The Alva School

leadership
analysis
Florida
college and career
students
mission
family and community involvement
school improvement
ambitious
striving
achievement
teaching
relationships
needs assessment
success
areas of focus
instruction
resources
supportive environment
growth
strategic planning
collaboration
vision
learning

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

The Alva School

17500 CHURCH AVE, Alva, FL 33920

http://alv.leeschools.net/

Demographics

Principal: Nathan Shaker

Start Date for this Principal: 11/20/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
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)	96%
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 (61%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (55%)
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

The Alva School

17500 CHURCH AVE, Alva, FL 33920

http://alv.leeschools.net/

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)
Combination School PK-8	No	73%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	30%

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 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.

The Alva School will provide educational opportunities for academic excellence for all K-8 students in a safe, respectful, and productive learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Alva School is a place of excellence where all students are inspired to think and learn.

The school will design programs and learning opportunities that promote academic achievement and the personal and social growth of every student. As a richly diverse community of learners that values all its members, The Alva School will assume a central role in the community by linking parents, local agencies, and businesses to the school.

The Alva School will provide a safe and productive learning environment in which students can communicate effectively, think critically, solve problems, and are technologically literate through a variety of curricular and extra-curricular activities. Through a challenging course of study with high standards, students will become responsible learners who can work collaboratively, and be accountable for their own academic and developmental progress.

The Alva School students will become life-long learners who will be educated to make valuable contributions to society. Through the teamwork of the school, home, and community, every student will be well prepared for the demands of the future.

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
Shaker, Nathan	Principal	Dr. Nathan Shaker is The Alva School Principal, overseeing kindergarten through eighth grade. Dr. Shaker provides leadership and direction and promotes the improvement of teaching. By hiring and retaining quality instructors and putting them in positions that align with their personal strengths, our principal is able to ensure that our school is filled with leaders who aim to strengthen our school.
Schmidt, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Kimberly Schmidt is the Assistant Principal at The Alva School. Mrs. Schmidt works with scheduling and our students daily, overseeing grades 4-6. Mrs. Schmidt collaborates with school and district staff, school administration, parents, teachers, and students to ensure that we meet school and student goals for safety, security, and student success.
Stinson, Kim	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Kim Stinson is an Assistant Principal here at The Alva School. She works directly with K-3 students and teachers to improve processes in elementary. collaborates with school and district staff, school administration, parents, teachers, and students to ensure that we meet school and student goals for safety, security, and student success.
Smith, Erica	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Erica Smith handles curriculum and testing for grades K-8 here at The Alva School. She works closely with staff to ensure students are properly tested and supported.
Cangialosi, Erica	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Erica Cangialosi is the middle school reading coach here at The Alva School. She also oversees the gifted program. Mrs. Cangialosi works closely with students as well as staff to ensure all students' needs are met. Mrs. Cangialosi continually organizes and presents current middle level data to better inform school based decisions to the entire staff or during weekly department/grade level PLCs.
Houchin, Haley	Instructional Coach	Ms. Haley Houchin is a 6th grade English Language Arts teacher at The Alva School. Ms. Houchin helps to create a safe and trusted environment for our students here at The Alva School. She also is the School Improvement Plan coordinator, a volleyball coach, and a club facilitator.
Clark, Emily	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Emily Clark is the K-2 literacy coach at The Alva School. Mrs. Clark works closely with students as well as staff to ensure all students' needs are met.
MacNevin, Emmilee	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Emmilee MacNevin is a 6-8 reading teacher at The Alva School. Mrs. MacNevin works closely with students and checks in with her regarding their academics and behavior. Mrs. MacNevin helps to create a safe and trusted environment for our students here at The Alva School.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Sites, Jennifer	Teacher, ESE	Mrs. Jennifer Sites is an ESE resource teacher here at The Alva School. Mrs. Sites helps to create a safe and trusted environment for our students here at The Alva School. Mrs. Sites works directly with ESE students, K-8, to ensure they are receiving their accommodations as well as overseeing behavioral issues.
Perez, Roseanne	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Roseanne Perez in an Assistant Principal overseeing grades 7-8 at The Alva School. Mrs. Perez helps to manage behaviors and provide support to staff and students. Mrs. Perez collaborates with school and district staff, school administration, parents, teachers, and students to ensure that we meet school and student goals for safety, security, and student success.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 11/20/2021, Nathan Shaker

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
7

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
85

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,208

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.
9

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	85	84	85	92	98	102	222	216	223	0	0	0	0	1207
Attendance below 90 percent	1	9	11	18	16	24	41	24	29	0	0	0	0	173
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	17	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in ELA	1	8	1	6	1	12	19	7	14	0	0	0	0	69
Course failure in Math	0	2	1	8	1	18	28	21	8	0	0	0	0	87
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	13	26	58	32	52	0	0	0	0	182
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	9	26	58	42	47	0	0	0	0	183
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	4	1	6	10	30	64	33	53	0	0	0	0	201

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/21/2021

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				55%	62%	61%	52%	55%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				60%	60%	59%	55%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				60%	53%	54%	50%	46%	52%
Math Achievement				64%	62%	62%	61%	55%	61%
Math Learning Gains				70%	61%	59%	67%	55%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				61%	49%	52%	54%	52%	52%
Science Achievement				51%	54%	56%	56%	51%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				70%	78%	78%	67%	75%	77%

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	62%	58%	4%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	52%	55%	-3%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	54%	-2%	56%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
06	2021					
	2019	53%	52%	1%	54%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
07	2021					
	2019	51%	51%	0%	52%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
08	2021					
	2019	56%	57%	-1%	56%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	63%	61%	2%	62%	1%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	59%	62%	-3%	64%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2021					
	2019	44%	58%	-14%	60%	-16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
06	2021					
	2019	56%	47%	9%	55%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
07	2021					
	2019	64%	57%	7%	54%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
08	2021					
	2019	64%	60%	4%	46%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	62%	50%	12%	53%	9%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	41%	46%	-5%	48%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	65%	67%	-2%	71%	-6%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	59%	41%	61%	39%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	50%	-50%	57%	-57%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Data was collected through a quarterly progress monitoring cycle, which included instruments such as STAR, iReady. and district-created progress monitoring assessments.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5/9.3	22/36.7	1/50
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	4/44.4	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	3/5.7	19/31.7	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/14.3	3/33.3	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	7/11.5	17/27	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	2/18.2	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	2/3.3	11/17.5	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	2/18.2	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	19/24.4	48/52.7	53/57.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/20	2/16.7	2/16.7
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	1/33.3
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	9/12	11/17.5	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	2/16.7	6/50
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31/35.2	42/45.7	44/46.8
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	3/17.6	1/5.9
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/25	1/25
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	3/3.4	18/19.8	32/34
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	1/5.9
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	1/25

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20/36.4	31/51.7	32/53.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/8.3	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5/6.5	18/19.8	19/21.1
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19/20.4	37/39.8	41/52.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/7.7	2/18.2	2/18.2
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	63/37.5	88/46.1	90/46.4
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	3/11.1	7/24.1	5/15.6
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18/13.8	36/24	49/33.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/7.7	1/3.3	6/19.4
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	77/40.7	85/42.1	115/55.8
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	5/18.5	3/9.7	7/22.6
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/16.7	2/25
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	68/36.6	70/35.4	82/41.4
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	4/14.8	5/15.6	3/10.7
	English Language Learners	1/12.5	2/28.6	2/22.2
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	72/40.7	105/52.2	119/60.1
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	5/17.9	9/27.3	6/21.4
	English Language Learners	2/33.3	3/50	3/37.5

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	101/59.1	106/59.6	106/58.2
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/15.4	1/6.3	3/20
	English Language Learners	1/50	0/0	1/50
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	70/47.3	79/49..7	73/45.9
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	5/35.7	3/16.7	2/11.8
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/50	0/0
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	51/30.5	85/48.6	90/51.4
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/7.7	2/12.5	1/7.1
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/33.3	1/50

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	9	31	33	25	30	26	26	26			
ELL	23	42	45	39	39						
BLK	38	38		32	48		27				
HSP	41	48	44	52	42	42	43	46	68		
MUL	50	40		41	45						
WHT	50	46	31	61	52	47	52	53	67		
FRL	41	43	34	50	48	39	38	44	55		
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	15	44	48	33	61	69	14	35			
ELL	33	59	57	50	69	77	36				
BLK	27	41		39	57	71		55			

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	59	63	58	65	77	73	51	66	53		
MUL	53	25		33	50						
WHT	55	60	64	67	69	55	52	71	57		
FRL	48	61	62	59	67	60	41	64	44		
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	15	41	45	28	55	54	10	25			
ELL	25	36	45	39	56	50					
BLK	41	54	55	26	42		40				
HSP	50	52	57	61	66	53	49	68	47		
MUL	44			67							
WHT	54	55	48	63	68	56	58	68	54		
FRL	45	48	48	54	63	52	47	62	42		

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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	507
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	95%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
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	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

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	37
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	48
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	44
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	51
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	44
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?

Looking at a three year trend among 2018, 2019 and 2020/2021, CASTLE and FOCUS data, we learned that the trends emerging across grade levels in English Language Arts is trending below state and district proficiency. However, our L25 students and learning gains trended upward in English Language Arts. In math, The Alva School is trending above both the district and state in proficiency. The science data is trending downward in proficiency over the past three years.Civics continues to be lower in proficiency than the district or the state.

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

Looking at a three year trend among 2018, 2019 and 2020/2021, the data component that showed the greatest need for improvement would be The Alva School's data containing fifth grade through eighth grade English Language Arts, which needs to have a focus on increased proficiency. Proficiency also needs to be increased in seventh grade civics.

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

The contributing factors to this need for improvement are that we saw an increase drop of level three's down to level two's, which demonstrates that we are not maintaining proficiency. New actions that can be taken to address this need for improvement at The Alva School is targeted instruction of weak standards, monitoring of improvement through progress monitoring and targeted interventions when mastery of standards is not achieved. The social studies progression plan has changed to support students with background knowledge of U.S. history prior to taking civics. Utilizing district instructional guides to solidify instruction of key concepts with anchor charts will be implemented in civics classrooms. Data will also be monitored through common formative assessments.

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

Utilizing data from 2018-2021 and IREADY data, we learned that the data component that showed the most improvement was The Alva School's math proficiency in grades three through eight. Math has continued to trend higher than the state or district in proficiency.

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

The contributing factors to this improvement in The Alva School's proficiency is the use of programs such as IREADY to provide individualized instruction and targeted intervention as well as implementing the teaching of prerequisite skills to cement learning of grade level standards.

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

The strategies that will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning at The Alva School is relying on data driven decision making, fluid placement of reading to respond to data, and enrichment opportunities to match the achievement level of the standards. In addition, teachers will be monitored to ensure that students are meeting the depth and rigor of the standards and provided intervention and enrichment as data indicates.

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 professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers are leaders at The Alva School are IREADY trainings as well as leading and learning trainings to have an in-depth understanding of standards. Leading and learning trainings to build capacity and knowledge of standards based instruction. Professional development is also provided in PLC's to learn best practices of data driven instruction.

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

Some additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year are focusing on implementing high yield instructional strategies to support students' learning. The Alva School will provide onboarding for new teachers and staff so that systems to increase proficiency are implemented. Teachers will continue to receive training to implement curriculum with fidelity and administration will monitor data and instruction through observation during learning walks and by participating in weekly PLCs.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Multi-Racial
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: It is one of only 2 ESSA areas that are below 41% - it is at 40%.

Measurable Outcome:	For our Multiracial students, we hope to achieve 45% proficiency, at minimum. There are very few students in this category for us, so we would like to increase the percentage significantly.
Monitoring:	Identification of individual students with their Core content teachers. Focus on specific student achievement during Quarterly Data Chats. Monitoring of Multiracial Students by Literacy Coaches at assigned Grade Levels.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nathan Shaker (nathans@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The strategy being implemented for our multiracial students is a double-block of English Language Arts as well as a double-block of Reading for those students in need. Research-based Reading programs that focus on phonics and comprehension/analysis. We will have regular data chats with students as well as teachers to promote gains and achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our curriculum department vets all research-based programs for use.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Summer scheduling based on academic performance.
2. Flexible and reactive scheduling based on progress monitoring and student need.
3. Access to after-school tutoring and targeted intervention.

Person Responsible	Nathan Shaker (nathans@leeschools.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	It is one of only 2 ESSA areas that are below 41% - it is at 40%.
Measurable Outcome:	For our SWD students, we plan to achieve 45% proficiency at a minimum. We will focus on gains this year with a goal of 70% in this subgroup.
Monitoring:	Identification of individual students with their Core content teachers. Focus on specific student achievement during Quarterly Data Chats. Monitoring of Multiracial Students by Literacy Coaches at assigned Grade Levels.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	The strategy being implemented for our SWD students is a double-block of English Language Arts as well as a double-block of Reading for those students in need. Research-based Reading programs that focus on phonics and comprehension/analysis. We will have regular data chats with students as well as teachers to promote gains and achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our curriculum department vets all research-based programs for use.

Action Steps to Implement

1) Summer scheduling based on academic performance
2) flexible and reactive scheduling based on progress monitoring and student need
3) access to after school tutoring and targeted intervention

Person Responsible	Nathan Shaker (nathans@leeschools.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to School Safety	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our referrals and suspensions for tobacco far exceeded other violations in the 2020-2021 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	We will decrease our instances of tobacco use by 50%. The Alva School had 20 instances of tobacco use. We will reduce this to less than 10 instances.
Monitoring:	We will monitor this quarterly with a school culture meeting that will assess all discipline data highlighting tobacco use.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Roseanne Perez (roseanneap@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students are required to participate in a three-day education program that is created by the Second Steps program. We also use a very proactive approach by providing training to parents and students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We believe that educating parents to be aware of the warning signs of tobacco use will help to flatten the curve in tobacco use.

Action Steps to Implement

1) Proactive meetings with parents
2) Use of the early warning system to identify at risk students
3) Quarterly meetings with all students to reinforce positive behaviors and reporting of concerns

Person Responsible	Nathan Shaker (nathans@leeschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Using 2021 ELA Assessment Data and our status as a RAISE school, we determined a need to focus on Reading Intervention and Reading Skills at grades 4 (48%) and 5 (41%).
Measurable Outcome:	Grades 4 and 5 will exceed 50% proficiency on the 2022 FSA, moving our school out of RAISE status. We will achieve this by focusing on a 70% gain score.
Monitoring:	We will monitor through iReady Progress Monitoring and frequent checks of district progress monitoring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Erica Cangialosi (ericajc@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Departmentalization and differentiated scheduling for both grades 4 and 5. Research based reading programs and frequent trainings from the curriculum department will be utilized. iReady for all students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our Curriculum Department vets all research-based programs for use.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Summer scheduling based on academic performance.
2. Flexible and reactive scheduling based on progress monitoring and student need.
3. Access to after-school tutoring and targeted intervention.

Person Responsible	Nathan Shaker (nathans@leeschools.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math performance was an area of concern, specifically in 5th grade, and in L25 Gains, based on FSA performance
Measurable Outcome:	By focusing on achieving 70% Learning Gains in Math, both overall and for L25, The Alva School will accomplish the goal of increasing proficiency.
Monitoring:	Assistant Principals will monitor based on district assessments, iReady performance, and quarterly data chats.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kimberly Schmidt (kimberlyds@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	District assessments, iReady performance, and quarterly data chats.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our Curriculum Department vets all research-based programs for use.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Summer scheduling based on academic performance.
2. Flexible and reactive scheduling based on progress monitoring and student need.
3. Access to after-school tutoring and targeted intervention.

Person Responsible	Nathan Shaker (nathans@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

Tobacco use is an area of concern following the COVID lockdowns. Violent Acts were also cited, but "fighting" and "physical attack" are not disproportionately high, relative to other middle schools. While the SafeSchoolsforAlex site ranks The Alva School as being "very high" in incidents, it appears to be more of a concern with lack of reporting around the state, then excessive incidence.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

The Alva School addresses building a positive school culture and environment by welcoming parent involvement and inviting them to open houses, 6th grade boot camp, festivals and more. In the beginning weeks of the school year, administration and staff instilled the culture of our school in our students. This included grade level meetings, open house and activities to help build connections between students, teachers, administration and families. The Alva School promotes a supportive and fulfilling environment as well as positive learning conditions that meet the needs of all students. Allowing parents and guardians to participate in open house and school-based activities allow for them to develop a deeper understanding of their students' goals, school procedures and curriculum. Events such as the fall festival, club meetings and sporting events are held throughout the year to promote a positive environment for students. This also allows for parents to view their students' behavior in the school setting and promote their positive work ethic and behavior.

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

The stakeholders that have a role in promoting a positive culture and environment at The Alva School are the administration, faculty and staff, community members, parents of students, board members and volunteers. Parents and guardians were invited to SAC and PTO at the start of the school year and have been reminded through parent link and flyers sent home with students. We also sent a google form that was sent to teachers at the beginning of the year requesting strategies to help meet SIP goals. Input was recorded from the planning portions of SAC meetings. Creating a positive culture includes the community events that are held by The Alva School. These events include but are not limited to band concerts, chorus concerts, seasonal festivals, clubs, student-parent nights and sporting events. Volunteers come into the

classroom to help promote reading, assist at sporting events as well as seasonal festivals. With their help, we are able to facilitate a positive culture among our community.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Multi-Racial	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: School Safety	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**