

The School District of Lee County

San Carlos Park Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	23

San Carlos Park Elementary School

17282 LEE RD, Fort Myers, FL 33967

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

Demographics

Principal: Monica Stevens

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: D (38%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

San Carlos Park Elementary School

17282 LEE RD, Fort Myers, FL 33967

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>93%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>64%</p>

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.

San Carlos Park Elementary's School Mission Statement to ensure excellence in a safe, creative, and nurturing environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

San Carlos Park Elementary's School Vision Statement is to actively engage students as lifelong learners and 21st Century world-class leaders.

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
Kutz, Christy	Principal	
Robinson, Michele	Assistant Principal	
Bode, Tara	Assistant Principal	
Russo, Brittney	Instructional Coach	
Hacker, Brianna	School Counselor	
Williams, Teresa	Instructional Coach	
Lorenzini, Tracy	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Monica Stevens

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.*

0

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.*

16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

65

Total number of students enrolled at the school

683

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

11

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

14

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	115	104	111	128	112	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	675
Attendance below 90 percent	4	18	24	22	14	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	8	11	20	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Course failure in Math	0	3	8	8	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	36	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	38	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	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	6	10	14	30	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	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	105	106	130	114	104	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	659
Attendance below 90 percent	40	15	19	11	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	1	6	7	6	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	0	2	7	6	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	6	7	5	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	105	106	130	114	104	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	659
Attendance below 90 percent	40	15	19	11	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	1	6	7	6	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	0	2	7	6	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	6	7	5	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	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				50%	57%	57%	54%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				44%	56%	58%	59%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36%	50%	53%	57%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				46%	62%	63%	54%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				51%	65%	62%	50%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	54%	51%	46%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				36%	52%	53%	51%	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	52%	58%	-6%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	50%	55%	-5%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2021					
	2019	41%	54%	-13%	56%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

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	46%	62%	-16%	64%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
05	2021					
	2019	40%	58%	-18%	60%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	33%	50%	-17%	53%	-20%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

- iReady Reading Diagnostic K-5
- iReady Math Diagnostic K-5
- NGSSS Science Grade 5

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	17	28	41
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
Mathematics	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12	26	45
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	21	42	55
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
Mathematics	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14	27	58
Mathematics	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	35	45	58
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
Mathematics	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11	25	40
Mathematics	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	21	36	38
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
Mathematics	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14	30	41
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	35	40	46
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
Mathematics	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19	40	43
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Science	All Students	37	38	46
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	6	6	13

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	9	25		12	30		10				
ELL	37	44	45	31	55		40				
BLK	40			40							
HSP	39	44	50	44	53	41	33				
WHT	56	38		53	50		61				
FRL	42	35	29	41	33	13	44				
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	24	34	21	26	49	45	39				
ELL	35	35	30	36	45	32	21				
BLK	29	27		29	36						
HSP	39	43	36	39	48	30	30				
WHT	68	48	33	59	56	64	47				
FRL	46	45	41	37	46	38	32				
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	26	50	47	42	54	37	33				
ELL	31	53	57	40	49	45	20				
BLK	39	55		37	39		69				
HSP	47	63	63	48	49	45	38				
WHT	67	55	36	65	54	45	64				
FRL	50	58	55	49	51	48	48				

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	43
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	48
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	346
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	19
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	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
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	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
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	52
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	36
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

There was an increase in percent of students proficient in all grade levels from Fall to Spring in both reading and math.

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

L25 in both reading and math are our greatest need as well as keeping the momentum of improvement for our science scores.
Based on progress monitoring, 3rd and 5th graders greatest need was math. 4th graders greatest need was in ELA.

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

Some contributing factors for improvement include: inconsistent instructional models (Face to Face vs Home Connect vs Virtual), attendance, and struggle to move L25.
New actions that are needed for improvement include: hire new PCT with math focus, math time added to the beginning of the day, and revitalizing the proficiency scales.

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

Based off progress monitoring, every grade showed Fall to Spring improvement. FSA scores in math showed a 51% Learning Gain in grades 3-5.

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

Some contributing factors and actions include: extra 25 minutes in the morning during arrival devoted to math, math department pushed out seamless curriculum through IGs, tweak scope/sequence to improve, and take 10 math review.

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

Strategies to implement in order to accelerate learning are: walk to read time built into daily schedule, streamlining PLC process, weekly data analysis/backwards design, word of the day for vocabulary instruction, and science time every day across all grade levels.

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.

Professional development opportunities that will be provided to support teachers and leaders will be PD based faculty meetings around high yield strategies and instructional rounds using "Pineapple Board".

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 of improvement include: tutoring, Saturday School, science specials, and reading specials.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: To increase high yield instructional strategies in all academic areas. Looking at data, we need to work on moving L25s with higher levels of engagement and high yield strategies so that there's a higher probability that students progress monitoring data will increase.

Measurable Outcome: Teachers will attend PD based faculty meetings and be given opportunities throughout the week to attend instructional rounds where they will model and/or observe these strategies. They then will use these strategies in their own classrooms to increase student engagement.

Monitoring: Class walkthroughs and lesson plans

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Christy Kutz (christymk@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Marzano's 9 High Yield Instructional Strategies

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research proven strategies to increase student engagement which increases academic success.

Action Steps to Implement

Faculty meeting presentations, pineapple board

Person Responsible Christy Kutz (christymk@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: Data shows need for continued improvement in math proficiency.

Measurable Outcome: Marzano's Proficiency Scales. All teachers will develop and use proficiency scales in math. Each student will have their own to track their progress. Students will show a learning gain in math proficiency by utilizing the proficiency scales.

Monitoring: Using weekly PLC to develop and deepen proficiency scales, starting with backwards design.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Christy Kutz (christymk@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Marzano Research indicates this as best practice. The continued use of proficiency scales will deepen student and teacher understanding of the standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: A proficiency scale states what students are expected to achieve and how to get there. It also provides the teacher a clear blueprint to the standard. The PLC leaders will continue to provide teachers with professional development to improve their instruction and meet the needs of all learners in their classroom.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Deepen use of proficiency scales by creating, developing and revising them in PLCs.
2. Recruit and hire math PCT
3. Math 25 for the first 25 minutes of arrival time

Person Responsible Christy Kutz (christymk@leeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Since the science state assessment tests three years worth of standards, it is important that students have exposure to a guaranteed and viable science curriculum and instruction aligned to the state standards.

Measurable Outcome: Grade 5 students will score at or above the district average on the state science assessment.

Monitoring: Lessons will be monitored via classroom walk throughs, lesson plans, and progress monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Christy Kutz (christymk@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: All students will be instructed in standards-based science lessons daily. In addition, a consistent science lab schedule, including science specials, will be implemented.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students need consistent science instruction, in every grade level, in order to retain the information needed to be proficient on the science FSA in 5th grade..

Action Steps to Implement

1. Ensure all teachers have access to science standards for their grade level
2. Monitor lesson plans and classroom instruction via classroom walk-throughs.

Person Responsible Christy Kutz (christymk@leeschools.net)

#4. Other specifically relating to Academic Vocabulary: ELA, Math, Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The student body at San Carlos Park needs more explicit instruction with academic vocabulary. This is a barrier to proficiency in all academic areas: reading, math and science.
Measurable Outcome:	We will improve proficiency in all tested subject areas by improving vocabulary instruction in all grade levels.
Monitoring:	Lesson plans and walk throughs
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christy Kutz (christymk@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will identify and explicitly teach subject specific words in ELA, mathematics and science.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The ability to decode new words isn't enough for students to increase their vocabulary and knowledge of what those unknown words mean. Students with limited vocabulary will struggle to be proficient in all areas.

Action Steps to Implement

- Word of the Day
- Listed vocabulary in Proficiency Scales
- Thinking Maps with vocabulary in all subjects
- Provide training
- Monitor the instruction of teaching academic vocabulary through lesson plans

Person Responsible Christy Kutz (christymk@leeschools.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus	
Description and Rationale:	Allows teachers consistency in backwards design, data analysis, assessment building.
Measurable Outcome:	School will improve proficiency in all areas by beginning with the end in mind (backwards design) as well as by analyzing data collected from progress monitoring and standards assessments.
Monitoring:	During weekly PLC meetings, PCTs will facilitate grade level teams in data analysis of standards assessed and backwards design.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christy Kutz (christymk@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Backwards design, goal setting, data analysis, PLC questions
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When teachers begin with the end in mind, they take the assessment with the lens of what needs to be included in the lesson plan for instruction. Teachers also are able to set goals and check the data to see which students reached these goals and which need reteaching. Reflecting on the PLC questions weekly as a group will also guide their planning for instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

- Weekly PLC facilitated by PCTs
- Take assessments
- Backwards design
- Collect and analyze assessment data
- Use data to drive instruction
- Reflect on PLC questions

Person Responsible Christy Kutz (christymk@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

n/a

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

SCPE addresses building a positive school culture by functioning as a trauma sensitive school and a school who is working towards being a High Reliability school as defined by Robert Marzano. A trauma-sensitive school is one in which all students feel safe, welcomed, and supported and where addressing trauma's impact on learning on a school-wide basis is at the center of its educational mission. Our school supports collaboration of staff and students in academic, professional and unstructured settings. Our teachers team plan and work collaboratively to build a guaranteed and viable curriculum for students along with reliable assessment. Our students are encouraged to participate in Kagan structures to increase their engagement and ability to work together as a team. We consider ourselves a family here and pass that on to staff and students. During our Walk to Read intervention times, teachers "share" students since ALL students are OUR students. Our school has two School Counselors who work tirelessly to build and improve a positive culture for our students.

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

All staff, parents and students are stakeholders in promoting a positive culture and environment at our school. We look to our staff to build positive relationships with students and make connections with each child in the building. Our students job in promoting a positive culture and environment is to Parents are a major stakeholder in our school as we rely on them to work with their students at home and have a strong home and school connection. We try to reach more parents by offering SAC on Zoom to include as many parents as possible. Each year we hold a Title 1 Parent Literacy Event with Santa that helps include parents as stakeholders in our school and their children's education. We typically hold one math based and one ELA based event a year.

Another stakeholder that we have that contributes to our school culture and environment is community members from our churches and local businesses. We have a great relationship with various churches and businesses in the area who support our students and staff to meet student needs and support teachers for supplies, Employee of the month and monthly treats for staff. FGCU works together with our school with student interns and volunteers as an additional stakeholder in our community.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement				\$194,138.00
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22	
6000	100-Salaries	0631 - San Carlos Park Elementary School	Ttitle III	0.5	\$38,500.00	
<i>Notes: Banister-Instructional Support Specialist</i>						
6120	100-Salaries	0631 - San Carlos Park Elementary School	Ttitle III	1.0	\$77,819.00	
<i>Notes: Hobbs-School Counselor</i>						
6120	100-Salaries	0631 - San Carlos Park Elementary School	Ttitle III	1.0	\$77,819.00	
<i>Notes: Hacker-School Counselor</i>						
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$135,552.00
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22	
6000	100-Salaries	0631 - San Carlos Park Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$72,390.00	
<i>Notes: Allevato-Instructional Coach</i>						
6300	520-Textbooks	0631 - San Carlos Park Elementary School	Ttitle III		\$2,750.00	
<i>Notes: MAFS books</i>						
5000	100-Salaries	0631 - San Carlos Park Elementary School	Title, I Part A	0.4	\$28,956.00	
<i>Notes: Reynolds-Math resource</i>						
5000	311-Subagreements up to \$25,000	0631 - San Carlos Park Elementary School	Other		\$2,500.00	
<i>Notes: Math intervention tutoring</i>						
5000	100-Salaries	0631 - San Carlos Park Elementary School	Title, I Part A	0.4	\$28,956.00	
<i>Notes: Ford-Math resource</i>						
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$217,570.00
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22	
5000	100-Salaries	0631 - San Carlos Park Elementary School	Other	1.0	\$72,390.00	
<i>Notes: Trimmer-Science instruction</i>						
5000	100-Salaries	0631 - San Carlos Park Elementary School	Other	1.0	\$72,390.00	
<i>Notes: Trimmer-Science instruction</i>						
5000	100-Salaries	0631 - San Carlos Park Elementary School	Other	1.0	\$72,390.00	

			<i>Notes: Trimner-Science instruction</i>			
	6000	100-Salaries	0631 - San Carlos Park Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$400.00
			<i>Notes: Science coach</i>			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Academic Vocabulary: ELA, Math, Science				\$189,613.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6000	100-Salaries	0631 - San Carlos Park Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$72,390.00
			<i>Notes: Lorenzini-Instructional Coach</i>			
	6000	100-Salaries	0631 - San Carlos Park Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$72,390.00
			<i>Notes: Russo-Instructional Coach</i>			
	5000	311-Subagreements up to \$25,000	0631 - San Carlos Park Elementary School	Ttitle III		\$2,500.00
			<i>Notes: Extended School Tutoring</i>			
	6200	510-Supplies	0631 - San Carlos Park Elementary School	Ttitle III		\$527.00
	6150	300-Purchased Services	0631 - San Carlos Park Elementary School	Ttitle III		\$1,500.00
			<i>Notes: Family Literacy Breakfast</i>			
	3373	300-Purchased Services	0631 - San Carlos Park Elementary School	Ttitle III		\$6,000.00
			<i>Notes: Summer reading bags for L25</i>			
	6300	391-Subagreements up to \$25,000	0631 - San Carlos Park Elementary School	Ttitle III		\$2,750.00
			<i>Notes: LAFS books</i>			
	6300	391-Subagreements up to \$25,000	0631 - San Carlos Park Elementary School	Ttitle III		\$2,600.00
			<i>Notes: Flocabulary</i>			
	6000	100-Salaries	0631 - San Carlos Park Elementary School	Title, I Part A	0.4	\$28,956.00
			<i>Notes: Grant-resource</i>			
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities				\$78,390.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6000	100-Salaries	0631 - San Carlos Park Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$72,390.00
			<i>Notes: Williams-Instructional coach</i>			
	6400	310-Professional and Technical Services	0631 - San Carlos Park Elementary School	Ttitle III		\$6,000.00
			<i>Notes: High Reliability Schools Training</i>			
					Total:	\$815,263.00