Dr Carrie D Robinson Littleton Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Dr Carrie D Robinson Littleton Elementary School

700 HUTTO RD, North Fort Myers, FL 33903

http://lit.leeschools.net//

Demographics

Principal: Monica Broughton

Start Date for this Principal: 9/20/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (50%)
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

Dr Carrie D Robinson Littleton Elementary School

700 HUTTO RD, North Fort Myers, FL 33903

http://lit.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)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	50%

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 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 Robinson Littleton Elementary staff, students, parents, and community believe that the education provided should meet the various needs of the people served. The curriculum will change as required to fulfill this responsibility by providing for the implementation of educational programs, instructional techniques, and classroom management systems. Our mission will be accomplished within the framework of the local and state educational goals.

Provide the school's vision statement.

There is a consensus that the education provided for students who attend Dr. Carrie D. Robinson Littleton Elementary School will determine our future role in the community, the character of our society, and the quality of lives of our children. Our students will be provided a structured education stressing strong foundational skills, as well as, a shared responsibility with parents and teachers.

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
Broughton, Monica	Principal	
Sanders, Jeff	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 9/20/2021, Monica Broughton

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.*
3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Total number of students enrolled at the school
489

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

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

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	103	63	84	91	73	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	489
Attendance below 90 percent	4	16	21	23	14	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	0	3	3	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	7	9	21	5	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Course failure in Math	0	1	5	8	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	17	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	20	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
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	5	13	18	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

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	2	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	58	79	78	66	68	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	427
Attendance below 90 percent	3	18	11	3	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	4	1	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	1	1	4	10	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	2	5	7	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	4	3	6	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	2	1	2	0	3	2	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	58	79	78	66	68	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	427
Attendance below 90 percent	3	18	11	3	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	4	1	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	1	1	4	10	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	2	5	7	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	4	3	6	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	2	1	2	0	3	2	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	

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				50%	57%	57%	44%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				57%	56%	58%	42%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				68%	50%	53%	43%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				48%	62%	63%	50%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				47%	65%	62%	56%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	54%	51%	45%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				43%	52%	53%	32%	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	41%	55%	-14%	58%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2021					
	2019	44%	54%	-10%	56%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	53%	61%	-8%	62%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	39%	62%	-23%	64%	-25%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
05	2021					
	2019	43%	58%	-15%	60%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	42%	50%	-8%	53%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						

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				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	7/10.8	11/15.5	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14/38.9	11/28.9	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0/25	2/50	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6/10.3	13/20	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	2/13.3	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	1/1.6	8/11.3	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/12.5	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	2/13.3	0/0

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10/23.3	14/29.2	15/29.4
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	4/9.5	9/18.8	14/28
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	1/14.3
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20/37.7	20/37	28/50.9
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/15.4	2/15.4	2/14.3
	English Language Learners	1/16.7	1/16.7	2/33.3
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	1/2	9/16.7	14/25.5
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	2/14.3
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	1/16.7

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23/31.9	35/45.5	48/59.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	3/20	3/20	5/31.3
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/25	2/40
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	8/18.2	19/41.3	18/38.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	2/15.4	2/14.3
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13/32.5	17/41.5	23/56.1
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/11.1	1/11.1	5/55.6
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

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	34	67		49	77		29				
ELL	38			56							
BLK	40			35							
HSP	51	60		53	63		52				
WHT	57	72		52	71		38				
FRL	52	69	45	47	62		38				

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	24	59		38	53	60					
ELL	22	73		39	60						
BLK	25	47		30	47						
HSP	49	68	92	44	46	59	36				
MUL	20			20							
WHT	57	49	44	57	46		58				
FRL	46	56	63	45	45	37	42				

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	19	20	9	38	50	27	40				
ELL	17	54		33	46						
BLK	27	42		35	37	20	20				
HSP	43	48	47	50	54	64	24				
MUL	50			40							
WHT	47	38	38	54	60	47	43				
FRL	40	43	44	45	52	44	29				

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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	443
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	51
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	38
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	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	58
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	51
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?

On a positive note, our overall proficiency in both reading and math increased from FY19 to FY21. ELA increased from 50% to 53%. Math increased from 48% to 51%. Once again, learning gains is a strength as well. ELA Learning Gains increased from 57% to 66% and Math learning Gains increased from 47% to 69%. This is a cause for celebration, given the unique set of circumstances faced. However, a closer look at subgroup data reveals these learning gains did not spread through the subgroups evenly. Math L25 increased from 38% to 69% while ELA L25 decreased significantly from 68% to 44%. Science saw a slight decrease, from 43% to 42%.

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

Based off progress monitoring and state assessments, ELA L25 Learning Gains, which saw a decrease from 68% to 44% demonstrates the greatest need for improvement. This dip in reading gains could also be a contributing factor to the 1% decrease in Science.

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

To say that last year presented unique contributing factors would be an understatement. Lack of time, an increase in outside stressors for both teachers and students, and mobility of students layered with the typical factors of student motivation, efficient use of instructional time, and adequate planning time made a significant impact in ELA. Looking deeper into the progress monitoring data, alongside our FSA scores, we can see two clear ELA subdomains in which Littleton students struggle- phonics and vocabulary. Many of the same factors from last year persist into this school year. Dedicated planning

time for teachers, to include half day quarterly sessions with grade level, resources permitting will improve targeted instruction.

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

Based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, our greatest area of improvement was Math L25, which increased from 38% to 73%. Following closely was Math Learning Gains which increased from 47%-69%.

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

Math was our highest priority need based on FY19 data. The action steps implemented included iReady progress monitoring, IXL Math, PLC analysis of iready and summative data, use of manipulatives to help students with concrete examples, daily use of math vocabulary and student/ teacher data chats and goal setting. High Yield Instructional Strategies were used across all content areas, including Math, to support students higher level thinking.

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

To accelerate learning we will need to target student needs by analyzing data in the PLC setting. Teachers will work collaboratively with grade level and cross grade level teachers to gather and utilize resources to close the gaps in student knowledge while also building grade level skill. A look at school wide sub-domain data for ELA shows two distinct areas, outside comprehension, that are low across the entire school- phonics and vocabulary. By focusing K-2 on strengthening routines through our school wide phonics programs and targeting students in grades 3-5 with specific intervention lessons to strengthen phonics skills, students will be more accurate getting the words off the page. Building vocabulary will also need to be a focus in every grade level if we are to accelerate learning. Primary grades will focus on the direct instruction of grade level content area and Tier 2 words. Grades 3-5 will do the same, but also use high leverage instructional strategies like affixes and roots to expand vocabulary at a greater rate. High Yield instructional strategies will also be essential to ensuring learning is accelerated across all grade levels and subgroups.

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.

Teachers have iReady training available for both interpreting data from progress monitoring and using the data to inform classroom instruction. iReady also has resources specific to each grade level standard to improve instruction. Really Great Reading Phonics trainings and refresher courses are available continuously throughout the year. Modeling of each of these strategies, as well as the unknown word routine and high leverage vocabulary strategies are offered by our Peer Collaborative Teachers and K-2 Literacy Coach. High yield strategies trainings, modeling, and support are also offered at the school level. PLCs meet weekly to address student learning and needs. Administration, Peer Collaborative Teachers, and K-2 Literacy Coach regularly attend these PLC meetings to assist with facilitation, analysis of data, or modeling strategies as needed.

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

Continued training on Really Great Reading phonics programs to ensure fidelity of implementation. Retraining and continued professional development on High Impact Strategies to ensure clarity and consistent use across all content areas. Modeling and coaching opportunities for high impact vocabulary strategies will continue to ensure sustainability.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	47% of Littleton students scored below Level 3 on the 2021 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment. 44% of students in grades kindergarten through grade 3, based on the 20-21 end of year screening and progress monitoring data are on track to score Level 3 or above on the grade 3 ELA assessment. By looking deeper into the reporting categories on our progress monitoring assessments, we can plainly see a comprehension issue exists. Students, across all grade levels, struggle with comprehension. A deeper look at the progress monitoring data indicates the cause of this comprehension gap lies in two specific domains- phonics and vocabulary. Across all grade levels, Littleton students struggle to get the print off the page accurately. They also struggle with the meanings of the words and phrases, both literal and figurative. Significant gaps in basic and advanced phonics skills combined with lack of vocabulary knowledge are the root cause for the majority of Littleton students' difficulty with comprehension of both literary and informational texts. Students are missing many foundational skills leading to poor decoding and unwillingness to practice a laborious task. Vocabulary learning occurs when students notice a new word, guess the meaning of the word, and retain the new knowledge. An unwillingness to actively participate in reading creates an environment where students are not engaging in this process. The reading homework is not being done by many students, even just reading each night. We need to increase active practicing of reading during school day to ensure all students have practice time. Vocabulary development remains a focus though our Curriculum Maps and Instructional Guides. Really Great Reading is used schoolwide to support grade levels for phonics instruction and intervention.
Measurable Outcome:	The ELA Achievement of 3rd-5th grade students will increase from 53% to 58%, ELA Learning Gains of 5th grade students will increase from 66% to 71%, and ELA Lowest 25th Percentile of 5th grade students will increase from 44% to 50% as measured by the FSA 2022.
Monitoring:	District Progress Monitoring which includes iReady Reading and DIBELS will be used to ensure we are making gains to our desired outcome. PLCs meet weekly, with administration, peer collaborative teachers, or literacy coach to analyze data and plan for interventions or enrichment for all students, including ESSA identified subgroups black and multiracial.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Monica Broughton (monicatb@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	High-Yield Instructional Strategies: 1. Numbered Heads Collaborative Pairs 2. Distributed Summarizing 3. Text-Dependent Questioning 4. Writing to Raise Achievement 5. Higher-Order Thinking
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	High-Yield Strategies are researched-based instructional practices linked to increased student achievement. The strategies support students' higher-level thinking with the goal of using level 3 or 4 question on Webb's Depth of Knowledge. High-Yield Strategies are instructional based. They can be applied across all content areas and enable teachers to focus on improving the quality of instruction students will receive to fill phonics gaps, build student vocabulary, and ensure students are using these newly acquired skills to build comprehension of grade level texts. As a bonus, these strategies can also be used to

improve student retention and understanding across all other content areas. A focus on instructional practices allows for greater impact in student learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Progress monitoring using i-Ready
2. Utilization of IXL & Flocabulary for ELA
3. PLC analyzation of data collected from i-Ready Reading and summatives to determine students' needs and what to implement to help the students not meeting the standards
4. Utilization of the Curriculum Maps and Instructional Guides
5. Research-based High-Yield Strategies will be documented in Lesson Plans
6. Focused intervention groups across each grade level to target student need.
7. Reading Parent Involvement Night (virtual event) is scheduled for September 13, 2021
8. Teachers will conference 1:1 with students about their performance and goal setting
9. Administration will attend PLC meetings, pull data from Performance Matters, and see that the Curriculum
Maps are being followed based on walk-throughs and lesson plans. These strategies will be implemented with all subgroups including black and multiracial. Monitoring data of every single student including the ESSA subgroup.

Person Responsible   Monica Broughton (monicatb@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	FY21 FSA data indicates an increase in Math Achievement. Math Achievement increased from 48% to 51%, Learning Gains from 47% to 69%, and Math Lowest 25th Percentile from 38% to 73%. This area is a critical need as it was our highest priority the previous school year. It is critical for sustainability of student growth and proficiency that we maintain the structures put into place. Content area vocabulary development and ample practice opportunities to ensure mastery of skills, including the use of manipulatives, must continue to ensure sustainability.
Measurable Outcome:	The Math Achievement of 3rd-5th grade students will increase from 51% to 55%, Math Learning Gains of 5th grade students will increase from 69% to 70%, and Math Lowest 25th Percentile of 5th grade students will increase from 73% to 74% as measured by the FSA 2022.
Monitoring:	District Progress Monitoring which includes iReady Math and Standards Based assessments will be used to ensure we are making gains needed to reach our desired outcome for all students, including identified ESSA subgroups black and multiracial.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Monica Broughton (monicatb@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	High-Yield Instructional Strategies: 1. Numbered Heads Collaborative Pairs 2. Distributed Summarizing 3. Text-Dependent Questioning 4. Writing to Raise Achievement 5. Higher-Order Thinking
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	High-Yield Strategies are researched-based instructional practices linked to increased student achievement. The strategies support students' higher-level thinking with the goal of using level 3 or 4 question on Webb's Depth of Knowledge. High-Yield Strategies are instructional based. They can be applied across all content areas and enable teachers to focus on improving the quality of instruction students receive. A focus on instructional practices allows for greater impact in student learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Progress monitoring using i-Ready
2. Utilization of IXL Math
3. PLC analyzation of data collected from i-Ready Math and summatives to determine students' needs and what to implement to help the students not meeting the standards
4. Utilization of Curriculum Maps and Instructional Guides
5. Math manipulatives will be utilized in all classrooms to help students with concrete examples
6. Math Vocabulary will be used daily with students.
7. Parent Involvement Night with an emphasis on math is scheduled for January 2021.
8. Teachers will conference 1:1 with students about their performance and goal setting
9. Administration will attend PLC meetings, pull data from Performance Matters and see that the Curriculum Maps are being followed based on walk-throughs and lesson plans. These strategies will be implemented with all subgroups including black and multiracial. Monitoring data of every single student including the ESSA subgroups.

Person Responsible	Monica Broughton (monicatb@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.

Disruption and insubordination continue to be the greatest areas of concern, as the actions lead to internal suspension (ISS) or out of school suspension (OSS). Teacher support is critical to ensure students are in the classroom focused on learning. Behavior disruptions negatively impact the student receiving the referral, as well as, the learning environment of all students. Instructional time is lost for all students when behavior escalates, especially for the student removed from the learning environment for any period of time.

We will continue the use of Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports (PBIS) school wide which allows for positive referral recognition and clear behavioral consequences. This approach emphasizes instruction of appropriate behaviors.

PBIS allows for consistent implementation of school behavior expectations across campus for the majority of our population and the flexibility to work with students who need more support learning appropriate choices in the school environment. PBIS allows teachers and specialists on our campus to work on identifying the specific behaviors to address, establishing goal(s) for change and step(s) required to achieve it, procedures for recognizing and monitoring changed behavior, and the flexibility to choose the appropriate behavioral strategies that will be most effective for students with higher need.

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.

At the beginning of the school year, parents and students are invited to Meet Your Teacher, School Advisory Committee (SAC) and Annual Title I meeting where staff shares the vision, mission, and culture of the school.Analyzation of data for all student groups to include regular ed, ELL, ESE, L25, and FRL, is shared with faculty and staff in addition to SAC which is comprised of parents, faculty, community members, and business partners at the beginning of the school year and also at the end of each quarter. This is done to monitor the progress of student performance and to determine what adjustments may be needed and what areas to celebrate. Also, throughout the school year, curriculum and parent involvement events are held with a focus on reading, math, and Science. Parents receive their child's progress monitoring report to include strategies to use to help their child be successful. Communication to families about school events

are provided via newsletters, School Messenger, school's weekly communication folder, marquee, flyers, and the website.

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

To ensure that we have community and business partners as stakeholders, they are extended the opportunity to be a part of the School Advisory Council and/or mailed a letter requesting their partnership. Input from stakeholders is collected through surveys after parent involvement events and during SAC meetings. The administration has an open door policy, thus parents and other stakeholders are able to communicate in person of their suggestions and/or concerns. Relationship-building is a clear priority for all faculty and staff members. A variety of methods are used to set a positive tone and clarify the values that will guide interpersonal interaction between students and between the teacher and students starting with day one and continues throughout the school year.

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
		Total:	**$0.00**