

The School District of Lee County

# Franklin Park Elementary School



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>26</b>

# Franklin Park Elementary School

2323 FORD ST, Fort Myers, FL 33916

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Mia German**

Start Date for this Principal: 9/20/2021

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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 Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (48%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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](http://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

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>26</b>

# Franklin Park Elementary School

2323 FORD ST, Fort Myers, FL 33916

<http://frk.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	97%

## 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.

Our mission is to maintain a positive learning culture, where everyone performs at a high level and takes pride in success.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Franklin Park Elementary is to be a world-class school.

### 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
Freeman, Michelle	Principal	
German, Mia	Assistant Principal	
Lewis, Abby	Assistant Principal	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 9/20/2021, Mia German

**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.*

1

**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.*

8

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

395

**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	54	71	64	91	55	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	395
Attendance below 90 percent	9	15	17	30	18	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	0	3	3	7	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA	1	9	3	7	5	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in Math	1	0	3	8	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	24	25	0	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	33	28	0	0	0	0	0	64
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	5	5	14	29	36	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	0	3	1	7	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	

**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	71	68	84	71	61	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	418
Attendance below 90 percent	21	11	24	14	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	4	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	0	4	6	15	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Course failure in Math	0	3	3	12	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

**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	4	13	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

**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	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	71	68	84	71	61	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	418
Attendance below 90 percent	21	11	24	14	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	4	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	0	4	6	15	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Course failure in Math	0	3	3	12	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

**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	4	13	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

**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	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis****School Data Review**

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



School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				42%	57%	57%	39%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				56%	56%	58%	47%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				69%	50%	53%	39%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				52%	62%	63%	49%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				74%	65%	62%	68%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				81%	54%	51%	61%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				13%	52%	53%	36%	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	46%	58%	-12%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	49%	55%	-6%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
05	2021					
	2019	25%	54%	-29%	56%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	49%	61%	-12%	62%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	45%	62%	-17%	64%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2021					
	2019	51%	58%	-7%	60%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	15%	50%	-35%	53%	-38%
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.

<b>Grade 1</b>				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	1/2.1	5/10	1/100
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	2/33.3	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0/0	3/6.4	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/16.7	0/0

  

<b>Grade 2</b>				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	5/6.9	7/10	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/20	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	1/1.4	4/6	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	4/12.1	3/9.4	5/14.7
	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	1/3.2	2/6.1	4/11.8
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	9/17.6	20/38.5	21/38.2
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/33.3	1/33.3	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	1/16.7
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0/0	4/7.4	11/20.4
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14/23.7	15/25.4	18/27.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	1/11.1
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/16.7	1/14.3
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	1/1.6	5/8.1	10/15.4
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	1/11.1
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	1/14.3
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7/12.5	16/24.2	18/28.1
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/11.1	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/14.3	1/14.3

## 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	8										
ELL	13			19							
BLK	23	36	54	18	15	15	17				
HSP	38			32							
FRL	28	43	54	21	15	14	23				
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	21	63		36	79						
ELL	19	63	60	52	72						
BLK	42	54	71	51	71	78	14				
HSP	41	57		56	75		20				
FRL	42	58	77	51	74	87	14				

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	14	7		18	29						
ELL	17	30		58	64						
BLK	38	45	31	49	70	65	30				
HSP	38	45		44	58		40				
FRL	38	46	36	48	68	61	32				

### 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	32
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	255
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	4
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	31
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	25
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	41
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	34
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?**

There was a drop in ELA proficiency across 3rd and 4th grade from 2019 to 2021. There was also a significant drop in math proficiency from 2019 to 2021 in all grade levels. Additionally, gains dropped in both ELA and Math for 5th grade. Our ESE population dropped in both ELA and Math proficiency and gains. Our ELL population also dropped in both ELA and Math proficiency and gains.

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

Math is our greatest need for improvement in both proficiency and learning gains across all grade levels. Math proficiency in 2019 was 52% and in 2021 it was 22%. ELA proficiency and learning gains is in need of improvement for grades 3 and 4. ELA proficiency in 2019 for 3rd grade was 49% and in 2021 it was 18%. ELA proficiency in 2019 for 4th grade was 52% and in 2021 it was 26%.

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

Excessive absences for both students and staff due to a need to quarantine was a contributing factor. Additionally, out of the 11 classes of 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade, all teachers on those grade levels were new teachers, with 4 being interns that started in November. Instructional models varied for students throughout the school year. Referral data and out of school suspension contributed to a loss of instructional time which impacted student achievement. New actions include retaining teachers on those grade levels, providing professional development on social emotional learning, adding academic and behavior coaches, and strategically utilizing our PCTs.

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

Our 5th grade ELA proficiency increased from 25% in 2019 to 38% in 2021. Our Science proficiency also increased from 13% in 2019 to 23% in 2021.

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

In 5th grade ELA, a contributing factor for the improvement was creating a designated intervention time that was standard/skill specific to student needs. Coaches pushed in or pulled out during this block of time to provide additional support and lower the class size. For Science, the focus was on understanding the content through labs which provided hands-on learning for the students. A new program, Generation Genius was also implemented that provided content support, visuals, and contained a literacy component which students found engaging. Finally, the science coach pushed in to all the 5th grade classes to provide teacher and student support.

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

One strategy to implement is to extend the strategic intervention plan used in 5th grade to 3rd and 4th grade. Content coaches and PCTs meeting regularly with grade levels to provide support to teachers and students. District level coaches meet monthly with administration and coaches. Focusing on attendance and school-wide PBIS to improve academic progress.

**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.**

A monthly professional development calendar was created to address content-specific and instructional best practices. Professional development includes Conscious Discipline, Second Step, i-Ready, high-yield strategies such as writing for achievement, cooperative learning, and concept mapping, and utilizing resources from district in both math and reading. Professional development on our school-wide digital data wall and using data to make instructional decisions regarding student achievement.

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

A focus on improving school-wide culture by increasing staff appreciation and celebrations. We are dedicated with providing our new teachers with coaches to ensure onboarding and continuous support. School-wide implementation of PBIS/SEL by using 2nd Step to teach the SEL Core Competencies. Collaborating with district leadership to ensure the additional personnel will continue to be funded.

### **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

#### **Areas of Focus:**



**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	The percent of students in grades 3-5 scoring at the proficient level decreased from 42% in 2019 to 27% in 2021.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Increase the percent of proficient students in grades 3-5 from 27% to 35% as measured by the FY22 ELA FSA.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	Proficiency progress will be monitored using our school-level ELA standards assessments and our quarterly progress monitoring assessment, i-Ready Reading Diagnostic. An Academic Focus Team meets monthly to discuss progress, determine coaching needs for teachers, and discuss intervention practices. This team includes administration, PCTs (peer collaborative teachers), and content coaches.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Abby Lewis (abbyll@leeschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Using data to drive instructional decisions and develop specific learning paths based on student needs. Data from iReady student lessons, school-level assessments (Standards Mastery assessments from iReady), fluency data (Dibels) and classroom formative assessments will be used to make adjustments to each student's intervention plan, iReady learning path, and differentiated learning for small group instruction and independent practice.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	The rationale of data analysis is to improve instruction and in turn improve student learning. Data-driven decisions allow teachers to improve their responsiveness to students and ensure the instruction they receive is relevant to their needs.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Develop digital data wall to track progress monitoring data and data chat protocols for teachers/coaches to utilize with one another and with students.

**Person Responsible** Abby Lewis (abbyll@leeschools.net)

2. Train teachers on the digital data wall, iReady tracking tools, iReady reports, and iReady resources for instruction.

**Person Responsible** Abby Lewis (abbyll@leeschools.net)

3. Secure professional development training for teachers with trainers from iReady (Curriculum Associates).

**Person Responsible** Abby Lewis (abbyll@leeschools.net)

4. Teachers, with help of coaches, are tracking student iReady learning paths and have data chats with their students on an on-going basis and making adjustments to their learning path as necessary based on the data.

**Person Responsible** Abby Lewis (abbyll@leeschools.net)

5. Develop a strategic intervention plan utilizing data from iReady Diagnostics, Read 180 inventory assessments, and classroom assessments to modify instruction as needed. The intervention plan consists of additional support staff to provide small group instruction at all levels.

**Person Responsible** Abby Lewis (abbyll@leeschools.net)

6. Plan and implement learning walks for teachers to go into classrooms to observe best practices for classroom management, small group and differentiated instruction.

**Person Responsible** Abby Lewis (abbyll@leeschools.net)

7. Weekly grade level PLCs with a focus on data with coaches.

**Person Responsible** Abby Lewis (abbyll@leeschools.net)

8. Quarterly teachers meet with administration to discuss data from iReady diagnostic and to reflect on student learning progress.

**Person Responsible** Abby Lewis (abbyll@leeschools.net)

**#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Franklin Park's student discipline referrals have increased over the last several years. More teacher referrals indicate a growing concern on how discipline impacts teaching and learning. In addition, the increase of teacher referrals indicated a need to implement a school-wide research based behavior program. Disruptions, wasted class time to control behavior, and students spending time in the Panther Den decreased overall instructional time for all students.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	During the 2021-2022 school year, Franklin Park Elementary will increase the academic learning time for our students by reducing the number of student referrals by 50%, going from 419 to 209 as measured by student referral data in Focs.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	The discipline team meets monthly to discuss school-wide discipline data. This team includes admin, Dean, Behavior Coach, Intervention Specialist, SW, & Counselor. The referral data is analyzed by incident, student, and grade-level. A plan of action is put in place to address the area(s) of concern.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Mia German (miagg@leeschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Franklin Park will use a Tiered approach, adopting PBIS and Conscious Discipline that will focus on teaching appropriate behaviors with an emphasis on student's being positive & kind, respectful, making wise choices, and being safe & in control. In addition, students will be taught how to self-regulate and identify their emotions. PBIS is a researched-based system to support students in making acceptable choices in a positive, non-reactive manner. Conscious Discipline is an evidence-based, trauma-informed approach to interacting with students focused on developing their self-regulation skills. It emphasizes the power of the teacher to be the change they wish to see by meeting students' upset with a calm, strategic response to move students toward safety, connection and problem-solving. In addition, a focus on SEL will be implemented school-wide by using 2nd Step to teach the SEL Core Competencies.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	PBIS and Second Step aligns with the FLDOE & MTSS Project and also aligns with School District's of Lee County's Envision 2030 Goal 9 to decrease OSS. Goal 9 also directly supports Envision 2030 Goals 2-8, which focuses on student academic performance. Increased time in school leads to increases in academic progress.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Create a PBIS leadership team to develop school wide PBIS expectations, matrix, voice levels & revamp the discipline plan (PBIS Team).
2. Invite a Conscious Discipline trainer to preschool week to share how the brain works of students who have experienced trauma and why they fight/flight (Admin).
3. Create a staff presentation for Preschool week to introduce PBIS/CD & the new SEL handbook (PBIS Team).
4. Rebrand and print PBIS posters for classrooms and common areas (Admin).
5. Implement bi-monthly Panther store & quarterly celebrations (PBIS Team).
6. Implement digital Second Step Program (K-5) to teach SEL and create 20 minutes of SEL/morning meetings time into master schedule (classroom teachers/admin)
7. Create a structure for SEL/PBIS PLCs & PD. Teams will meet monthly to focus on SEL/PBIS; PBIS core team will meet monthly to review data & implementation; Schoolwide PBIS/SEL PD will occur 1st Tuesday monthly (all)

**Person Responsible** Mia German (miagg@leeschools.net)

8. Integrate PBIs/SEL strategies into all SAC & Parent Meetings (Admin).
9. Mid-year and end-of-year of progress monitoring toward goal of implementing SEL/PBIS into FPE's culture (PBIS Team).
10. Celebrate success throughout the year and create a culture where kids and staff can teach and learn (all).

**Person Responsible** Mia German (miagg@leeschools.net)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	The percent of students in grades 3-5 scoring at the proficient level decreased from 52% in 2019 to 22% in 2021.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Increase the percent of proficient students in grades 3-5 from 22% to 30% as measured by the FY22 Math FSA.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	Proficiency progress will be monitored using our school-level Math standards assessments and our quarterly progress monitoring assessment, i-Ready Math Diagnostic. An Academic Focus Team meets monthly to discuss progress, determine coaching needs for teachers, and discuss intervention practices. This team includes administration, PCTs (peer collaborative teachers), and content coaches.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Abby Lewis (abbyll@leeschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Using data to drive instructional decisions and develop specific learning paths based on student needs. Data from iReady student lessons, school-level assessments (Math Exemplars from the District), and classroom formative assessments will be used to make adjustments to each student's intervention plan, iReady learning path, and differentiated learning for small group instruction and independent practice.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	The rationale of data analysis is to improve instruction and in turn improve student learning. Data-driven decision allows teachers to improve their responsiveness to students and ensure the instruction they receive is relevant to their needs.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Develop digital data wall to track progress monitoring data and data chat protocols for teachers/coaches to utilize with one another and with students.

**Person Responsible** Abby Lewis (abbyll@leeschools.net)

2. Train teachers on the digital data wall, iReady tracking tools, iReady reports, and iReady resources for instruction.

**Person Responsible** Abby Lewis (abbyll@leeschools.net)

3. Secure professional development training for teachers with trainers from iReady (Curriculum Associates).

**Person Responsible** Abby Lewis (abbyll@leeschools.net)

4. Teachers, with help of coaches, are tracking student iReady learning paths and have data chats with their students on an on-going basis and making adjustments to their learning path as necessary based on the data.

**Person Responsible** Abby Lewis (abbyll@leeschools.net)

5. Develop a strategic intervention plan utilizing data from iReady Diagnostics, Master Track assessments, Reflex, Performance Coach and classroom assessments to modify instruction as needed. The intervention plan consists of additional support staff to provide small group instruction at all levels.

**Person Responsible** Abby Lewis (abbyll@leeschools.net)

6. Plan and implement learning walks for teachers to go into classrooms to observe best practices for classroom management, small group and differentiated instruction.

**Person Responsible** Abby Lewis (abbyll@leeschools.net)

7. Weekly grade level PLCs with a focus on data with coaches.

**Person Responsible** Abby Lewis (abbyll@leeschools.net)

8. Quarterly teachers meet with administration to discuss data from iReady diagnostic and to reflect on student learning progress.

**Person Responsible** Abby Lewis (abbyll@leeschools.net)

**#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners****Area of****Focus****Description  
and****Rationale:**

The percent of ELL students in grades 3-5 scoring at the proficient level decreased from 13% in 2019 to 8% in 2021.

**Measurable  
Outcome:**

Increase the percent of proficient ELL students in grades 3-5 from 8% to 15% as measured by the FY22 ELA FSA.

**Monitoring:**

Proficiency progress will be monitored using our school-level ELA standards assessments and our quarterly progress monitoring assessment, i-Ready Reading Diagnostic. An Academic Focus Team meets monthly to discuss progress, determine coaching needs for teachers, and discuss intervention practices. This team includes administration, PCTs (peer collaborative teachers), and content coaches.

**Person  
responsible  
for  
monitoring  
outcome:**

Abby Lewis (abbyll@leeschools.net)

**Evidence-  
based  
Strategy:**

A focus on explicitly teaching key vocabulary through student friendly terminology, visuals, and total physical response strategies.

**Rationale  
for****Evidence-  
based  
Strategy:**

Explicitly teaching vocabulary is an effective literacy instructional strategy for English Language Learners that can enhance reading comprehension. Intervention research suggests that ELLs benefit from rich, intensive vocabulary instruction that embodies "student-friendly" definitions, engages students in meaningful use of word meanings, and regularly review word usage.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Teachers will use Flocabulary, vocabulary cards, and interactive journals to explicitly teach and practice content/academic vocabulary.

**Person  
Responsible**

Abby Lewis (abbyll@leeschools.net)

Teachers write the standard/objective on the board for ELA, Math, SEL, and Science. The standard/objective is then broken down in student friendly language and visuals are used as necessary.

**Person  
Responsible**

Abby Lewis (abbyll@leeschools.net)

The Imagine Learning program will be used during the intervention block for those LY students with the lowest English Language proficiency.

**Person  
Responsible**

Abby Lewis (abbyll@leeschools.net)

**#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	The percent of SWD students in grades 3-5 scoring at the proficient level decreased from 21% in 2019 to 8% in 2021.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Increase the percent of proficient SWD students in grades 3-5 from 8% to 16% as measured by the FY22 ELA FSA.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	This Area of Focus will be monitored by the i-Ready Diagnostics taken three times yearly. The ESE teacher will meet monthly with administration to discuss growth in-between testing. The ESE teacher will monitor this data and make adjustments to instruction as needed.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Abby Lewis (abbyll@leeschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Phonics based instruction to fill in learning gaps on foundational skills not mastered.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	When students have strong foundational reading skills, their benefits can be seen in better word-level reading, improved reading accuracy, and increased reading rate. Once a strong foundation is in place, students' ability to tackle complex text increases as well as their reading comprehension.

**Action Steps to Implement**

During the intervention block, students will receive supplemental phonics instruction using Really Great Reading.

**Person Responsible** Abby Lewis (abbyll@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.

**Franklin Park Elementary School reported 0 incidents per 100 students is less than the Statewide elementary school rate of 1.0 incidents per 100 students. According to our 2020-21 FOCUS referral data, peer conflict is the primary concern with a secondary concern of disruptive behavior. With a school-wide focus on SEL by using Conscious Discipline, Second Step, and PBIS the incidents from our areas of concern will decrease. During the monthly PBIS team meetings, referral data will be analyzed by incident, grade-level, and student. This team will then use the 4 PLC questions to come up with a plan to address our areas of concerns. In addition our grade-level SEL PLCs and monthly SEL PDs will allow us to monitor the school culture and environment when it comes to student behavior.**



## 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, families and students are invited to our open house where families get a chance to meet their teachers. Our team focuses on creating a welcoming campus atmosphere that leaves a very good 1st impression. During our open house tables are set up to include transportation, aftercare, etc. to help the families with everything they need to get off to a great school year. During our school year we have our Annual Title 1, Parent Engagement, & SAC meetings. This is where the Principal shares the vision, mission, and culture of the school. Throughout the year a variety of sessions are planned to inform all stakeholders about curriculum, PBIS, and how to help kids at home just to name a few. We send out correspondence via school messenger, newsletter, social media sites, Peachjar, and marquee, inviting everyone to our meetings. Families are always given a survey at the end of each session so we can see how to better serve their needs.

The Sunshine Committee and Admin also does something each month to let the teachers know that they are appreciated. The Happy Cart that spreads happiness through treats, admin breaks for teachers, notes of appreciation are some of the things we do for staff to build a positive culture and environment.

Celebrating student success also is a way we build a positive school culture and environment. On a daily basis children can earn Panther Bucks for showing school-wide expectations. There are classroom and school-wide celebrations. Children are taught that our school is a safe place where they can learn but they are expected to follow expectations. Processes are put in place that deal with behavior and parents are apart of the plan. Our goal is to have a school where teachers want to come to work and children can't wait to get here each day.

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

The Gentlemen's Welcome is a community event that welcomes children and families back to school on the 1st Day of School. Community members, FP alumna, & school district employees come out on the 1st day of school to celebrate children and families. This well attended event lets families know that they are welcomed and that we care about them. Organizations set up tables to pass out valuable information about community resources and with the intent to reduce barriers so kids can be successful in school. We have many community partners that provide resources for the staff and students.

United Way is a very valuable Community Partner that is housed on our campus. The addition of UW is making a difference in the lives of our school community. Their main focus on the family helps promote a positive culture and environment at FPE. Parent Workshops, take home weekend meals, uniform and bill pay assistance are just some of the services that they provide. They also do things for the teachers throughout the 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: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00