

The School District of Lee County

# Mirror Lakes 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>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Mirror Lakes Elementary School

525 CHARWOOD AVE S, Lehigh Acres, FL 33974

<http://mle.leeschools.net>

## Demographics

**Principal: Amy Bobak**

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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (41%) 2016-17: C (42%)
<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, [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](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>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Mirror Lakes Elementary School

525 CHARWOOD AVE S, Lehigh Acres, FL 33974

<http://mle.leeschools.net>

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	84%

## 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.**

Mission: Through a safe and positive learning environment, focused engagement, collaboration, and student-centered learning, we will build a community of dedicated citizens who show passion for their achievements.

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

To inspire and educate all students for success

### 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
Bobak, Amy	Principal	
Delude, David	Assistant Principal	
Petrekin, Teri-Ann	Assistant Principal	

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Monday 9/20/2021, Amy Bobak

**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.*

11

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

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

1,080

**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	184	183	180	178	161	194	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1080
Attendance below 90 percent	17	42	48	47	36	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	238
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	9	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA	2	9	13	18	25	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
Course failure in Math	1	4	9	15	20	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	31	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	8	36	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
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	2	6	11	18	41	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143

**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	8	2	7	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
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	158	139	152	156	167	178	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	950
Attendance below 90 percent	9	25	23	11	10	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
One or more suspensions	0	2	8	1	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	1	7	12	9	14	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
Course failure in Math	2	6	4	5	8	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	13	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

**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	6	7	7	17	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84

**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	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

**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	158	139	152	156	167	178	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	950
Attendance below 90 percent	9	25	23	11	10	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
One or more suspensions	0	2	8	1	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	1	7	12	9	14	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
Course failure in Math	2	6	4	5	8	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	13	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

**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	6	7	7	17	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84

**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	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

**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				47%	57%	57%	44%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				48%	56%	58%	47%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	50%	53%	37%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				50%	62%	63%	40%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				63%	65%	62%	46%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	54%	51%	36%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				44%	52%	53%	40%	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	49%	58%	-9%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	43%	55%	-12%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2021					
	2019	39%	54%	-15%	56%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	46%	61%	-15%	62%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	55%	62%	-7%	64%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
05	2021					
	2019	44%	58%	-14%	60%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

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		24/18.6	43/29.3	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities		0/0	3/21.4	0/0
	English Language Learners		3/8.8	4/10.5	0/0
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		10/7.8	41/28.5	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities		0/0	3/27.3	0/0
	English Language Learners		3/8.8	7/18.4	0/0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	12/10.2	31/23.1	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	1/4.3	1/3.8	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	3/2.6	17/12.7	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/7.7	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	27/19.9	57/37.7	72/45.9
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/7.1	2/14.3
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/4.5	3/12.5
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6/4.5	32/21.2	47/29.9
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	2/14.3
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/4.5	3/12.5

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	38/28.4	57/38.3	71/45.8
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/4.3	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	1/4.3	1/4.0	3/10.3
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8/6.1	34/23.4	59/38.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/3.8	4/14.3
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	4/13.8
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	21/19.8	40/32.8	40/31.7
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/22.2	2/20	2/20
	English Language Learners	1/5.3	2/9.1	3/13
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8/5.7	34/20.4	38/22.1
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/9.1	2/18.2
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/3.8	3/10.3
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	38/22.8	61/35.7	94/58
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/22.2	2/18.2	4/36.4
	English Language Learners	4/14.3	6/20.7	8/32.0

## 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	24	44		30	33		38				
ELL	27	43	43	35	59	64	32				
BLK	40	49	18	42	40		34				
HSP	46	56	48	51	49	38	47				
MUL	50			36							
WHT	55	39		54	45		61				
FRL	41	47	35	44	41	33	42				
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	26	36	46	35	57	48	25				
ELL	34	55	62	42	67	63	30				
BLK	39	42	59	48	72	60	35				
HSP	47	48	52	48	63	54	42				
MUL	69			46							
WHT	52	49	69	58	57	42	58				
FRL	44	47	52	46	60	48	40				
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	27	37	42	26	46	46	53				
ELL	32	40	40	34	43	41	35				
BLK	44	43	29	34	42	30	28				
HSP	41	48	39	38	44	36	37				
MUL	64			50							
WHT	45	48	42	47	55	47	57				
FRL	43	46	35	38	44	35	36				

## 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	46
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	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	367

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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%	
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	41
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	43
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	51
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	41
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?**

Mirror Lakes Elementary needs to address ELA learning gains for students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged students. The ESSA subgroup Students with Disabilities falls below the 41% federal index, while the Economically Disadvantaged group falls at the 50% mark.

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

The greatest need for improvement based on the 2019 data is proficiency in ELA and proficiency in math. However, based on the 2021 data, Mirror Lakes Elementary will need to focus on

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

The entire administrative team at Mirror Lakes is new to the school. Therefore, they are unaware of what specific factors contributed to the need for improvement. However, in order to address these needs, the new Administrative Team will implement a specific and targeted PLC process to address standards and growth.

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

The lowest 25% in ELA and Math demonstrated the greatest gains in 2019.



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

Due to the replacement of the administrative team, the current team is unable to address this question at this time.

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

Mirror Lakes will implement Kagan Cooperative Learning, Top Score Writing, Thinking Maps graphic organizers, SRA reading, and strategic standards based common planning and professional learning communities.

**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.**

Mirror Lakes will continue to train teachers in the research based strategies described in part F.

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

In order to ensure sustainability, the District, in conjunction with the school will work towards the retention of teachers trained in best practices.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** In the 2020-2021 school year the percentage of students with disabilities demonstrating proficiency in ELA on the Florida Standards Assessment was 16%.

**Measurable Outcome:** In the 2021-2022 school year, Mirror Lakes will increase the number of students with disabilities demonstrating proficiency to 25% based on the 2022 Florida Standard Assessment for ELA.

**Monitoring:** Mirror Lakes Elementary will use iReady Diagnostic and Quarterly Exemplar information to monitor this goal. Within our data trackers, we will identify the students in our classes that fall into this subgroup and specifically track this data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Teri-Ann Petrekin (teriannrp@leeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Mirror Lakes Elementary will use SRA reading, iReady reading, and specific targeted PLC standards planning to meet the needs of our students.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Teachers will receive training in both iReady and the PLC process to develop a deep understanding of the standards

**Action Steps to Implement**

After School Tutoring

**Person Responsible** Teri-Ann Petrekin (teriannrp@leeschools.net)

Breakfast clubs

**Person Responsible** Amy Bobak (amycb@leeschools.net)

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	In the 2020-2021 school year the percentage of English Language Learning Students demonstrating proficiency in ELA on the Florida Standards Assessment was 10.7%
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	In the 2021-2022 school year, Mirror Lakes will increase the number of English Language Learning Students demonstrating proficiency to 17% based on the 2022 Florida Standard Assessment for ELA.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	Mirror Lakes Elementary will use iReady Diagnostic and Quarterly Exemplar information to monitor this goal. Within our data trackers, we will identify the students in our classes that fall into this subgroup and specifically track this data.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Teri-Ann Petrekin (teriannrp@leeschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Mirror Lakes Elementary will use SRA reading, iReady reading, and specific targeted PLC standards planning to meet the needs of our students.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Teachers will receive training in both iReady and the PLC process to develop a deep understanding of the standards

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**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.

**We did not have any reports on the SafeSchoolsforAlex site. Discipline is always a primary concern for us as students in class leads to increase in academic success. We will continue to use PBIS and our Blue Card for Behavior system which resulted in a 78% reduction in discipline referrals from 19-20 to 20-21.**