Pelican Elementary School

leadership
analysis
Florida
college and career
students
mission
school improvement
ambitious
family and community involvement
striving
achievement
teaching
relationships
needs assessment
success
areas of focus
instruction
strategic planning
collaboration
vision
learning
supportive environment
resources
growth

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Pelican Elementary School

3525 SW 3RD AVE, Cape Coral, FL 33914

http://pel.leeschools.net/

Demographics

Principal: Clinton Garlick

Start Date for this Principal: 1/13/2021

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	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	99%
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 (56%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Pelican Elementary School

3525 SW 3RD AVE, Cape Coral, FL 33914

http://pel.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	No	80%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	48%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	B

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.

Through the collaborative efforts of parents, staff, students, and the community, Pelican Elementary develops the emotional, social, academic, and physical potential of every student, enabling them to be respectful, responsible learners achieving their highest potentials.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pelican Elementary is a safe, secure, child-centered school which provides the foundation for a career and college readiness for every child.

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
Garlick, Clint	Principal	
Wills, Karen	Assistant Principal	
Randazzo, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Grade Level Chair
Lowry, Diana	Teacher, K-12	1st Grade Level Chair
Ritter, Renee	Teacher, K-12	2nd Grade Level Chair
Dwyer, Melinda	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade Level Chair
Johnson, Maria	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade Level Chair
Costa, Breanne	Reading Coach	K-2 Reading Coach
Young, Kelly	Reading Coach	3-5 Reading Coach
Wood, Courtney	Math Coach	Math Coach

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 1/13/2021, Clinton Garlick

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.*

5

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

46

Total number of students enrolled at the school

938

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

8

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	143	148	147	163	151	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	879
Attendance below 90 percent	6	20	18	27	26	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
One or more suspensions	0	3	3	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	7	3	7	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	3	0	4	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	18	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	30	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
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	5	5	11	20	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	129	125	136	128	118	163	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	799
Attendance below 90 percent	3	3	9	6	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	1	2	5	7	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	7	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	1	2	6	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

2020-21 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	129	125	136	128	118	163	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	799
Attendance below 90 percent	3	3	9	6	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	1	2	5	7	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	7	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	1	2	6	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				61%	57%	57%	59%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				56%	56%	58%	54%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	50%	53%	57%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				61%	62%	63%	60%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				59%	65%	62%	46%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	54%	51%	41%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				59%	52%	53%	64%	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	63%	58%	5%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	58%	55%	3%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2021					
	2019	62%	54%	8%	56%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	58%	61%	-3%	62%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	65%	62%	3%	64%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2021					
	2019	58%	58%	0%	60%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	57%	50%	7%	53%	4%
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				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11/9.2	48/37.8	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	2/33.3	0/0
	English Language Learners	1/20	2/40	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6/5.3	45/35.4	1/100
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	2/33.3	0/0
	English Language Learners	1/20	1/20	0/0
Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17/15.2	48/40	1/100
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/11.1	4/20	0/0
	English Language Learners	1/7.7	3/17.6	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6/5.5	19/16	1/100
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/5.6	3/15	0/0
	English Language Learners	2/15.4	3/17.6	0/0

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	42/32.8	64/48.1	74/54.4
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/6.7	2/12.5	2/12.5
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	1/14.3
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10/8.1	50/37.6	61/44.9
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/6.7	1/6.3	2/12.5
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	1/14.3

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	44/40	68/57.6	83/69.2
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	3/20	3/20	3/21.4
	English Language Learners	0/0	2/18.2	4/36.4
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10/9.4	38/32.2	56/46.7
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/6.7	3/21.4
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/9.1	2/18.2

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	61/38.6	80/47.6	98/56.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	3/20	3/18.8	6/37.5
	English Language Learners	4/28.6	2/14.3	3/21.4
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15/9.5	50/29.9	73/42.2
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/6.7	4/25	5/31.1
	English Language Learners	0/0	2/14.3	2/14.3
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	44/27.5	78/48.4	107/62.9
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/13.3	4/26.7	6/42.9
	English Language Learners	0/0	2/14.3	7/50

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	32	38		32	47		50				
ELL	51	52		43	22		38				
BLK	38			47							
HSP	66	58	53	53	38	26	55				
MUL	67			52							
WHT	60	40	40	59	53	42	59				
FRL	57	47	43	49	46	36	45				
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	43	58	25	37	40	32				
ELL	40	52	41	40	57	38	33				
ASN	80			90							

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	36	52	50	43	48		36				
HSP	58	53	55	58	63	52	51				
MUL	69			38							
WHT	65	57	44	65	59	39	64				
FRL	55	51	52	54	52	44	55				

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	29	49	53	30	58	56	31				
ELL	35	50	40	46	52	42					
BLK	19	40		29	36						
HSP	56	49	50	56	47	44	55				
MUL	64	64		50	45						
WHT	63	56	55	65	47	37	70				
FRL	55	50	54	54	47	42	58				

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	49
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	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	395
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	42
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	
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	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
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	60
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	50
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	46
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?

Pelican Elementary holds high standards for student achievement. With that mindset, our trends overall, have demonstrated our focus that all students can and will succeed. Considerable focus has been placed on ELA scores and we have improved our overall ELA average from 61% in 2019 to 63% in 2021. However, we have demonstrated a loss in scores as follows:
ELA Learning Gains: 48% 2021 56% 2019
ELA L25 Percentile: 43% 2021 50% 2019
Math Achievement: 57% 2021 61% 2019
Math Learning Gains: 46% 2021 59% 2019
Math L25 Percentile: 37% 2021 45% 2019
Science Achievement: 55% 2021 59% 2019
Many of our programs and efforts in place, we believe, would have yielded better results if it were a "normal" school year.

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

Math Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% clearly is our most pressing need. This was the lowest performance with 37% meeting proficiency. Two years ago we added of a Math Coach on staff. The math coach is responsible for both staff development and directly working with our most needy students. Additionally, we have a Math Leading & Learning point person on each grade level. We expect more growth with this plan in place.

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

If we are honest, one thing that most impacted overall achievement results for the 2020-2021 school year was the less than optimal school learning environment created by the Covid pandemic. Many students were taught via virtual learning environments without the benefit of hands one, in-person instruction. Additionally, for students in face-to-face instructional models, the ability to use cooperative learning models such as Kagan, were not allowed due to distancing requirements. Finally, in previous years we maintained and after school tutoring program for math. We were not able to maintain that in 2020-2021.

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

Overall, ELA Achievement scores were good. Despite less than optimal learning environments, we decreased only 2% pts. Our scores dropped from 63% in 2019 to 61% in 2021.

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

Contributing factors directly related to this improvement were the addition of a second reading coach to our staff. Additionally, every grade level has a Leading and Learning point person who is responsible for relaying instructional and curriculum information from the district to their teams. Finally, and most importantly, the master schedule was created to provide maximal instructional support to teachers and classes with the most needy students.

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

This year Pelican has hired additional staff to support learning in lower achieving classrooms. We have also maximized minutes in the master schedule and create a 30 minute primary/ 45 minute for 4th/5th grades intervention block in ELA. We are also optimizing programs to support students that have learning gaps. We are focusing on more rigorous programs like iReady which seems to directly correlate with FSA scores. We also use district exemplars to progress monitor along the way to ensure student success!

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.

This year, most professional development will occur through the Reading and Math Instructional Coaches as well as the grade level Leading and Learning contacts during our Professional Learning Communities.

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

Our STEM teacher is working on science K-5 to support the Science FSA scores. This has already shown benefits. We have a K-2 Reading Coach and a 3-5 Reading Coach working directly with grade level teachers and students. We also have a Math Coach working with teachers and students. Our district is also providing additional homework support for families via an after school. With regards to social emotional learning to support student wellbeing we utilize Second Step and Zones of Regulation. We also utilize Safer Smarter Kids curriculum school-wide.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup has consistently been our weakest subgroup. It is the only subgroup for which we have not met standard. The data demonstrated that our SWD learning gains scores dropped 7% from 57% in FY18 to 50% in FY19.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase proficiency for Students with Disabilities subgroup from 37% to 41% in FY21/22
Monitoring:	Continuous progress monitoring
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Clint Garlick (clintonrg@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Pelican will utilize a three-pronged approach: 1) School-wide intervention time will be provided for all students K-5 five days per week. Additional instructional supports will be provided to every grade level both during intervention time and during the instructional day to targeted groups of students in ELA and math. ESE teachers will work directly with the general education teacher both inside and outside of the intervention time. 2) PLC Data meetings with instructional staff for the purpose of immediate progress monitoring will ensure the right students are receiving the intended supports. 3) Implementation of SEL strategies to support students 4) ELA Grade Level Experts 5) Instructional Coaches 6) Providing Assistance and Resources when possible including intervention time! 7) SAMs Club/Kagan trainings
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for selecting the strategies is that, according to Hattie's Effect Size, each one has the potential to accelerate student achievement at a HIGH rate (.30-.69) or considerably accelerate student achievement at a SUPER HIGH rate (.70 and above) Small Group Differentiation Centers- .47 Effect Size Hands on Learning- .30 Effect Size Interventions/ Extensions- .77 Effect Size MTSS (RTI)- 1.29 Effect Size Scaffolding- .82 Effect Size High Level of Student Engagement- .49 Effect Size Goal Setting (Buckets)- .48 Effect Size Progress Monitoring- .58 Effect Size Curriculum Maps and Instructional Guides .64 Effect Size

Action Steps to Implement

1. Develop the Master Schedule to provide optimal learning opportunities for all students (minutes of instruction).
2. Develop staffing schedules that provide optimal in-class time with students (minutes of instruction)
3. Student scheduling that effectively groups students to maximize the student to teacher ratio.
4. PLC meetings to analyze baseline and progress monitoring data to adjust supports as needed
5. School Leadership team to meet monthly to analyze effectiveness of the strategy implementation.
6. Continuous professional development and conversations around High Yield Instructional Strategies

Person Responsible	Karen Wills (karenlwil@leeschools.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Black/African American
Measurable Outcome:	
Monitoring:	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	
Monitoring:	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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.

Using data provided for by the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org website, Pelican Elementary ranked #782 out of 1,395 elementary schools in the state of Florida. We reported 0.6 incidents per 100 students. This rate is less than the statewide elementary school rate of 1.0 incidents per 100 students. There were 6 incidents total for the 2020-2021 school year. Of those 6, 1 was for bullying, 2 were for vandalism and 3 were for major disruptions. We attribute the low rate to our focus on PBS practices and the utilization of the Second Step curriculum. Additionally, we host a schoolwide Anti-Bullying month focus each October. Our school counselor also works directly with student in need of support and provides teachers and parents with tools to help students.