the reading of a book or other text while guided and supported by a teacher. The teacher explicitly models the skills of proficient readers, including reading with fluency and expression. The shared reading model often uses oversized books (referred to as big books) with enlarged print and illustrations. Teachers will use this strategy with Read Aloud and grade level text from the reading series. Teachers will also model think-alouds. Think-alouds have been described as "eavesdropping on someone's thinking." With this strategy, teachers verbalize aloud while reading a selection orally. The purpose of the think-aloud strategy is to model for students how skilled readers construct meaning from a text.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	As students receive explicit instruction on how to think about reading and construct meaning from text they will begin to understand i-Ready passages at a higher comprehension rate. This paired with the modeling of being a proficient reader in shared reading experiences, students will be able to reach and surpass their 50 minute i-Ready weekly goal and reach their 75% or above passing rate.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will post and track on scoreboards the class average of reading minutes and passing rates for i-Ready weekly.

Person Responsible Mary Charles (charlema@collierschools.com)

Students will track their own i-Ready goal of 50 minutes weekly and 75% passing rate and be able to speak to their data with an adult (teacher weekly) in a data chat.

Person Responsible Barbara Fields (fieldb@collierschools.com)

Classes will track what lead measures they will participate in and the quantity of those measures weekly that will impact their WIG of 50 minutes of i-Ready with a 75% passing rate.

Person Responsible Mary Charles (charlema@collierschools.com)

Teachers will meet with administration weekly in a WIG Data Meeting to discuss their lead measures and how that impacts their data.

Person Responsible Brandon Carter (carteb@collierschools.com)

Shared reading and think aloud strategies will be modeled and taught through professional development days and grade level meetings by the reading coach to classroom teachers.

Person Responsible Mary Charles (charlema@collierschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math gains for the lowest 25% has consistently been the lowest performing data component for Big Cypress. The percentage of students scoring level 1 and 2 on State Assessments did not decrease overall from the SY19 testing year. Students scoring 3,4 and 5 overall did not increase in math. Our overall math scores were 64% which was the district average however that overall grade was 2 points below our SY19 score.
Measurable Outcome:	BCE's Student Math proficiency will move from 64% to 70% by the end of the school year as evident of our FSA scores.
Monitoring:	Grade level expectations are to practice flashcards 2 times per week. The goals set by each grade level team of fluency per quarter expectations was set in the math action team. Trackers will be completed by teachers and students to track lead measure (the practice quantity and quality) as well as the assessments giving for mastery of facts. ALEKS pie goals are set by teachers and students and monitored by teachers and administration. Math intervention groups are based on data from monitoring the pie goals of 4th and 5th grade students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brandon Carter (carteb2@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Building procedural fluency by setting a school wide aligned goal for each grade level will improve the mastery of fact fluency which in turn improve student stamina for problem solving. The math fluency goal across the grade levels will 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.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By building procedural fluency students will be able to build stamina. The more energy students use for procedures such as mastery of math facts the less energy they will have for problem solving and the less likely they will obtain conceptual understanding. By having a knowledge of procedures and when and how to use them appropriately, efficiently and accurately time taken to perform these tasks will lessen and the time to solve more complex concepts in math will be preserved.

Action Steps to Implement

Math Fluency Goals will be set for each grade level in the math action teams.

Person Responsible Brandon Carter (carteb2@collierschools.com)

Weekly grade level WIG meetings will discuss the data on math fluency with each other and the administration.

Person Responsible Brandon Carter (carteb2@collierschools.com)

Students will track their own progress on math fluency in their data binders. Teachers will track the individual student progress as well as the class. Grade levels will track their grade level percentage of mastery.

Person Responsible Barbara Fields (fieldb@collierschools.com)

A fluency contest (assessment) will be given in each class and a winning representative will be sent to contest per grade level with the principal. Winners will be celebrated as well as participants.

Person Responsible	Brandon Carter (carteb@collierschools.com)
---------------------------	--------------------------------------------

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our Science scores declined 14 points for SY19 to SY21 making this our greatest drop. We went from a 71% in SY19 to 57% in SY21. We contribute this drop to the lack of hands on experiences during the virtual period. As students began to come back to school shared materials were difficult to use due to Covid protocols. Many of our students remained virtual for the beginning of the year which added to the inability to do hands on science with students. Many of our lowest 25% remained virtual for the beginning of the year which added to the barrier of working with students within a real classroom rather than in a virtual setting. This we believe impacted our science scores.

Measurable Outcome: BCE's Science proficiency will move from 57% to 71% by the end of the school year as evident of our FSA scores.

Monitoring: Science Labs have been added to allow for more hands-on experiences. These labs will be stocked with needed supplies. Supplies will be stocked and monitored by the STEAM teacher. Students and teachers are tracking science standards in their STEAM class through leadership portfolios and science notebooks. Each grade level is creating vocabulary lists to tie in 5th grade content. Within the Science Action Team those lists will be created and then distributed by the grade level representative. Lab use will be monitored by sign up for the labs. The science action team is meeting monthly to work on research based structures for science.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Barbara Fields (fieldb@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will be focusing on Inquiry based learning within our classrooms, science labs and lunch bunch science intervention groups. Scientific inquiry is a powerful way of understanding science content. Students learn how to ask questions and use evidence to answer them. In the process of learning the strategies of scientific inquiry, students learn to conduct an investigation and collect evidence from a variety of sources, develop an explanation from the data, and communicate and defend their conclusions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Inquiry based learning is student centered and the role of the teacher is as a facilitator. Due to the lack of hands-on science experiences in the SY21 school year, this strategy will allow for students to discover, investigate and research science in a way that was not always possible during virtual learning and with Covid protocols. Inquiry-based learning challenges student thinking by engaging them in the investigation process. Students learn to communicate and justify decisions through logic of evidence about the natural world.

Action Steps to Implement

The Science Action Team will create grade level specific vocabulary words that will tie directly to tested 5th grade vocabulary. These lists will be provided to each grade level for use during classroom instruction.

Person Responsible: Barbara Fields (fieldb@collierschools.com)

Science labs will be created, stocked and scheduled for grade level use. These labs will allow for teachers to set up inquiry based experiences for all students/classrooms.

Person Responsible: Barbara Fields (fieldb@collierschools.com)

Grade level Science learning goals will be tracked through student leadership portfolios and science notebooks in STEAM class.

Person Responsible Barbara Fields (fieldb@collierschools.com)

Science Lunch Bunch groups will target 5th grade students in need of interventions to support opportunities for inquiry based experiences during lunch. These groups will use the Science Labs.

Person Responsible Brandon Carter (carteb@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.

N/A

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.

BCE is in the third year of Leader in Me. We are focused on Action Teams this year with staff, Family Lighthouse with Parents and Lighthouse Leadership with students. We will create a leadership environment by teaching students to lead, monitor and achieve goals, share leadership roles with all stakeholders and empower all learners through social emotional learning and data driven achievement. SAC will be working along side of the PTA to allow for parent involvement in alignment with Leader in Me goals. SACC and the community will also be in support and with the goals of student leadership and implementation of the whole child empowerment of academic and emotional social learning. BCE will work in the framework of leadership, culture and academics to start with adult learning and modeling, teach the students to lead, create the leadership environment and share leadership through action teams and student voice teams.

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

Staff will participate in action teams that consists of Academics, Culture and Leadership to make decisions that impact the teaching and discuss best practices. These teams will promote and lead in their area the rest of the staff. Student leadership action team will meet monthly to discuss events and the climate that

impacts student engagement. This team will have a voice and make decisions for special school wide events, the school environment and leadership roles and opportunities for students. The Family Lighthouse Team will meet monthly to discuss promoting a positive culture of communication, involvement and support.

Part V: Budget

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

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