

The School Board of Highlands County

Memorial 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	24
Budget to Support Goals	24

Memorial Elementary School

867 MEMORIAL DR, Avon Park, FL 33825

<http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~mes/>

Demographics

Principal: Sullyann Hinkle

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (47%)
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 Highlands 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

Memorial Elementary School

867 MEMORIAL DR, Avon Park, FL 33825

<http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~mes/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School KG-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>71%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Highlands 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.

"Memorial Elementary, together with parents, students, and community, will provide opportunities that prepare all students to be responsible and productive citizens."

Provide the school's vision statement.

"Empowering today's children to become tomorrow's leaders."

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
Floyd, Courtney	Principal	The principals duties and responsibilities include overseeing and leading professional development, stocktake teams and committees. Upon completion of these meetings, the principal is responsible for providing resources and assistance as needed to support decisions made by the team. The principal will be actively involved in PLC meetings and effective lesson plan meetings, templates, and data chat discussions. Follow-up, walk throughs, and feedback will be provided to teachers. Support will be offered to teachers on an as-needed basis.
Hinkle, Sullyann	Assistant Principal	The assistant principals duties and responsibilities include leading the staff through the stocktake process. The assistant principal will ensure follow-up from stocktake meetings, to the principal, as well as the stocktake leads. The assistant principal will be actively involved in PLC meetings and effective lesson plan meetings, templates, and data chat discussions. Follow-up, walk throughs, and feedback will be provided to teachers. Support will be offered to teachers on an as-needed basis.
Franza, Sara	Instructional Coach	Collaborate with colleagues to ensure that all voices are heard when in stocktake meetings. Lead, organize, and implement strategies to increase the stocktake goal. Review school mission, vision, and goals; ensuring that all staff are aware of and contributing to them. Follow up with stocktake leadership team to evaluate, assess, and support all stocktake goals.
Kramer, Katina	Instructional Coach	Collaborate with colleagues to ensure that all voices are heard when in stocktake meetings. Lead, organize, and implement strategies to increase the stocktake goal. Review school mission, vision, and goals; ensuring that all staff are aware of and contributing to them. Follow up with stocktake leadership team to evaluate, assess, and support all stocktake goals.
Smith, Patricia	Instructional Coach	Collaborate with colleagues to ensure that all voices are heard when in stocktake meetings. Lead, organize, and implement strategies to increase the stocktake goal. Review school mission, vision, and goals; ensuring that all staff are aware of and contributing to them. Follow up with stocktake leadership team to evaluate, assess, and support all stocktake goals.
Hoffner, Kyle	Dean	Collaborate with colleagues to ensure that all voices are heard when in stocktake meetings. Lead, organize, and implement strategies to increase the stocktake goal. Review school mission, vision, and goals; ensuring that all staff are aware of and contributing to them. Follow up with stocktake leadership team to evaluate, assess, and support all stocktake goals.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Sullyann Hinkle

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

28

Total number of students enrolled at the school

556

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	98	93	71	93	79	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	529
Attendance below 90 percent	26	23	22	25	24	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144
One or more suspensions	0	6	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	3	6	3	2	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in Math	3	2	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	40	19	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	39	20	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	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	9	9	4	8	33	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102

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	20	18	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Students retained two or more times	0	1	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/24/2021

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	97	105	84	96	111	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	587
Attendance below 90 percent	21	17	13	8	16	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	12	2	6	9	13	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in ELA	29	21	1	10	14	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Course failure in Math	11	16	1	7	14	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	25	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	25	18	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	16	7	1	5	28	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

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	18	21	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	97	105	84	96	111	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	587
Attendance below 90 percent	21	17	13	8	16	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	12	2	6	9	13	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in ELA	29	21	1	10	14	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Course failure in Math	11	16	1	7	14	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	25	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	25	18	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	16	7	1	5	28	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

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	18	21	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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				44%	50%	57%	42%	48%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				52%	54%	58%	46%	48%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				64%	49%	53%	38%	40%	48%
Math Achievement				56%	57%	63%	57%	58%	62%
Math Learning Gains				64%	57%	62%	57%	50%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	44%	51%	29%	35%	47%
Science Achievement				41%	45%	53%	57%	52%	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	43%	50%	-7%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	48%	49%	-1%	58%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2021					
	2019	38%	45%	-7%	56%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	55%	56%	-1%	62%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	54%	60%	-6%	64%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2021					
	2019	61%	49%	12%	60%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	38%	43%	-5%	53%	-15%
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 ELA and Math diagnostic data/risk levels were used to determine percent proficiency. Science baseline data was used to determine proficiency.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	38/43%	34/36%	39/42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26/37%	22/30%	29/40%
	Students With Disabilities	9/50%	6/33%	5/27%
	English Language Learners	4/33%	1/8%	3/25%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	38/42%	42/46%	36/39%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29/40%	31/43%	25/35%
	Students With Disabilities	8/44%	8/44%	6/33%
	English Language Learners	6/50%	4/23%	6/54%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	27/30%	34/36%	39/42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20/31%	23/35%	24/36%
	Students With Disabilities	4/30%	4/30%	4/30%
	English Language Learners	2/11%	1/8%	3/25%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	22/27%	19/23%	35/42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/25%	12/18%	23/35%
	Students With Disabilities	2/15%	2/15%	4/30%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	3/27%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30/36%	29/34%	22/29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25/37%	21/30%	17/28%
	Students With Disabilities	4/22%	1/5%	2/12%
	English Language Learners	2/22%	1/11%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	22/26%	23/27%	19/23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/23%	14/20%	12/18%
	Students With Disabilities	3/16%	3/16%	4/23%
	English Language Learners	1/11%	1/12%	1/11%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	23/28%	32/35%	32/36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13/21%	20/31%	20/31%
	Students With Disabilities	2/10%	1/4%	2/9%
	English Language Learners	0/7%	2/28%	2/28%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	20/94%	20/85%	23/26%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13/21%	12/19%	14/22%
	Students With Disabilities	1/5%	0/0%	1/4%
	English Language Learners	2/28%	2/28%	3/42%

Grade 5				
Number/% Proficiency		Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	38/35%	40/37%	48/44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23/30%	21/27%	28/36%
	Students With Disabilities	8/24%	7/21%	10/32%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency		Fall	Winter
Mathematics	All Students	31/28%	32/29%	40/36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20/25%	16/20%	22/28%
	Students With Disabilities	6/18%	4/12%	6/18%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency		Fall	Winter
Science	All Students	27/31%	35/36%	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	13/22%	16/23%	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	7/31%	7/25%	N/A
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	N/A

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	11	20	21	18	15	20	8				
ELL	27	21		36	21		36				
BLK	24	36	58	21	41		17				
HSP	40	50	33	44	43	27	43				
MUL	29			43							
WHT	59	64		67	57		58				
FRL	37	41	45	37	41	50	32				
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	17	49	62	27	56	56	22				
ELL	21	70	90	38	73	63					
BLK	27	38	53	37	53	47	21				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
HSP	40	57	68	52	68	56	41				
MUL	33	36		67	73						
WHT	63	57	64	71	66		66				
FRL	40	49	62	51	62	50	36				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	21	32	16	28	41	19	27				
ELL	26	63	64	38	52	23					
ASN	73			91							
BLK	36	34	33	55	56	38	63				
HSP	35	55	42	48	60	26	43				
MUL	46			54							
WHT	51	44	40	66	54		70				
FRL	39	45	39	54	56	30	54				

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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	356
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	16
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	31
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
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	33
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	41
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	36
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	61
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	41
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?

A trend in the recent 2021 FSA data is a significant decrease in math proficiency in grades 3, 4, and 5 from previous years. In addition, students with disabilities showed little proficiency as well as learning gains. These students had a 15% proficiency in ELA, 25% proficiency in math, and 18% proficiency in science. The subgroup of African Americans has a 24% proficiency in ELA, a 20% proficiency in math, and 16% in science. Based on this data, a focus needs to be placed on effective tier 1 instruction.

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

Based off of the FSA data (comparing 2019 and 2021) third grade dropped 16%, 4th 14% and 5th 17% from 2019 FSA math data. In addition, students with disabilities proficiency as well as learning gains were low in both ELA and math (Proficiency: 15% in ELA and 25% in math; Learning Gains: 21% in ELA and 17% in math).

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 contributing factor is attendance. Due to Covid-19, students as well as staff members have had to quarantine and miss larger amounts of instruction. Instruction was to continue while students were at home, however, many students did not log on or participate in the virtual lessons. While quarantining is still a concern in the 2021-2022 school year, we are working to find new ways to continue the learning when students are unable to attend face to face learning. We are collaborating with coaches to provide additional support when students return to school as well as providing a variety of resources on Google Classroom for students to access when they are unable to be in attendance. We are ensuring that students tier 1 instruction is solid and well planned out, through our PLC model.

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

Comparing the 2019 FSA data to the 2021 FSA data, an area that showed improvement was science. In 2019, 5th graders had a proficiency of 38%. In 2021, 5th graders had a proficiency of 42%, showing a 4% increase.

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

Our 5th grade teachers collaborated and worked very closely with our school science coach. They calendared lessons, reviewed and analyzed data to determine specific areas of need for individual

students. In addition, we began using an online program, Study Island. This program allowed the teachers to individually assign lessons of need to individual students. This gave students and teachers another form of instruction that could be individualized based on observations and assessment that took place.

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

This year teachers have been giving an additional 30 minutes per day for planning. Twice, weekly, teachers will use this time, collaborate with their colleagues, and prepare lessons, using the IPG and the effective lesson plan template. Teachers then present the lessons to their students. At the second PLC of the week, teachers bring back student data and work samples and discuss the lesson and next steps. Coaches and administration are involved in this planning process and provide support as needed.

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.

CKLA professional development was provided to teachers during pre-week to ensure that teachers are teaching the curriculum with fidelity. A effective lesson was modeled for science teachers. Teachers are participating in CRI-PD. Monthly stock take meetings will provide teachers with a collaborative opportunity to discuss new strategies and measure the success of ELA, Math, Remediation, and Discipline.

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

Teachers are using a google doc to create an effective lesson plan weekly. This allows all teachers to use the template, discuss, comment, and add feedback. In addition, teachers are able to see areas that were strong as well as ways that the lesson could be improved for next time. Data and student work is reviewed weekly. Next action steps are discussed and implemented.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Based on FSA data as well as other assessments, it was determined that our Core, Tier 1 instruction, needs improvement in ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

Currently, MES has a 40% proficiency on the 2021 FSA assessment. By strengthening Tier 1 ELA instruction, our goal is to increase this to 50% proficiency on the 2022 FSA assessment.

Monitoring:

Twice weekly, the teachers meet with their teams to create the lessons and review the data. The coaches and the teachers collaborate to determine the most effective instruction. Each month, a teacher from each grade level will meet and be a part of the ELA stocktake team. This group will evaluate explicit instruction, using the IPG and the effective lesson plan template that was created in PLC. The team will discuss and share strategies to improve. Each month the team will reassess and develop ways to improve.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sara Franza (franzas@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Implement high quality instructional materials (Amplify CKLA-FL) in every classroom with fidelity to strengthen core instruction.
Weekly PLC's in ELA to assist teachers with the planning, delivery and monitoring of core instruction (models of effective instruction).
Professional development in core reading instructional strategies for 5th grade ELA teachers.
District wide professional learning and ongoing support provided to reading coaches in "student centered coaching" facilitated by TNTP and supported by district reading specialists.
Incorporate explicit and systematic supplemental instruction in the areas of phonics, fluency and vocabulary beyond the 90 minute reading block utilizing 95% group Blueprint for Intervention and district developed fluency support guides.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Based on data and observations, our Tier 1 instruction is not healthy. By implementing the IPG and reviewing the data monthly, our Core Tier 1 instruction will improve.

Action Steps to Implement

An effective lesson plan template was created and shared with teachers.
Teachers meet weekly to create a lesson using the effective lesson plan template.
Teachers meet weekly to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the lesson and review data.
Teachers meet monthly with stocktake teams to review data on a school wide basis.
Next steps are discussed and determined.

SWD students in the bottom 25% will receive explicit, targeted instruction in a small group setting with a support facilitator, in addition to targeted support in the classroom.
ELL students in the bottom 25% will receive explicit, targeted instruction in a small group setting with the ESOL para, in addition to targeted support in the classroom.
African American and Hispanic students in the bottom 25% will receive explicit, targeted instruction in WIN groups, in addition to targeted support.

MTSS coach will work closely with teachers to ensure that all subgroup needs are being met.

Person Responsible Sara Franza (franzas@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on 2021 FSA data, it was determine that our Core, Tier 1 instruction in math is not healthy.

Measurable Outcome: On the 2021 FSA math assessment, 43% of students were proficient. Our goal for the 2022 FSA math assessment is 52% proficiency.

Monitoring: Each month, a teacher from each grade level will meet and be a part of the Math stocktake team. This group will evaluate explicit instruction, using the IPG. The team will discuss and share strategies to improve. Each month the team will reassess and develop ways to improve.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Katina Kramer (kramerk@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: The strategy used will be the Instructional Practice Guide, focusing specifically on Core Action 2: Explicit Instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Based on data and observations, our Tier 1 instruction is not healthy. By implementing the IPG and reviewing the data monthly, our Core Tier 1 instruction will improve.

Action Steps to Implement

An effective lesson plan template was created and shared with teachers.
 Teachers meet weekly to create a lesson using the effective lesson plan template.
 Teachers meet weekly to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the lesson and review data.
 Teachers meet monthly with stocktake teams to review data on a school wide basis.
 Next steps are discussed and determined.

SWD students in the bottom 25% will receive explicit, targeted instruction in a small group setting with a support facilitator, in addition to targeted support in the classroom.
 ELL students in the bottom 25% will receive explicit, targeted instruction in a small group setting with the ESOL para, in addition to targeted support in the classroom.
 African American in the bottom 25% will receive explicit, targeted instruction in WIN groups, in addition to targeted support.

MTSS coach will pull a group in the bottom 25% to provide additional support as well as attend PLC's to ensure that explicit, instruction is planned.

Person Responsible Katina Kramer (kramerk@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Based on our 2021 FSA data, students are in need of remediation throughout lessons.

Measurable Outcome: On the 2021 FSA ELA data, we had 49% of students make learning gains in ELA. On the 2021 FSA Math data, we had 46% of students make learning gains in math. Our goal for the 2022 FSA ELA learning gains is 58% and 55% for math.

Monitoring: Each month, a teacher from each grade level will meet and be a part of the Remediation stocktake team. This group will evaluate how and when students are being remediated as well as checks for understanding throughout the lesson. The team will discuss and share strategies to improve. Each month the team will reassess and develop ways to improve.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Based on effective lesson plan template, teachers will incorporate checks for understanding throughout their lessons. This will allow teachers to know when students need remediated and adjust instruction as needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students will be able to continue learning throughout the lesson. Teachers will be able to adjust instruction prior to the ending assessment so that students will be remediated throughout.

Action Steps to Implement

An effective lesson plan template was created and shared with teachers.
 Teachers meet weekly to create a lesson using the effective lesson plan template.
 Teachers meet weekly to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the lesson and review data.
 Teachers meet monthly with stocktake teams to review data on a school wide basis.
 Next steps are discussed and determined.

Person Responsible Patricia Smith (smithp1@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on our referral data, students are being removed from class, receiving ISS or OSS and losing valuable classroom instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	We would like to decrease our referral count by 5%.
Monitoring:	Students will be given strategies for handling and being proactive when it comes to classroom behaviors.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kyle Hoffner (hoffnerk@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will be incorporating restorative practices.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research suggests that building relationships with students and using specific strategies will decrease misbehaviors.

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.

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org) one area that is ranked "very high" for Memorial Elementary is on the number of suspensions. In the school year 2019-2020, Memorial had 59 days of in-school suspension and 15 days of out of school suspension. Another area that was ranked in the "high" level was violent incidents. Memorial had a violent incident rate of 0.67 per 100 students. Due to these suspension numbers and violent incidents, this is an area of focus for Memorial. We have created a team of teachers (one teacher per grade level) that will meet monthly in a Stock take meeting. During this meeting, teachers will have provided their grade level representative their discipline data. The team will discuss trends and develop strategies to support behaviors, teachers, and families. This team will continue to monitor this data and determine areas of strength and weakness. Strategies will be put in place and supported as needed.

Another strategy that we have put into place for this school year is the behavior matrix. This is a guide for teachers to use when determining the level of severity of an incident and if the incident should result in a referral, a misconduct form, or a parent conduct. This behavior matrix also clarifies steps that needs to be taken for specific incidents. This will allow all of our teachers to be on the same page, when dealing with similar behaviors. This will provide an overall school culture and expectation for students, families, and teachers.

In addition, during pre-week, Memorial teachers were trained with Rufus Lott, on Restorative Practices. During this training, teachers learned how to created a relationship agreement with their students. This is an agreement that is created by the teacher and students; all members of the class have a say as to what goes into the agreement. It consists of areas that are important to the teacher as well as the students. All of the members of the class, sign the agreement. Teachers were trained on how to hold circle with their classes to develop positive relationships with students. Teachers were given tools on how to de-esclate situations and build relationships with students and families.

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.

Positive school culture is the key to the success of a school, and most importantly, student success. We at Memorial Elementary strive to create a welcoming, positive environment, that is evident from the moment someone enters campus. All office staff have been trained on ways to properly engage with visitors as well as phone etiquette. When looking to hire staff at Memorial Elementary, we are looking for individuals who have a love for children. We create programs that encourage involvement in our students. Some of these include classroom "buddies" and mentors. We make positive phone calls home, prior to students even starting school. We work to create a working relationship with parents and the community. We have community events that are free of charge (Grill and Chill). Staff members participate in team building activities. Administration ensures that time is set aside to build relationships and work diligently to ensure that those relationships continue. Communication is open and consistent.

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

Memorial Elementary has many stakeholders who promote positive school culture. Parents and community members play an active role in our PTO as well as our SAC committee. These groups meet monthly to discuss school and district data as well as ways to increase parent/community involvement. We plan opportunities for the community to become more involved in various school events throughout the year.

Some of these activities include events to unite the school and the community. One main event is our "Grill and Chill." This event is created in collaboration with the Sheriffs Office, the Boys and Girls Club, as well as the school. It is held at a community football field. This is a time where we grill hotdogs and hamburgers and just enjoy time together and build relationships. The Sheriffs office and school staff organized games, including tug of war, football, and other activities. Our last event was held in the 2018-2019 school year. We had over 300 families attend the event. Due to Covid-19, we have been unable to hold this event. We are looking forward to continuing this event in the near future.

In addition, stakeholders support the school in many functions throughout the school year. They collaborate with the school and provide opportunities for families to become involved. Some of these events include after school reading/curriculum nights, as well as fun events, such as the Spring Fling.

We will continue to reach out to the community and involve as many stakeholders as possible.

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: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00