The Sanibel School

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

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

The Sanibel School

3840 SANIBEL CAPTIVA RD, Sanibel, FL 33957

http://sbl.leeschools.net/

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Lusk

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
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)	35%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (84%) 2017-18: A (78%) 2016-17: A (79%)
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

The Sanibel School

3840 SANIBEL CAPTIVA RD, Sanibel, FL 33957

http://sbl.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)
Combination School PK-8	No	21%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	14%

School Grades History

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

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.

The mission of The Sanibel School is to provide a world class education, so that students reach their potential through hands-on exploration! We believe what happens here will soon change the world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Unite, Inspire, Empower!

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
Reid, Jamie	Principal	Oversees all staff and students. Maintains safety as first priority while ensuring academic instruction is maximized and differentiation for all students occurs daily.
Lusk, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Supports Principal in overseeing all staff and students. Maintains safety as first priority while ensuring academic instruction is maximized and differentiated for all students occurs daily.
Heuck, Michelle	Instructional Coach	Assists with student discipline, MTSS, mentoring new teachers, and any additional duties needed to support students and staff.
Bergamo, Dr. Gregory	Teacher, ESE	Middle School ESE Teacher
Lear, Robin	Teacher, ESE	Elementary ESE Teacher
Sanders, Laurie	Reading Coach	K-2 Reading Coach, supports reading instruction, progress monitoring, and instructional teacher support
King, Stacey	School Counselor	Supports new students to our school, leads classroom instruction on social emotional skills, works with 6th graders as they transition to middle school, supports families with any need she can, creates opportunities for families and teachers to connect to support student success.
Christoff, Soo	Instructional Technology	Helps support student safety online and provide daily guidance on student issues and staff as related to SPALC representative.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2021, Jennifer Lusk

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.*
1

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.*
6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
21

Total number of students enrolled at the school
254

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
2

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	18	21	28	25	28	38	29	33	34	0	0	0	0	254
Attendance below 90 percent	1	1	3	1	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	11
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	5
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/21/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				89%	62%	61%	90%	55%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				76%	60%	59%	72%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				84%	53%	54%	66%	46%	52%
Math Achievement				90%	62%	62%	87%	55%	61%
Math Learning Gains				78%	61%	59%	62%	55%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				71%	49%	52%	69%	52%	52%
Science Achievement				87%	54%	56%	79%	51%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				96%	78%	78%	100%	75%	77%

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	91%	58%	33%	58%	33%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	85%	55%	30%	58%	27%
Cohort Comparison		-91%				
05	2021					
	2019	91%	54%	37%	56%	35%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				
06	2021					
	2019	84%	52%	32%	54%	30%
Cohort Comparison		-91%				
07	2021					
	2019	89%	51%	38%	52%	37%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
08	2021					
	2019	91%	57%	34%	56%	35%
Cohort Comparison		-89%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2021					
	2019	91%	61%	30%	62%	29%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	79%	62%	17%	64%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-91%				
05	2021					
	2019	89%	58%	31%	60%	29%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
06	2021					
	2019	92%	47%	45%	55%	37%
Cohort Comparison		-89%				
07	2021					
	2019	94%	57%	37%	54%	40%
Cohort Comparison		-92%				
08	2021					
	2019	100%	60%	40%	46%	54%
Cohort Comparison		-94%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	81%	50%	31%	53%	28%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	87%	46%	41%	48%	39%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	96%	67%	29%	71%	25%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	86%	59%	27%	61%	25%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	50%	-50%	57%	-57%

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	6/22.2	19/76.0	22/78.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/1	1/50
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	1/1
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13/48.1	25/92.6	25/89.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/50	1/100	2/100
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/100	1/100

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11/47.8	16/69.6	17/73.9
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5/21.7	15/68.2	19/82.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/25	3/75
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16/59.3	23/82.1	27/96.4
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/50	2/50	3/75
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14/51.9	20/71.4	25/89.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/50	1/25	3/75
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18/56.3	28/77.8	34/91.9
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/50	2/50	4/100
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9/29	29/82.9	32/86.5
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	3/75	2/50
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18/58.1	29/82.9	29/80.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	2/50
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7/22.6	26/77.2	30/83.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/25	3/75
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12/38.7	23/63.9	25/71.4
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	2/50
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19/63.3	20/64.5	24/75.0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/33.3	1/33.3	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0/0	4/25	13/72.2
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	1/33.3
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	25/78.1	27/81.8	27/77.1
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/33.3	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	18/64.3	25/83.3	26/89.7
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Civics	All Students	32/91.4	34/91.9	37/97.4
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	21/87.5	23/88.5	25/96.2
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	28/93.3	31/96.9	32/100
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	1/100
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18/94.7	22/100	23/95.8
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/100	1/100
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17/56.7	25/78.1	28/87.5
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	1/100
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

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	56			58							
HSP	80			90							
WHT	90	85	78	91	78	83	88	97	84		
FRL	92	91		88	85						
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	50	80		46	55						
HSP	80	80		90	80						
WHT	89	76	88	90	79	71	88	96	89		
FRL	86	77		83	78	70	67				

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
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	64	58		60	50						
HSP	81	64		88	86						
WHT	91	74	69	87	60	61	83	100	79		
FRL	82	65	50	81	60	78	67		50		

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	84
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	756
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	57
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	85
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	86
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	89
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?

Our sixth grade data was the lowest across curriculum domains.

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

Our progress monitoring and FSA data proved that our current 7th grade students need the most support.

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

We are a small school and even one student's data can have a significant impact on our grade level averages. We saw an increase in Special Education need last year and we continue to work with District LRT's to ensure the staff have all necessary training and to provide insight to meet student needs.

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

Our Civics and Algebra EOC's both had high pass rates. Only one student in each of those subjects did not score a level 3 or higher out of all our students who were tested.

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

Our teachers use their planning time to work with students daily. They participate in afterschool tutoring and provide resources for student remediation and acceleration as needed. Differentiation and small groups occurs daily. We also trained our staff in High-Yield Instructional Strategies during preschool week to be used in all curricular areas.

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

We use small group instruction or one-on-one tutoring when necessary, using data to pinpoint the skills each student needs to master grade-level concepts. Scaffolding is provided in instructional practices to make sure that students continue to display mastery as we accelerate the learning process.

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.

PD opportunities are provided throughout the school year, beginning with preschool week. Teachers are required to attend Leading and Learning meetings, weekly PLC's meetings, and APPLES mentors are assigned. We constantly strive to support teachers and improve instructional strategies.

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

High Yield Instructional Strategies trainings have been a focus for professional development during preschool as well as during the school year. Additionally, we provide Leader in Me training for our teachers throughout the school year. Both of these additional services have been provided to our teachers annually for the past several years and will be a part of future trainings as well.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We utilize a program called Springboard to assist middle school ELA and reading. This program allows us additional differentiation at students' current levels and to accelerate them where applicable. We identified ELA as a critical need as it is a cross curricular skill and assists students to perform higher in Civics, Science, and Mathematics by providing stronger foundational skills to assist students in problem solving.
Measurable Outcome:	By May 2022, the ELA Learning Gains for L25s in 7th Grade will be 50% or higher as measured by FSA scores and tracked through progress monitoring. Last year's FSA score showed 0 L25 6th Grade students proficient in ELA.
Monitoring:	This will be monitored through the quarterly iReady progress monitoring. Staff will conference with students each time they take a progress monitoring assessment to discuss goals and their performance.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jamie Reid (jamiebr@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will be utilizing High Yield Instructional Strategies to support student engagement and raise student achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We selected High Yield Instructional Strategies as we did a full staff development training during preschool week with Dr. Matthew Kay and Kassidy Kay. We discussed effect size and how to maximize differentiation with students.

Action Steps to Implement

Admin will oversee the High Yield Instructional Strategies are being utilized daily. This will be done by reviewing lesson plans, conducting classroom walk- throughs, and conferencing with teachers.

Person Responsible Jamie Reid (jamiebr@leeschools.net)

Admin will ensure staff have what they need to fully utilize High Yield Instructional Strategies and review them at upcoming staff meetings.

Person Responsible Jennifer Lusk (jenniferllu@leeschools.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Fifth grade L25 math proficiency was at 77% as measured by last year's FSA. It is currently at 0% as measured by District Progress Monitoring. Our L25 population consists of students who all have an IEP for various reasons.
Measurable Outcome:	By May 2022, Sanibel will maintain a 77% or higher math proficiency within our L25 population as measured by the FSA.
Monitoring:	Quarterly iReady progress monitoring will be the tool used. Teachers will be utilizing weekly iReady instructional data along with classroom performance data to drive data conversations with students. Data will be discussed during weekly PLC meetings to ensure maximized differentiation and student support occurs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Heuck (michellelhe@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Dr. Michelle Heuck and Robin Lear will both work closely with classroom teachers to ensure student progress and learning gains are occurring. We will utilize High-Yield Instructional Strategies to engage students in their learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	High Yield instructional strategies was chosen due to the entire staff being trained during Pre-School week. A follow up training along with staff being provided the printshop created foldable was presented on Wednesday, September 29th.

Action Steps to Implement

Dr. Heuck will pull student progress monitoring data for teachers and admin.
Staff will have time to reflect on the data prior to the PLC's.

Person Responsible   Michelle Heuck (michellelhe@leeschools.net)

Admin will meet individually with teachers to discuss student achievement data and address any concerns they have.

Person Responsible   Jamie Reid (jamiebr@leeschools.net)

Resources will be reallocated based on the outcomes of these meetings. Resources such as adjustments to ESE support schedules, additional manipulatives, scheduling of parent meetings, etc.

Person Responsible   Jennifer Lusk (jenniferllu@leeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our 2019 data revealed that 86% of our students passed the Algebra EOC. In 2021, the data revealed that 96% of the students passed the Algebra EOC. We currently have 16 students enrolled in Algebra which is 47% of all 8th grade student enrolled in a math class. Math acceleration is an important component while looking at the individual needs of each student. This class is considered a vital building block on the course to college readiness. The Sanibel School strives to meet the academics demands of all of our student and offering an accelerated Algebra course is one way we attain this.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to achieve a 100% pass rate on the Algebra EOC in 2022 and to raise enrollment to 66% by next year.
Monitoring:	Students will be monitored by using the Algebra EOC scores for the 21-22 school year. We will also utilize progress monitoring in Performance Matters/Unify for quarterly formatives. STAR assessment are given to show student mastery of the particular objectives.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Lusk (jenniferllu@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Math teacher Mrs. Scarnato skillfully implements instructional practices when teaching Algebra to her students. She incorporates many metacognitive strategies and visual representations in her lessons. These techniques allow her to support diverse group within their algebraic development.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	At preschool week, it was determined by our leadership team that this was an area that we needed to focus on in the upcoming school year.

Action Steps to Implement

The students will be taught utilizing high yield strategies with explicit instruction. Also, Mrs. Scarnato offers tutoring and support services when students do not master the material. She will also conference with parents if additional guidance is required.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Lusk (jenniferllu@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.

The Sanibel School consistently scored well when comparing to the other schools statewide. We are in the top 10 across multiple curricular areas. The Sanibel School continuously monitors academic achievement at both the local and state levels. There is always an extra emphasis on behavior and the school culture and training opportunities are provided. We are also a Leader In Me school and the students take pride and accountability with their actions.

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.

Our school family is constantly looking for ways to spread cheer, support each other, and promote positive staff morale. We have monthly pot luck luncheons for the entire school. Our middle school team organized a staff bbq in our courtyard before families arrived at open house. We encourage staff to come support our sporting events. We raffle prizes such as wave runner rentals and parasailing monthly. We work closely with our PTA who does random surprises such as food truck breakfasts. We send each other electronic kudos as a thank you for going above and beyond. Every new staff member gets a mentor, regardless if they are new to teaching or not. If they are not the primary focus is to help the new staff member become acclimated with our school community, layout, culture, and surrounding area.

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

Principal Reid and Assistant Principal Lusk work collaboratively to monitor staff morale. When it looks like a boost is needed they might bring around the happy cart or meet with the leadership team to get insight on how to improve a situation. Staff members are frequently recognized on the morning news. The leadership team consists of Mrs. Sanders, Mrs. Lear, Dr. Bergamo, Dr. Heuck, Ms. King, and Ms. Christoff.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00