
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	26

Allen Park Elementary School

3345 CANELO DR, Fort Myers, FL 33901

<http://alp.leeschools.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Melissa Booth

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2014

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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (59%)
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 Lee 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	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	26

Allen Park Elementary School

3345 CANELO DR, Fort Myers, FL 33901

<http://alp.leeschools.net/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">82%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee 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.

A high performing school community inspiring high performing lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Today's Learners...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
Eastridge, Lisa	Principal	<p>Lisa Eastridge is the Instructional Leader of the school. She works with her administrative and leadership team as on form of communication with the staff. The Assistant Principal, Dana Philpott works with new teachers, scheduling, discipline, and ordering curriculum. Terrance Siler serves to support the behavior choices and discipline needs of students. Amy Holik works with ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies based questions. She also serves as the liaison between Allen Park Elementary and the Curriculum Department at the District Office. As the liaison between the Curriculum Department and District Office, she serves as the contact with the Leading and Learning Teams for each grade level and department. The Leading and Learning Teams facilitate the Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). Jennifer Browning teaches classes, guides the implementation of the Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) and character education systems at Allen Park Elementary, and counsels with students referred to her and connects families with community resources to meet their individual needs. She works with various stakeholders to support behavior, mental health, and socioeconomic needs. Sue is the member of the Mental-Health Team who is present on campus full time. Kelly Scibilia serves as the Intervention Specialist. She works with teachers and parents to monitor student progress through data and the Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) to facilitate the Problem-Solving Team (PST) Meetings. Kelly also collaborates with our School-Social Worker to monitor and support our students with attendance concerns. Alice Short serves as the English Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) Coordinator. She monitors our ESOL students to provide feedback to teachers on resources and accommodations available to service our students. Stefanie DeMichele, 3-5 Reading Resource Teacher, works with our student receiving intensive reading interventions within the fourth- and fifth-grade levels. She collaborates with teachers and students regarding student progress. Stefanie coaches teachers with reading instruction and implementation of reading initiatives. Shelley Endrey, K-2 reading coach works with the district in providing ELA initiatives with fidelity in grades K-2.</p> <p>Grade-level Chairs serve as one avenue of communication between administration and grade-level team members. They represent the initial point of contact for grade-level team members to reach out to for support. They also serve to support new teachers in their grade level acclimating to the school.</p> <p>Grade-Level/Subject-Area PLCs are facilitated by the Leading and Learning Teams, who also meet monthly with the Reading Specialist for vertical PLCs. The Leadership Team participates in the various PLCs, as noted by Leadership team members' names above. This serves as another means for building communication between the Leadership Team, Administrative Team, and the different grade levels and subject areas. Within the PLC meetings, student-performance data is reviewed and used to drive instruction. In addition, grade levels meet with administration on a monthly basis to address questions, concerns, and review data to further drive instruction and general approaches to supports for teachers and students.</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Philpott, Dana	Assistant Principal	Collaborates with Third-Grade PLCs
DeMichele, Stefanie	Instructional Coach	3-5 Reading Resource Teacher- collaborates with fourth-grade PLCs
Endrey, Shelley	Instructional Coach	K-2 Reading Resource Coach, collaborates with Kinder and grade 1 PLCs, secretary for SAC
Siler, Terrance	Dean	Dean Of Discipline, Collaborates with Second Grade PLCs
Holik, Amy	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Reading/Curriculum Specialist, Literacy Contact, Collaborates with ELA PLCs.
Browning, Jennifer	School Counselor	
Scibilia, Kelly	Other	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/1/2014, Melissa Booth

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

59

Total number of students enrolled at the school

914

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

11

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

12

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	152	153	147	170	125	146	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	893
Attendance below 90 percent	24	42	40	39	24	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200
One or more suspensions	0	4	6	4	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	3	33	16	26	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
Course failure in Math	1	14	8	24	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	29	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	44	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	2	18	13	27	35	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138

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	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	138	138	159	133	144	143	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	855
Attendance below 90 percent	12	14	17	15	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	1	4	3	3	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	5	14	16	10	33	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
Course failure in Math	5	7	9	8	13	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	14	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	13	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

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	5	11	12	10	30	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	138	138	159	133	144	143	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	855
Attendance below 90 percent	12	14	17	15	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	1	4	3	3	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	5	14	16	10	33	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
Course failure in Math	5	7	9	8	13	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	14	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	13	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

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	5	11	12	10	30	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	6	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	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				63%	57%	57%	65%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				61%	56%	58%	56%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	50%	53%	40%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				62%	62%	63%	65%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				60%	65%	62%	45%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				25%	54%	51%	21%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				61%	52%	53%	67%	54%	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	56%	58%	-2%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	63%	55%	8%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2021					
	2019	60%	54%	6%	56%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	57%	61%	-4%	62%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	63%	62%	1%	64%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	58%	-6%	60%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	58%	50%	8%	53%	5%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady reading and math diagnostic assessments.

Grade 1					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		14/16.3	23/24.2	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities		2/16.7	1/9.1	0/0
	English Language Learners		1/10	0/0	0/0
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		5/5.9	17/18.5	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities		2/18.2	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners		0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	7/5.3	26/19.9	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	2/9.5	0/0
	English Language Learners	2/5.6	4/10.8	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	1/0.8	15/11.1	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	2/9.5	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/2.7	0/0
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	35/28.5	54/40.9	65/48.1
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/6.3	2/12.5	4/25
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17/14	34/26.2	50/37.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/6.3	2/12.5	3/18.8
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	1/6.7

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	48/36.4	61/43	65/45.1
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/9.1	1/8.3	1/8.3
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/5.3	1/5.0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	18/20	31/32.6	39/40.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	39/33.1	44/35.8	55/43.7
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/11.8	1/5.3	2/10.5
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/5.6	2/11.1
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	3/4.5	12/15.8	18/25.4
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	1/5.6
	English Language Learners	1/11.1	1/10	1/10
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	24/39.3	29/39.7	42/60.9
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	5/35.7	2/14.3	6/35.3
	English Language Learners	1/16.7	3/33.3	3/33.3

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	15	33	40	17	29	27	25				
ELL	31	43	33	29	59	57	33				
ASN	81			85							
BLK	29	39	44	28	30	22	32				
HSP	44	48	44	40	51	50	44				
MUL	44			50							
WHT	79	59		81	65		84				
FRL	33	42	40	33	35	26	36				
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	19	53	48	28	51	33	29				
ELL	39	50	46	50	45	17	24				
ASN	92	94		96	94						
BLK	39	49	35	39	47	19	34				
HSP	51	55	47	52	56	33	44				
MUL	79			57							
WHT	84	69	50	82	70		83				
FRL	50	55	43	49	52	22	49				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	29	25	20	37	28	5	38				
ELL	31	53	45	45	39	40	43				
ASN	97	84		97	74						
BLK	46	38	38	40	26	15	44				
HSP	48	50	46	55	34	22	47				
MUL	64	50		60	50						
WHT	83	67	38	83	59	36	83				
FRL	50	46	36	52	35	18	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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	385
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
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	42
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	83
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	47
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	47
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	74
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	37
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

Trends that emerge are a drop in proficiency in ELA, Math, and Science in our 2021 FSA scores in grades 3-5. ELA from 63% to 49%, Math from 62% to 40%, and Science from 61% to 56%.

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

The greatest need for improvement is in ELA proficiency based on FSA 2021 and progress monitoring.

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

Contributing factors includes both student and staff absences, lack of parental support, and larger class sizes. Actions for improvement to address this situation is utilizing small group instruction, inserting our highly effective reading coaches for small group targeted instruction, and monitoring absences.

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

The most improvement shown is the lowest 25% of ELA and Math. L25 maintained ELA proficiency of 43% and in math L25 increased from 25% to 38%.

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

Our focus was on the lowest 25%. Teachers diligently tracked these students and implemented small group instruction, and targeted instruction based on their needs. Reading coaches also pulled the students for interventions.

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

Strategies that will need to be implemented to accelerate learning are: backwards planning design, cooperative planning, small group instruction, utilization of reading coaches and a focus on ESE teachers and students with disabilities.

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 development in iReady focused on reading and math instructional groupings is ongoing this year. We will also have PD in backwards planning provided by the district. Ongoing data chats and PD during PLCs will include reviewing data and how to use the data to fill gaps as well as increased opportunities for extension in classrooms.

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

Additional services that will be provided is ongoing monthly data chats, ongoing iReady professional development, and an increase in instructional support by hiring resource teachers to help work with small groups of students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: PLCs and grade level collaborative planning are a focus. We have several new teachers to the school and to the district/Florida that have not been trained in backwards planning. Many of our older teachers would benefit from a review as well. Planning collaboratively with the grade level teams will bring new ideas and/or experience from other teachers that in turn will increase effective planning. Teachers will focus on backwards planning and will make data driven decisions to instruct to the rigor of the standards. Data from formatives/ exemplars and iReady will be used to create groups and drive instruction.

Measurable Outcome: School FSA proficiency in Reading will increase from.. 49% to 53%
 School FSA proficiency in Math will increase from.. 49% to 54%

Monitoring: PLCs and grade level collaborative planning will be monitored by our coaches/resource teachers as well as our administrative team. This team will also coach and assist in classrooms providing teachers with assistance in planning as well as working with intervention groups. Data will be pulled from Performance Matters as well as iReady and will be discussed at PLC meetings, grade level meetings, and admin chats that take place monthly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lisa Eastridge (lisade@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: PLC teams will use backward design while planning. Planning will focus on the outcome and how students will get there. High yield strategies will be reviewed with teachers and implemented in daily instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We have several new teachers to our state as well as several first year teachers. Many teachers are not familiar with backwards planning and some need to be refreshed on the topic. We are a second year iReady school, and we need everyone to be trained and efficient in planning with the end in mind. We want to increase our use of data to drive instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

We will contact the district to set up professional development in backwards design planning.
 Resource teachers will monitor data in iReady and Performance Matters
 Teachers will attend PD on backwards planning
 Data will be used during PLCs and monthly data chats to drive instruction.

Person Responsible Amy Holik (amymhol@leeschools.net)

Coaches/resource teachers will monitor exemplar assessment data and growth, and monitor iReady diagnostic assessments.

Person Responsible Amy Holik (amymhol@leeschools.net)

Grade level collaborative planning and plc 3 times a month.

Person Responsible Lisa Eastridge (lisade@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus ELA Proficiency is a critical need for an area of improvement. ELA proficiency went from 63% to 49% in 2021.

Description and Rationale: A focus on ELA proficiency will strengthen overall student performance and ultimately growth and proficiency will increase. Based upon the ESSA data, students with disabilities are lower than the 41% federal performance threshold.

Measurable Outcome: Given support with reading coaches, utilizing Really Great Reading and Read 180 for curriculum support, the ELA proficiency will increase by 4% points in 2021-2022 to 53% proficiency based on ELA statewide assessment in grades 3 – 5.

Monitoring: Reading coaches will work with small groups and will help to model lessons for teachers when needed. They will also monitor iReady progress both in class and on diagnostics. Coaches will touch base with grade level teams on RGR instruction and coaching. Grade level teams will focus on backwards planning and collaborative planning to increase rigor and ELA instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Amy Holik (amymhol@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will utilize continuous-progress monitoring of skills and provide a review based upon targeted areas at the end of each unit/concept. Students will be grouped based upon demonstrated performance (data-driven grouping). Targeted-instruction sessions will be created during collaborative planning. Based upon noted needs, differentiated instruction will be provided students to meet independent needs to close any learning gaps. During PLCs and collaborative planning, performance of students with disabilities will be looked at specifically to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses, so that individualized supports may be addressed for students. Teachers will share data with the administration team at the monthly grade-level meetings to discuss the performance of students with specific focus regarding students with disabilities. Maximize data-driven instruction and proven results of identified teacher by collaborating and sharing practices with other teachers. Teachers will be asked to identify the High Yield Strategies being implemented within their Lesson Plans, which are reviewed by the Administration Team. Common planning time is offered for additional partnering on instruction, which includes, but is not limited to the identification and implementation of High Yield Strategies within instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research shows ongoing progress monitoring, targeted instruction, and high-yield instructional strategies result in high growth. Increased engagement and rigor through the implementation of high-yield instructional strategies has been shown to positively influence learning gains.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Resource teachers will pull small groups daily.
2. Provide additional high-yield instructional strategy training on backwards planning
3. Collaborate in ongoing PLCs with grade-level teachers and administration to determine any additional needed steps and review results of ongoing-progress monitoring
4. Reach out to district for backwards planning design professional development
5. Provide common planning times.
 - a) Ongoing collaborative planning (lessons and reviews)
 - b) Collaborative creation of formative assessments (shared/common assessments)
6. Grade-level/Subject-Area: PLCs - Collaborative review of formative assessments to drive instruction and plan groups

- a) Data review, discussion, and planning for targeted-instruction
- 7. Implementation of targeted-instruction based upon student needs
- 8. Review of results and summative assessments
 - a) Grade-level/Subject Area Planning
 - b) PLCs
 - c) Grade-level meetings with Administration Team
- 9. Students with disabilities will be monitored closely, and progress will be shared with the administrative team monthly, or more frequently if needed, to discuss progress.
- 10. ESE Teachers will participate in grade-level/subject area PLCs in accordance to their caseloads, so they may actively participate in the discussion of performance data and individualized needs of students noted within their IEPs.
- 11. Students will participate in various intervention programs based upon their performance levels. Program-dependent benchmarks are in place for ongoing progress monitoring.
- 12. Monthly grade level with administration team meetings occur to monitor plans in place.
- 13. Separate grade-level chair meetings with administration are held on a monthly basis to offer another avenue of monitoring plans in place.

Person Responsible Lisa Eastridge (lisade@leeschools.net)

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

An area of focus in math was identified due to the proficiency going from 62% to 49% in 2021.

Measurable Outcome:

Given additional supports,(Backwards Planning Training, iReady learning paths, and Reflex Math Fluency program) the 21-22 FSA Math proficiency will increase by 5 percentage points, yielding an overall 54% proficiency.

Monitoring:

Admin and resource teachers will monitor district exemplars as well as iReady Diagnostic assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amy Holik (amymhol@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Collaboration with and district-provided training by approved district personnel regarding best practices and proven instructional strategies in the math content area. During PLCs and collaborative planning, performance of students with disabilities will be looked at specifically to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses, so that individualized supports may be addressed for students. Teachers will share data with the administration team at the monthly grade-level meetings to discuss the performance of students with specific focus regarding students with disabilities. During PLCs and collaborative planning, performance of students with disabilities will be looked at specifically to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses, so that individualized supports may be addressed for students. Teachers will share data with the administration team at the monthly grade-level meetings to discuss the performance of students with specific focus regarding students with disabilities. Teachers will be asked to identify the High Yield Strategies being implemented within their Lesson Plans, which are reviewed by the Administration Team. Common planning time is offered for additional partnering on instruction, which includes, but is not limited to the identification and implementation of High Yields Strategies within instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

With several new teachers and first year teachers we are focused on implementing high yield strategies to enhance classroom instruction. A focus on rigor and an increase in collaborative planning will help teachers determine specific learning needs and tools.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide common planning times.

a) Data review, discussion, and planning for targeted-instruction

Implementation of targeted-instruction based upon student needs

Review of results and summative assessments

Leading and Learning Team to support optimize use of curriculum map as part of PLCs (houses multiple resources for remediation).

Students with disabilities will be monitored closely, and progress will be shared with the administrative team monthly, or more frequently if needed, to discuss progress.

ESE Teachers will participate in grade-level/subject area PLCs in accordance to their caseloads, so they may actively participate in the discussion of performance data and individualized needs of students noted within their IEPs.

Students will participate in individualize prescriptive programs, such as iReady, to remediate students

Monthly grade level with administration team meetings occur to monitor plans in place.

Separate grade-level chair meetings with administration are held on a monthly basis to offer another avenue of monitoring plans in place.

Person Responsible Lisa Eastridge (lisade@leeschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Attendance has been below the 90 percent average due to the pandemic and needing to quarantine students. Attendance is instrumental in learning, as students must be present to receive instruction and collaborate to learn.

Measurable Outcome: Given new procedures to communicate attendance concerns to the school social worker, and monitoring student attendance with our information specialist and school social worker, the school will average a 90 or above attendance percentage (18-19: 94%) during the 21-22 school year.

Monitoring: Teachers will contact the parent after 3 consecutive days of absences. The social worker will get involved if no contact can be made. The mental health team will touch base on a regular basis to monitor all attendance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lisa Eastridge (lisade@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Ongoing monitoring by teachers, school-information specialist, school counselor, social worker, principal, and mental-health team in conjunction with collaborating with families to build relationships.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Ongoing monitoring and relationship building provide a collaborative approach for support and accountability by students and families. Each year we receive new students in Kindergarten as well as all grade levels. We do our best to maintain the awareness and importance of school attendance with all stakeholders

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will complete an electronic form and submit to the school social worker when there are attendance forms.
2. Teachers will call student homes when a student is absent for 3 consecutive days.
3. Develop and implement regular touch base meetings for mental-health team members

Person Responsible Lisa Eastridge (lisade@leeschools.net)

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.

Dedicated individuals for coaching and building of relationships will allow for more support to be given to teachers giving them tools to instruct students on how to self regulate their behavior. Curriculum and programs that teach students how to make positive choices and accept ownership for their behavior will enhance students' toolboxes. These areas of targeted focus should lead to stronger relationships, more engaging instruction, informed teachers stronger support systems and decrease the number of disruptive referrals.

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.

Allen Park will host School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings in accordance to SAC guidelines. Parents, family members, community, and personnel are welcomed and encouraged to attend virtually via Zoom due to Covid, until we open up the school to the public in the future. We promote participating in SAC through email and school messenger as well as in Google Classrooms. Our SAC meetings will be held four times throughout the year for all stakeholders to participate in dialogue regarding enhancing relationships and supports for students and families. Parents are given the opportunity to provide feedback at our SAC meeting on our SIP and share ideas concerning school wide plans. We will hold a virtual Curriculum Night, a Storybook Character Day, Title I Virtual Parent Information Meetings, and Student-Led Conferences.

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

These activities will be offered to all stakeholders to attend and participate in. Allen Park and the Parent Teacher Association (PTA) collaborate with community businesses to raise funds and resources to meet the needs of students. Parents and families are invited and encouraged to attend a variety of virtual meetings and events such as Curriculum Night, Meet the Teacher, Student-Led conferences, SAC and Title I involvement meetings. We encourage parents and families to be an active participant in the learning process and educational growth of their children. Student parent activities are encouraged at home such as Build a Bug and Character Day. The results are shared at school. School newsletters are sent out electronically each month, and agendas, email, zoom, and school messenger are used as a means of communication concerning upcoming events and classroom activities.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00