Patriot Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Patriot Elementary School

711 SW 18TH ST, Cape Coral, FL 33991

http://pat.leeschools.net/

Demographics

Principal: Elizabeth Feliciano

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 (52%) 2016-17: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Patriot Elementary School

711 SW 18TH ST, Cape Coral, FL 33991

http://pat.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	91%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	58%

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.

To be a quality school of leaders unified in achieving success for all.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To empower leaders who positively impact the world.

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
Feliciano, Elizabeth	Principal	The roles of each member are as follows: Principal/Assistant Principal • Facilitate implementation of the MTSS problem-solving process in your building • Provide or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development • Assign paraprofessionals to support MTSS implementation when possible • Attend MTSS Team meetings to be active in the MTSS change process • Conduct classroom Walk-Throughs to monitor fidelity
Lew, Steven	Assistant Principal	Principal/Assistant Principal • Facilitate implementation of the MTSS problem-solving process in your building • Provide or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development • Assign paraprofessionals to support MTSS implementation when possible • Attend MTSS Team meetings to be active in the MTSS change process • Conduct classroom Walk-Throughs to monitor fidelity
Lane, Amber	Other	Collect and analyze multiple sources types of data to improve student learning. ▪ Facilitate effective team-based collaborative action planning and problem-solving processes inclusive of family, student, school, and community stakeholders. ▪ Disseminate evidence-based content knowledge including, but not limited to, organizational change/implementation processes, MTSS/EWS and PBS knowledge and expertise, and best practices in reading, math, science, and behavior instruction. ▪ Facilitate and support targeted student interventions to implement and sustain MTSS/EWS and PBS processes at the individual student, classroom, and school-based levels. ▪ Perform Medicaid administrative claims reimbursable activities as directed in accordance with Chapter 3 of the federally approved School District Administrative Claiming (SDAC) Guide. ▪ Provide evidence-based professional development training, instructional coaching, and technical assistance to support data-based problem solving. ▪ Utilize data to inform ongoing school-based professional development, technical assistance, and coaching so as to improve the fidelity of MTSS/EWS and PBS implementation processes and overall student and staff outcomes. ▪ Build the capacity of MTSS/EWS and PBS processes at the school level.
Carthy-Pierre, Kimberly	Instructional Coach	Instruct students approximately 50% of the time, preferably in a core subject area, and fulfill instructional coaching duties approximately 50% of the time. • Design and deliver professional development opportunities at the school level for faculty and staff. • Provide one-on-one and group mentoring to apprentice and mentor

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		teachers. ▪ Model, observe, and provide feedback to teachers through the utilization of an instructional coaching cycle. ▪ Lead and guide professional learning communities through data analysis that results in the selection, implementation, and evaluation of research-based instructional strategies. ▪ Work collaboratively with the building principal, assistant principal, faculty, and staff to address site-based professional learning needs. ▪ Provide a schedule of activities including lesson plans and a professional development calendar to be shared with teachers and administrators. ▪ Assist in identifying and developing future leaders in the building.
Gulli, Nicole	Reading Coach	Work with teachers to ensure that scientifically-based literacy-researched programs are implemented with fidelity. ▪ Provide direct, classroom-based, professional development for teachers through regular modeling of research-based literacy instruction. ▪ Work with all teachers (including Exceptional Student Education, content area, and elective areas) in the schools they serve, prioritizing coaching and mentoring time with those teachers, activities, and roles that will have the greatest impact on student achievement. ▪ Mentor teachers in providing appropriate intensive intervention instruction for struggling students, including those who are Limited English Proficient. ▪ Model lessons in effective reading instruction, including lessons that provide differentiated instruction. ▪ Facilitate teacher study groups regarding current reading research and effective reading instruction. ▪ Organize and lead professional development programs which are needs-based and focused on the accomplishments of the established reading benchmarks. ▪ Demonstrate interpersonal skills as a member of an academic coaching team and build trust with teachers and school leadership. ▪ Coach teachers in effective literacy instructional strategies through interrelated content. ▪ Coordinate and schedule ongoing professional development of teachers through activities such as coaching grade level meetings, classroom demonstrations, and study groups. ▪ Model enthusiasm, commitment, and intensity for focused reading instruction. ▪ Provide instructional support for teachers in the implementation of the initiatives of the Department of Education for the State of Florida and Lee County.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 9/20/2021, Elizabeth Feliciano

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

48

Total number of students enrolled at the school

737

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

4

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

5

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	104	107	126	153	128	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	737
Attendance below 90 percent	2	12	15	16	21	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	11	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA	0	4	0	6	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	0	2	3	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	20	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	26	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	2	8	21	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	81	101	123	125	118	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	686
Attendance below 90 percent	3	6	8	10	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	6	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	1	2	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	1	3	6	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	81	101	123	125	118	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	686
Attendance below 90 percent	3	6	8	10	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	6	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	1	2	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	1	3	6	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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				62%	57%	57%	57%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				60%	56%	58%	55%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	50%	53%	39%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				65%	62%	63%	61%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				67%	65%	62%	57%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	54%	51%	34%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				57%	52%	53%	62%	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	65%	58%	7%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	54%	55%	-1%	58%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2021					
	2019	66%	54%	12%	56%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	69%	61%	8%	62%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	55%	62%	-7%	64%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2021					
	2019	69%	58%	11%	60%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	56%	50%	6%	53%	3%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Utilizing STAR for Progress Monitoring for grades K-5 Reading and Mathematics

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			60/58%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			59/57%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			67/55%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			65/53%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students			48/47%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students			42/41%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students			65/60%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students			57/53%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36.6%		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	0		
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21.5%		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	0		
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20.8%		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	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	47	55	26	20	20	15				
ELL	45	58		46	35		50				
ASN	58			67							
BLK	22			28							
HSP	54	45	62	50	35	24	51				
MUL	27			40							
WHT	62	62	46	62	36	30	56				
FRL	49	57	55	48	31	24	46				
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	19	36	30	25	47	48	8				
ELL	36	48	31	48	58	53	25				

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
BLK	40	31		42	47						
HSP	54	64	59	56	65	52	56				
MUL	82			91							
WHT	70	61	35	71	67	53	60				
FRL	54	60	45	61	68	62	50				
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	12	34	33	22	31	29	21				
ELL	39	45	47	38	29	13	45				
BLK	40	45		40	42						
HSP	57	56	50	54	55	35	59				
MUL	82			82							
WHT	57	56	33	68	61	38	65				
FRL	51	53	41	53	51	33	57				

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	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	367
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
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	47
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	63
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	46
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	34
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	43
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?

FSA statewide testing from 2019 to 2021 trend shows an increase in ELA achievement from 50% to 55% and ELA L25 learning gains from 44% to 71%. Overall Math learning gains decreased from 63% to 33%, and Math L25 learning gains increased from 50% to 40%. Science Proficiency decreased from 57% to 52%.

The overall trend for ELL (LY) students from 2019 to 2021 statewide assessments shows a decrease in proficiency for grade 3: 15% to 6% in ELA and 46% to 31% in math; an increase in grade 4: 22% to 33% in ELA, and a decrease from 44% to 40% in math, grade 5: 29% to 17% in ELA, and 38% to 50% in math.

Overall grade 4 learning gains for L25 increased from 55% to 100%; learning gains increased from 57% to 100%, Math learning gains decreased from 60% to 33%, and increased in L25 learning gains from 41% to 45%. This data includes only students retained from the previous school year.

Overall grade 5 ELA learning gains for L25 increased from 34% to 44% and ELA learning gains decreased 64% to 52%. ELA proficiency was consistently increasing prior to the COVID 19 pandemic at 68% in 2019 decreasing in 2021 to 55%. Math proficiency was 68% to 48% post pandemic. Math learning gains were 35% and L25 learning gains were 23%.

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

Our greatest areas of need are in priority order below.

Based on statewide assessments and progress monitoring Math achievement, learning gains, and L25 learning gains for all subgroups decreased.

Based on statewide assessments and progress monitoring ELA achievement learning gains, and L25 learning gains for all subgroups decreased.

Based on statewide assessments and progress monitoring Science achievement decreased.

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 greatest factor to this need for improvement is the data is only based on one grade level, grade 5, due to the COVID 19 pandemic in 2020 cancelling state assessments and causing school closures. This created a wide achievement gap for all students grade 3-5 in all subject areas.

Inconsistent intervention groups caused a lack of fidelity of instruction due to multiple teacher/student quarantines in grades 3-5 that caused cancellation of intervention groups.

Limited instructional support for intervention groups and classroom assistance due to ongoing standardized assessment testing that had to be conducted separately for students learning virtually and students learning face to face.

Due to an additional fifth grade unit being added to the school after other hiring had been completed during first quarter, teachers had to rearrange students to create a new class. This caused the 5th grade ESE Co-Teach classroom to have inconsistent instructional staff in the classroom. The second semester was taught completely by a guest teacher with support provided by resource teachers.

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

Based on progress monitoring and statewide assessments, ELA Lowest 25% went up from 25% in 2018 to 39% in 2019, to 50% in 2020.

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

Our L25 students were provided consistent, additional support with program implementation with fidelity. Our instructional support teachers provided small group interventions to students with the greatest need. Based on standards and results from progress monitoring. This additional support used research based interventions while working with the lowest 25%. These students were provided instruction using specialized curriculum (SRA, HD Word, Read 180). For the 2020-2021 school year, K-2 Literacy Coach position was added as well as a 3-5 Resource Teacher were added to help support in classrooms and provide interventions.

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

Based on statewide assessments and progress monitoring, and due to the increased enrollment of ELL students, an increased need for more ELL support was shown. To help with this subgroup, a second ELL paraprofessional is needed to implement more small group support for the FY22 school year. This second paraprofessional was hired and began the FY22 school year on the first day of school. We will also implement specialized curriculum to help accelerate the ELL language acquisition in all grade levels (ie. SRA Reading Mastery/HD Word for monolingual and LY students in grade 3+).

The 2021 assessments also showed a drop in Science achievement showing a need for more targeted science instruction. A science focused elective class will be implemented into the weekly electives rotation for students in all grade levels to recieve this targeted science instruction from a STEM teacher. This STEM elective began the first week of the 21-22 school year.

Student attendance contributed to the overall achievement levels shown on progress monitoring and statewide assessments. Attendance for the 2020-2021 school year was affected by multiple quarantines of both students and staff. For the 21-22 school year, we will give even greater emphasis to student attendance by having students consistently track their own attendance and recognizing students with good attendance habits weekly.

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.

To support our teachers in learning how to best support our ELL student population, more professional development will be provided in the area of ELL SIOP strategies, thinking maps, and kagan to support their language acquisition and vocabulary development. Additionally, we will offer professional development on the IReady Program which offers an individualized digital learning path for students and offers additional standardized resources for teachers to use in the classroom for ELA and Math.

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

Additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability will include data tracking for ELL/L25 students to ensure effective implementation of the new curriculum (ie: Wonders, SRA, B.E.S.T Standards). In addition, scheduling appropriate staff to implement the new curriculum to ensure fidelity and consistency in instructional delivery for the ELL/intervention groups. Finally, weekly monitoring of teacher lesson plans to ensure use of SIOP strategies are used as well as Kagan structures and Thinking Maps to ensure opportunities for practice are being given.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In the 2020-2021 school year, the entire leadership team entered their positions as either being new to that position and/or new to the school. This included the Principal, K-2 Literacy Coach, 3-5 Resource Teacher who were new to their positions. The Assistant Principal and Intervention Support Specialist were both new to their position and new to the school. And in the 2021-2022 school year, the Peer Collaborative Teacher was both new to the school and new to the position. Building capacity will begin with the leadership team to ensure all members have the same understanding of all implemented school and district initiatives.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2021-2022 school year, the leadership team will have participated in professional development opportunities for all school-based and district initiatives.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored weekly at Leadership Team PLC meetings to assess each members progress toward the identified outcome.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Elizabeth Feliciano (elizabethff@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence based strategy implemented is our Leadership Team PLC which includes an agenda and follow up notes for each meeting.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The purpose of this strategy is both for record keeping and accountability for all Leadership Team Members. It will also clearly identify those responsible for each task or action step discussed.

Action Steps to Implement

Leadership Team members will choose and agree upon a consistent meeting day, time, and location each week.

Person Responsible	Nicole Gulli (nicolemgu@leeschools.net)

Identify PLC roles for each team member (ie: recorder, time keeper, etc).

Person Responsible	Nicole Gulli (nicolemgu@leeschools.net)

Create and contribute to weekly agendas to include grade level needs, upcoming meetings and events, and identified training opportunities.

Person Responsible	Amber Lane (amberl@leeschools.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The overall trend for ELL (LY) students from 2019 to 2021 statewide assessments shows a decrease in proficiency for grade 3: 15% to 6% in ELA and 46% to 31% in math; an increase in grade 4: 22% to 33% in ELA, and a decrease from 44% to 40% in math, grade 5: 29% to 17% in ELA, and 38% to 50% in math.
Measurable Outcome:	With targeted instruction in Reading, ELL Students at Patriot Elementary will increase learning gains by 20% as measured by statewide standardized assessments.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will monitored by standards based classroom exemplars and progress monitoring assessments quarterly throughout the school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Elizabeth Feliciano (elizabethff@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	For this area of focus we are increasing staff for more small group support for ELL students. We are also implementing specialized intervention curriculum to target the needs of ELL students. In addition, we will be training staff to increase their understanding of using ELL Accommodations and SIOP strategies for their English Learners. SIOP stands for Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol which is a means of making grade level academic content more accessible for English Learners while also promoting their English Language development.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows that ELL students learn best when SIOP strategies are applied to learning. These strategies (ie: Building Background and Presentation Strategies) are supported by scientific research as a tool for teachers to implement into learning opportunities for students learning English and can be implemented across grade levels and content areas.

Action Steps to Implement

Building capacity with staff through professional development opportunities to increase teacher knowledge of appropriate use of SIOP strategies with ELL students.

Person Responsible	Elizabeth Feliciano (elizabethff@leeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Overall Math learning gains decreased from 63% to 33%, and Math L25 learning gains decreased from 50% to 40%.
Measurable Outcome:	With targeted instruction in math, Patriot students will increase learning gains from 33% to 70% and L25 learning gains from 40% to 70% as measured by statewide standardized assessments.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored by standards based classroom exemplars and progress monitoring assessments throughout the year. The standards based classroom exemplars are created by the district math department and includes questions at all achievement level descriptors. Teachers will track student progress per standard through the use of district software and documenting progress through student data chats and tracking. Progress monitoring assessments will be given 3 times during the school year through the iReady program. Teachers will use data from the progress monitoring to inform instruction and needs to intervention.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kimberly Carthy-Pierre (kimberlyac@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will utilize Thinking Maps to improve student understanding a math vocabulary development. USe of thinking maps helps students gain a deeper understanding of the concept being taught and make connections to previously learned skills. Teachers will determine the thinking map that best supports learning of the current concept being taught. Teachers will also use Kagan Structures (ie: Numbered Heads Together or Collaborative Pairs) to engage students in learning. This cooperative learning strategy holds each student accountable for learning the material. This strategy promotes discussions and helps students collaborate on understanding high level material, but also prevents the dominant student in the group always answering.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	HIgh yield strategies are researched based practices linked to student achievement. Kagan structures are among those high yield strategies. This specific strategy helps promote student learning, collaboration, and accountability for all students to learn concepts taught in a safe learning environment (ie: small groups). In addition, Thinking Maps are research based and proven to improve student learning and understanding of concepts taught. Thinking Maps are based on fundamental thinking processes that can be used across grade levels and concepts.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify and break down state standards/skills into management teaching pieces. We will use CPALMS and M.A.F.S. and B.E.S.T standards to determine the list of standards and skills to be taught.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Carthy-Pierre (kimberlyac@leeschools.net)

Teacher PLCs will implement Understanding by Design planning protocol using the District created assessments for each standard/skill.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Carthy-Pierre (kimberlyac@leeschools.net)

Teacher PLCs will identify which instructional strategies best supports student learning of the standard or skill.

Person Responsible   Kimberly Carthy-Pierre (kimberlyac@leeschools.net)

After instruction, teachers will assess students and reteach concepts as needed.

Person Responsible   Kimberly Carthy-Pierre (kimberlyac@leeschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	FSA statewide testing in 2021 was only able to measured learning gains for students in grade 5 from 2019 to 2021. This data shows grade 5 ELA learning gains for L25 increased from 34% to 44% and ELA learning gains decreased 64% to 52%.
Measurable Outcome:	With targeted instruction in ELA, Patriot Students will further increase learning gains for L25 students from 44% to 70% and will increase learning gains for all students from 52% to 70% as measured by statewide standardized testing.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored by standards based classroom exemplars and progress monitoring assessments throughout the year. The standards based classroom exemplars (iReady Standards Mastery checks) are created by the iReady program and includes questions at all achievement level descriptors. Teachers will track student progress per standard through the use of district software and documenting progress through student data chats and tracking. Progress monitoring assessments will be given 3 times during the school year through the iReady program. Teachers will use data from the progress monitoring to inform instruction and needs to intervention.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kimberly Carthy-Pierre (kimberlyac@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will utilize Thinking Maps to improve student understanding and vocabulary development. Use of thinking maps helps students gain a deeper understanding of the concept being taught and make connections to previously learned skills. Teachers will determine the thinking map that best supports learning of the current concept being taught. Teachers will also use Kagan Structures (ie: Numbered Heads Together or Collaborative Pairs) to engage students in learning. This cooperative learning strategy holds each student accountable for learning the material. This strategy promotes discussions and helps students collaborate on understanding high level material, but also prevents the dominant student in the group always answering.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	HIgh yield strategies are researched based practices linked to student achievement. Kagan structures are among those high yield strategies. This specific strategy helps promote student learning, collaboration, and accountability for all students to learn concepts taught in a safe learning environment (ie: small groups). In addition, Thinking Maps are research based and proven to improve student learning and understanding of concepts taught. Thinking Maps are based on fundamental thinking processes that can be used across grade levels and concepts.

Action Steps to Implement	

Identify and break down state standards/skills into management teaching pieces. We will use CPALMS and L.A.F.S. and B.E.S.T standards to determine the list of standards and skills to be taught.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Carthy-Pierre (kimberlyac@leeschools.net)

Teacher PLCs will implement Understanding by Design planning protocol using the iReady created assessments for each standard/skill.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Carthy-Pierre (kimberlyac@leeschools.net)

Teacher PLCs will identify which instructional strategies best supports student learning of the standard or skill.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Carthy-Pierre (kimberlyac@leeschools.net)

After instruction, teachers will assess students and reteach concepts as needed.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Carthy-Pierre (kimberlyac@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Looking at the data across the state for elementary schools, the top five incident counts by type were Physical attack, Threat or Intimidation, Fighting, Bullying, and Tobacco. Comparatively, Patriot Elementary's top five discipline incident counts from 2020-2021 were Disruptive Behavior, Peer conflict, Insubordination/Disrespect, Horseplay, and Other Rules Violations. One area of concern that we will be monitoring during the upcoming school year is Bullying. We have observed an increased trend in bullying complaints over the past school year, and have targeted this as a schoolwide improvement priority. Additionally, we are a PBIS model school and have implemented school-wide positive behavior supports to acknowledge and celebrate positive behavior with our students. As a leadership team, we monitor our discipline data throughout the year to track and analyze trends throughout the school year we need to focus upon. As the data shows certain behaviors increasing or decreasing, it allows us to make the necessary adjustments on our campus with our PBIS incentives, classroom instructional techniques/ practices, and school-wide safety processes for our students to be successful.

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.

School staff are recognized monthly to show appreciation for their hard work by the Sunshine Committee. School staff are also nominated weekly by other staff members to be recognized in administration's weekly notes.

Students are encouraged to use the 7 Habits by Leader In Me and staff use this language with them daily to help encourage positive behavior and interactions between students and all stakeholders. We also recognize students for positive school attendance habits. In the cafeteria, appropriate behavior is rewarded monthly using ClassDojo. The School principal also schedules quarterly meetings with teachers to provide an opportunity for teachers to share concerns and discuss goals and student data.

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

School staff have formed the Sunshine Committee which recognizes school staff monthly to show appreciation. They also provide staff sponsored gifts for special occasions and bereavement.
School administration offers recognition treats for staff members who win the peer weekly nomination. Staff members chosen receive a jeans pass for the following week, a special marked parking space in the school parking lot, and a special treat in their mailbox.
Students will be recognized on the school news for having positive attendance habits, as well as for filling up their 7 Habits cards by staff members "catching them" using the habits throughout the school. These students also receive special tangible rewards for these achievements from administrators as well.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00