

The School District of Lee County

Manatee Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

Manatee Elementary School

5301 TICE ST, Fort Myers, FL 33905

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

Demographics

Principal: Scott Lemaster

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: B (58%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: D (39%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Manatee Elementary School

5301 TICE ST, Fort Myers, FL 33905

<http://man.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	89%

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.

Manatee Elementary will develop world class citizens ready for the future through mindfulness, engaged learning, academic excellence, and Teamwork.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Manatee Elementary.....Leading the Way, Every Student, Every Day.

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
Sherman, Diane	Principal	
Forkey, Tammy	Assistant Principal	
Restino, Caitlin	Assistant Principal	
McGarvey, Crystal	Reading Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 9/20/2021, Scott Lemaster

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.*

6

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Total number of students enrolled at the school

810

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	100	124	142	159	129	156	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	810
Attendance below 90 percent	7	43	43	46	36	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	215
One or more suspensions	0	3	6	5	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA	1	21	18	39	45	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158
Course failure in Math	1	13	12	23	32	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	36	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	9	40	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
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	21	19	35	52	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	188

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	2	1	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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				40%	57%	57%	29%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	56%	58%	44%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	50%	53%	46%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				64%	62%	63%	41%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				80%	65%	62%	62%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				69%	54%	51%	58%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				45%	52%	53%	23%	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	31%	58%	-27%	58%	-27%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	41%	55%	-14%	58%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
05	2021					
	2019	40%	54%	-14%	56%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	56%	61%	-5%	62%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	68%	62%	6%	64%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2021					
	2019	58%	58%	0%	60%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	41%	50%	-9%	53%	-12%
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	9/8.7	16/14.2	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	1/1.8	5/8.6	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11/10.6	11/9.7	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/25	0/0
	English Language Learners	3/5.5	4/6.9	0/0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	7/5.3	18/12.9	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	4/5.5	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	3/2.3	6/4.3	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/11.1	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	2/2.7	0/0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	16/14.4	23/20.5	40/35.7
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	1/2.9	1/2.9	7/20
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	2/2.2	15/15.6	25/25.8
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/3.2	7/21.9
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	15/12.9	32/25	35/26.9
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/12.5	2/12.5	1/6.3
	English Language Learners	1/2.3	6/12.5	8/16.3
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	3/2.6	21/16.8	34/27.4
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	2/13.3
	English Language Learners	1/2.3	8/16.3	12/25.5

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15/12.8	35/27.8	38/29.5
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	1/9.1
	English Language Learners	1/1.9	8/13.8	13/21.7
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15/12.9	33/26.4	47/37
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/25	1/11.1	2/18.2
	English Language Learners	4/7.5	10/17.2	18/30.5
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14/12.5	36/29.3	41/34.7
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	2/3.9	11/19.3	14/25.5

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	17	58		24	45						
ELL	34	66	71	55	65	68	29				
BLK	33	40		33	46		17				
HSP	38	64	74	56	63	70	31				
WHT	53			63							
FRL	37	58	75	51	54	47	27				
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	18	48	47	33	80	79	55				
ELL	32	45	58	62	76	59	33				
BLK	35	58	63	49	73	76	38				
HSP	40	50	55	67	81	66	41				

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
WHT	48	72		60	89		75				
FRL	36	50	58	61	79	68	41				
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	2	39	54	6	56	50	14				
ELL	19	41	39	33	57	58	15				
BLK	24	39	31	26	53	47	13				
HSP	26	43	47	41	63	62	19				
MUL	46			62							
WHT	48	42		50	64		31				
FRL	28	42	45	39	62	61	18				

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	54
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	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	433
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	92%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	56
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	34
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	57
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?

Low proficiency in Reading and Science achievement.

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

Proficiency in ELA and 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?

LY student population will work in small groups with ESOL paraprofessionals.
Imagine Learning will be implemented to support their learning.

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

ELA learning gains for the lowest 25% was 71%

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

A focus on daily intervention and iReady targeted instruction.

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

Targeted small group instruction and more frequent progress monitoring.

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.

SIOP training; High-Yield Strategies; Teach Like a Champion strategies; and Cooperative Learning Strategies.

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

An ESOL specialist will provide training in ESOL strategies and our APPLES teachers will be supported by Mentors who coach and model effective teaching strategies.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

4th- The 2020-2021 FSA ELA Proficiency data showed that our LY students were significantly lower than all other subgroups. Overall, 49 out of 117 students were proficient (41.9%). Out of the 49 proficient students, 12.24% (6) were Black, 12.24% (6) were White, 69.39% (34) were Hispanic, and 6.12% (3) were Mixed. When comparing subgroups, LY students were substantially lower. 33 LY students were tested, and only 3 (9.1%) were proficient. It was also noted that 0 out of 4 ESE students were proficient. However, with LY being a larger group, and 3 out of the 4 ESE students are LY, the impact of focusing on the LY subgroup would be greater. As a result, our goal is learning gains towards proficiency with our 4th grade LY students.

Measurable Outcome: In 2021-2022 4th grade LY proficiency in ELA will increase from 9.1% to 14% as measured by the Spring FSA ELA assessment.

Monitoring: Student progress towards proficiency will be monitored through iReady Reading, Exemplar Standards Mastery, Quarterly Comprehensives, and Data Chats with classroom teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Diane Sherman (dianems@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers will be utilizing SIOP strategies to deliver instruction to our LY students. Additionally ESOL para professionals will support the SIOP model during small group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The SIOP model supports high quality instruction for all students, such as cooperative learning, strategies for reading comprehension, writers workshop, and differentiated instruction. The model also adds the following key features: inclusion of language objective, development of background knowledge, content related vocabulary, and academic literacy practice.

Action Steps to Implement**Training**

Our ESOL Specialist will provide refresher training to teachers previously trained in SIOP, Teachers new to SDLC will receive the SIOP model inclusive training. Additionally training will be provided for our paraprofessionals.

The person responsible for this action step is Jessica Ambrose, our ESOL Specialist.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Coaching and Modeling

District ESOL Specialists, Resource Teachers, and Experienced SIOP Teachers will model SIOP strategies and provide coaching to teachers.

Person Responsible Caitlin Restino (caitlingr@leeschools.net)

Classroom walk throughs

Administration will document use of SIOP strategies through lesson plans, classroom walk throughs, targeted observations, and formal observations.

Person Responsible Tammy Forkey (tammywf@leeschools.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 5th- The 2020-2021 FSA ELA Proficiency data showed that our LY students were significantly lower than all other subgroups. Overall, 44 out of 130 students were proficient (33.8%). Out of the 44 proficient students, 18.18% (8) were Black, 11.36% (5) were White, 63.64% (28) were Hispanic, 4.55% (2) were Mixed, and 2.27% (1) were Asian. When comparing subgroups, LY students were substantially lower. 34 LY students were tested, and only 1 (2.9%) was proficient. It was also noted that only 1 out of 11 ESE students was proficient. However, with LY being a larger group, and 6 of the 11 ESE students are LY, the impact of focusing on the LY subgroup would be greater. As a result, our goal is learning gains towards proficiency with our 5th grade LY students.

Measurable Outcome: In 2021-2022 5th grade LY proficiency in ELA will increase from 2.9% to 6% as measured by the Spring FSA ELA assessment.

Monitoring: Student progress towards proficiency will be monitored through iReady Reading, Exemplar Standards Mastery, Quarterly Comprehensives, and Data Chats with classroom teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will be utilizing SIOP strategies to deliver instruction to our LY students. Additionally ESOL para professionals will support the SIOP model during small group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The SIOP model supports high quality instruction for all students, such as cooperative learning, strategies for reading comprehension, writers workshop, and differentiated instruction. The model also adds the following key features: inclusion of language objective, development of background knowledge, content related vocabulary, and academic literacy practice.

Action Steps to Implement**Training**

Our ESOL Specialist will provide refresher training to teachers previously trained in SIOP, Teachers new to SDLC will receive the SIOP model inclusive training. Additionally training will be provided for our paraprofessionals.

The person responsible for this action step is Jessica Ambrose, our ESOL Specialist.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Coaching and Modeling

District ESOL Specialists, Resource Teachers, and Experienced SIOP Teachers will model SIOP strategies and provide coaching to teachers.

Person Responsible Caitlin Restino (caitlingr@leeschools.net)

Classroom walk throughs

Administration will document use of SIOP strategies through lesson plans, classroom walk throughs, targeted observations, and formal observations.

Person Responsible Tammy Forkey (tammywf@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.

n/a

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 PBiS program provides schoolwide expectations and rewards using the S.T.A.R. acronym.

S- show respect

T- treat others kindly

A- always be safe

R- reach for the stars.

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

PBiS team consisting of the School Counselor, ESE representative, classroom teachers and administration.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00