Tortuga Preserve Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Tortuga Preserve Elementary School

1711 GUNNERY RD N, Lehigh Acres, FL 33971

http://tpe.leeschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Shonak

Start Date for this Principal: 9/20/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (50%)
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

Tortuga Preserve Elementary School

1711 GUNNERY RD N, Lehigh Acres, FL 33971

http://tpe.leeschools.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	82%

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.

Tortuga Preserve is shaping well-rounded leaders by being Proactive, Organized, Wise, Engaged, and Respectful. Our mindset is #ALLIN!

Provide the school's vision statement.

One TEAM with one MINDSET on the path to SUCCESS.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Shonak, Jennifer	Principal	Oversees all processes and procedures for the students and staff of the school. Ensures that teachers and staff are working towards SIP goals. Monitors school-wide data.
Vest, Marla	Assistant Principal	Oversees all processes and procedures for the students and staff of the school. Ensures teachers and staff are working towards SIP Goals. AP over K-2, K-5 ELA, TItle I, ESOL and APPLES Administrator.
Crawford, Dave	Assistant Principal	Oversees all processes and procedures for the students and staff of the school. Ensures that teachers and staff are working towards SIP Goals. AP over Grades 3-5, Math & Science, ESE and Safety.
Akridge, Chansi	Instructional Coach	Primary Literacy Coach who supports teachers and curriculum/instruction. Supports instruction related to SIP goals and assists in leading PLC's K-2.
Phennicie, Molly	Instructional Coach	Peer Collaborative Teacher who supports teachers 40% of the day and one classroom 60% for the school day. Supports instruction related to SIP Goals and assists in leading PLCs, models/coaches teachers and provides staff professional development.
Putnam, Amy	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Resource Teacher supports instruction related to SIP Goals and assists in leading PLC's.
Subbert, Elizabeth	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Resource Teacher supports instruction related to SIP Goals and assists in leading PLC's.
Pappas, Nicole	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Resource Teacher supports instruction related to SIP Goals, assists in leading PLC's and is testing coordinator.
Carter, Elizabeth	Dean	Student Discipline, administrative role/team, PBIS and assistant testing coordinator.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 9/20/2021, Jennifer Shonak

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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,038

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

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

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	165	187	149	190	153	194	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1038
Attendance below 90 percent	14	36	34	33	30	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	181
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	1	25	9	40	35	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
Course failure in Math	1	10	4	12	11	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	33	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	10	51	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
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	15	8	22	48	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145

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	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	133	141	162	154	175	153	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	918
Attendance below 90 percent	3	13	17	10	17	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	3	11	8	11	14	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Course failure in Math	3	4	2	6	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	30	5	2	7	11	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

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	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	133	141	162	154	175	153	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	918
Attendance below 90 percent	3	13	17	10	17	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	3	11	8	11	14	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Course failure in Math	3	4	2	6	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	30	5	2	7	11	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

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	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	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				45%	57%	57%	51%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				41%	56%	58%	52%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	50%	53%	46%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				53%	62%	63%	57%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				53%	65%	62%	58%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	54%	51%	38%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				48%	52%	53%	60%	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	40%	55%	-15%	58%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2021					
	2019	43%	54%	-11%	56%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	54%	61%	-7%	62%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	53%	62%	-9%	64%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
05	2021					
	2019	54%	58%	-4%	60%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	48%	50%	-2%	53%	-5%
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	16/11.9	36/24.8	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/16.7	2/15.4	0/0
	English Language Learners	1/3.3	5/15.2	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9/6.8	19/13.4	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/8.3	2/15.4	0/0
	English Language Learners	3/10	2/6.3	0/0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	19/12.7	31/19.7	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/5	0/0
	English Language Learners	1/2.4	1/2.3	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	3/2.0	9/5.9	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	1/2.4	0/0	0/0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	36/23.7	55/34.6	66/40.7
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/13.3	3/21.4	3/18.8
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/2.9	3/8.1
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10/6.8	32/20.4	47/29
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/6.7	2/14.3	4/25
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	2/5.4

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	50/32.5	67/42.7	70/43.2
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/10.5	0/0	3/14.3
	English Language Learners	2/9.5	4/18.2	3/13
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8/5.4	31/19.9	52/32.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	2/10
	English Language Learners	/0/	2/9.5	4/17.4

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	39/27.5	50/32.5	64/40.5
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/9.1	2/18.2
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/5.3	1/4.8
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11/8	33/21.9	47/29.9
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	1/9.1
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/5.6	3/14.3
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	22/15.3	49/33.1	65/43.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/9.1	2/22.2
	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	23	56		24	25		19				
ELL	33	45	42	29	41	42	23				
BLK	36	42	50	32	39	20	23				
HSP	43	51	45	42	42	24	36				
MUL	72			72							
WHT	62	40		59	72		54				
FRL	37	42	47	36	43	30	31				

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	27	36	33	33	42	42	28				
ELL	32	33	20	42	47	50	33				
BLK	37	43	61	43	46	48	35				
HSP	41	34	26	49	49	39	35				
MUL	67	75		67	50						
WHT	61	51	64	70	65	64	80				
FRL	41	41	42	48	50	44	41				

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	25	36	32	35	52	33	35				
ELL	27	44	48	44	47	26	27				
BLK	42	48	39	46	46	26	52				
HSP	44	49	52	54	59	41	53				
MUL	69	67		81	75						
WHT	70	59		70	65		84				
FRL	48	49	41	54	56	39	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	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	36
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	335

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	36
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	33
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	40
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	72
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	57
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	38
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?

According to 2018-19 Spring FSA Data our Math proficiency has decreased over time in all grade levels and subgroups.

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

Based upon the data components over the last 3 years the area that demonstrated the greatest need for improvement was Math L25 learning gains in all subgroups.

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

Math proficiency decreased from 53% in 2019 to 48% in 2021.Math learning gains decreased from 53% in 2019 to 48% in 2021. Math L25 Gains decreased from 44% in 2019 to 30% in 2021. Some contributing factors to the decline were inconsistent attendance, students learning virtually instead of in person, high teacher turnover in 4th and 5th grade, and many first year teachers in grades 3-5. New actions would include all students attending in person, a greater amount of support in math for new teachers in grades 3-5, increase in math intervention throughout the school year, and a greater focus on math instruction during PLC's.

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

Based upon the data our most improved area was our ELA Gains and ELA L25 Gains.

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

Some of the contributing factors for improvement in this area were afterschool tutoring, increased focus on ELA intervention during PLC's, and teachers focusing on individual student need in each standard.

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

Strategies will include increasing the number of Resource Teachers supporting grades 3-5 in ELA, focusing on standards mastery, intense intervention time, and afterschool tutoring.

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.

The professional development opportunities will include a book study on best teaching practices, short make and take sessions focused on student engagement, math, and high yield strategies.

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 will include having resource teachers to support grades 3-5, strategic plans that are implemented to provide support for students and having a focus on PLC structure.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 2020-2021 FSA Spring Data, one of our lowest performing categories was ELA Learning Gains with 47%. This is an increase of 6% from 2018 - 2019 FSA Data, however, it is currently our lowest performing area for ELA. This will continue to be a focus area for the 2021-2022 school year, especially our SWD and ELL Subgroups.
Measurable Outcome:	By the Spring of 2021-2022, ELA Learning Gains will increase from 47% to 70% as measured by the FSA.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through iReady lessons and the iReady standards based exemplars.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Shonak (jenniferis@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	TPE's Resource Team along with the ELA Leading and Learning Teams will support 3 - 5 with ELA planning. They will work with grade level teams and administration to review data and determine the areas of greatest need in reference to the ELA Standards. Students will use iReady intervention to support classroom instruction along with the LAFS Curriculum based on grade level standards. High Yield Strategies will be implemented in to daily instruction. Students will also be placed in flexible intervention groups during WIN Time for 45 minutes daily. All students, in all subgroups will be placed on their individual needs for standards mastery/enrichment mastery.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We determined that small group instruction will allow teachers to differentiate and target standards that are not being met and are specific to individual student needs. This also allows teachers to enrich those students that have mastered the standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1) Identify students that did not make ELA Learning Gains during the 2020-2021 School Year based on FSA data.
2) Determine students and standards needed (mastery/enrichment) based on iReady data.
3) Determine intervention/enrichment based on need.
4) Instruct on level for 90 minute ELA Block and based on needs during the 45 minutes of intervention. Provide support from Resource teachers to push in/pull out or coach individual teachers.
5) Assess, review data, plan for instruction and change instruction/groups based on needs.

Person Responsible Jennifer Shonak (jenniferis@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 2020-2021 FSA Spring Data, one of our lowest performing categories was Math Lowest 25% with 30%. This is a continued area of focus for the 2021-2022 school year with a focus on our students in ELL and SWD subgroups.
Measurable Outcome:	By the Spring of 2021-2022, Math Lowest 25% will increase from 30% to 44% as measured by the FSA.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through iReady lessons and the iReady standards based exemplars.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Shonak (jenniferis@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	TPE's Resource Team along with the Math Leading and Learning Teams will support 3 - 5 with Math planning. They will work with grade level teams and administration to to review data and determine the areas of greatest need in reference to the Math Standards. Students will use i-Ready intervention to support classroom instruction along with the I-Ready toolbox for on grade level standards. High Yield Strategies will be implemented in to daily instruction. Additional intervention time will be implemented throughout the day and during morning breakfast clubs/lunch bunch. After school tutoring (3-5) and students pulled for extra instruction via PE waivers (4 and 5) will begin Jan/Feb. Grade level intervention time will rotate between ELA and Math.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We determined that small group instruction will allow teachers to differentiate and target standards that are not being met and are specific to individual student needs. This also allows teachers to enrich those students that have mastered the standards. Data will be tracked using i-Ready Math and formatives to analyze what standards the students need and intervention/enrichment will be based on need.

Action Steps to Implement

1) Identify students that not make Math Learning Gains during the 2020-2021 School Year based on FSA data.
2) Determine students and standards needed (mastery/enrichment) based on iReady data.
3) Determine intervention/enrichment based on need.
4) 75 minute Math Block to include whole group and small group instruction both on level and reteach standards not mastered.
5) Assess, review data, plan for instruction and change instruction/groups based on needs.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Shonak (jenniferis@leeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Achievement level for Science decreased from 48% proficient to 37% proficient the 2020-2021 school year. 2021 Quarter 1 baseline data showed a proficiency of 24% proficient. This is a continued area of focus for the 2021-2022 school year with a focus on our students in ELL and SWD subgroups.
Measurable Outcome:	In 2021-2022 we will increase our Science proficiency from 37% proficient to 50% proficient as reported by the FLDOE School Grade Report.
Monitoring:	Diagnostic results from the District Progress Monitoring Baseline Science Assessment will be utilized to track student progress. Teachers will also use formatives and Performance matters to track science standard throughout the year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Shonak (jenniferis@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	TPE's Resource Team along with the Science Leading and Learning Teams will support 3 - 5 with Science planning. They will work with grade level teams, district science team and administration to review data and determine the areas of greatest need in reference to the Science Standards for grades 4 and 5. K-3 will include Science in 30 minutes each day at least 3 days a week. Grades 4-5 will include 45 minutes of Science per day. 5th Grade will revisit 3rd and 4th grade Science standards as needed. 5th Grade Resource Teacher will work with small groups of students to target specific areas of need based on standards/ diagnostic results.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Consistent team planning and collaboration with the District will help strategize and plan for Science instruction. Including 30-45 minutes per day of Science instruction across K-5 will build mastery of Science standards across all grade levels. Creating a plan to revisit 3rd and 4th grade Science standards will assist students in the mastery of standards taught in previous grades.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Conduct District Progress Monitoring Science Assessment with 5th Grade Students.
2. Determine students scoring below proficient level.
3. Identify standards not mastered.
4. Plan for intervention of standards based on student needs.
5. Monitor, progress, revisit plan.

Person Responsible   Jennifer Shonak (jenniferis@leeschools.net)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 2020-2021 FSA Spring Data, one of our lowest performing categories with our ESSA subgroup was ELA Proficiency with 23%. This is a decrease of 4% from 2018 - 2019 FSA Data, however it is our lowest performing area for ELA. This will continue to be a focus area for the 2021-2022 school year with our ESSA group.
Measurable Outcome:	By the Spring of 2021-2022, ELA Proficiency for our ESSA subgroup will increase from 23% to 30% as measured by the FSA.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through iReady diagnostics and the iReady standards based exemplars.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Shonak (jenniferis@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	TPE's ESE Resource Team along with the ELA Leading and Learning Teams will support 3 - 5 with ELA planning. They will work with grade levels and admin to review data and determine the areas of greatest need in reference to the ELA Standards. Students will use iReady intervention to support classroom instruction along with the LAFS Curriculum based on grade level standards. High Yield Strategies will be implemented into daily instruction. Students will also be placed in flexible intervention groups during WIN Time for 45 minutes daily. All students, in all subgroups will be placed on their individual needs for standards mastery/enrichment mastery.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We determined that small group instruction will allow teachers to differentiate and target standards that are not being met and are specific to individual student needs. This also allows teachers to enrich those students that have mastered the standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1) Identify students that not proficient during the 2020-2021 School Year based on FSA data.
2) Determine students and standards needed (mastery/enrichment) based on iReady data.
3) Determine intervention/enrichment based on need.
4) Instruct on level for 90 minute ELA Block and based on needs during the 45 minutes of intervention.
5) Provide support from ESE Resource teachers to push in/pull out or coach individual teachers.
6) Assess, review data, plan for instruction and change instruction/groups based on needs.

Person Responsible Jennifer Shonak (jenniferis@leeschools.net)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 2020-2021 FSA Spring Data, one of our lowest performing categories with our ELL subgroup was ELA Proficiency with 14%. This is an decrease of 8% from 2018 - 2019 FSA Data, however it is our lowest performing area for ELA. This will continue to be a focus area for the 2021-2022 school year with our ELL group.
Measurable Outcome:	By the Spring of 2021-2022, ELA Proficiency for our ELL subgroup will increase from 14% to 30% as measured by the FSA.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through iReady lessons and the iReady standards based exemplars.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	TPE's ESOL Resource Teacher, ESOL Paras, along with the ELA Leading Learning Teams, and District ESOL Specialist will support 3 - 5 with ELA planning. They will work with grade level teams and administration to review data and determine the areas of greatest need in reference to the ELA Standards. Students will use iReady intervention to support classroom instruction along with the LAFS Curriculum based on grade level standards. High Yield Strategies will be implemented in to daily instruction. Students will also be placed in flexible intervention groups during WIN Time for 45 minutes daily based on individual needs. In addition to standard curriculum students will work in Imagine Learning as needed. All students, in all subgroups will be placed on their individual needs for standards mastery/enrichment mastery.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We determined that small group instruction will allow teachers to differentiate and target standards that are not being met and are specific to individual student needs. This also allows teachers to enrich those students that have mastered the standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1) Identify students that did not make ELA Learning Gains during the 2020-2021 School Year based on FSA data.
2) Determine students and standards needed (mastery/enrichment) based on iReady data.
3) Determine intervention/enrichment based on need.
4) Instruct on level for 90 minute ELA Block and based on needs during the 45 minutes of intervention.
5) Provide support from ESOL Resource teachers and ESOL Paras to push in/pull out or coach individual teachers.
6) Assess, review data, plan for instruction and change instruction/groups based on needs.

Person Responsible Marla Vest (marlamv@leeschools.net)

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 2020-2021 FSA Spring Data, one of our lowest performing categories with our ESSA subgroup for Math was Proficiency with 24%. This is an decrease of 9% from 2018 - 2019 FSA Data. This will continue to be a focus area for the 2021-2022 school year with our ESSA group.
Measurable Outcome:	By the Spring of 2021-2022, Math Proficiency for our ESSA subgroup will increase from 24% to 30% as measured by the FSA.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through iReady diagnostics and district math formatives.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Shonak (jenniferis@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	TPE's ESE Resource Team along with the Math Leading and Learning Teams will support 3 - 5 with Math planning. They will work with grade levels and admin to review data and determine the areas of greatest need in reference to the Math Standards. Students will use iReady intervention to support classroom instruction along with the math standards. High Yield Strategies will be implemented in to daily instruction. Students will also be placed in flexible intervention groups during WIN Time for 45 minutes daily. All students, in all subgroups will be placed on their individual needs for standards mastery/enrichment mastery.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We determined that small group instruction will allow teachers to differentiate and target standards that are not being met and are specific to individual student needs. This also allows teachers to enrich those students that have mastered the standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1) Identify students that not meet Math Proficiency during the 2020-2021 School Year based on FSA data.
2) Determine students and standards needed (mastery/enrichment) based on iReady data.
3) Determine intervention/enrichment based on need.
4) 75 minute Math Block to include whole group and small group instruction both on level and reteach standards not mastered.
5) Assess, review data, plan for instruction and change instruction/groups based on needs.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Shonak (jenniferis@leeschools.net)

#7. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 2020-2021 FSA Spring Data, one of our lowest performing categories with our ELL subgroup was Math Proficiency with 17%. This is an decrease of 11% from 2018 - 2019 FSA Data, however it is our lowest performing area for Math. This will continue to be a focus area for the 2021-2022 school year with our ELL group.
Measurable Outcome:	By the Spring of 2021-2022, Math Proficiency for our ELL subgroup will increase from 17% to 30% as measured by the FSA.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through iReady lessons and the district math formatives.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marla Vest (marlamv@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	TPE's ESOL Resource Teacher, ESOL Paras, along with the Math Leading Learning Teams, and District ESOL Specialist will support 3 - 5 with Math planning. They will work with grade level teams and administration to review data and determine the areas of greatest need in reference to the Math Standards. Students will use iReady intervention to support classroom instruction along with the LAFS Curriculum based on grade level standards. High Yield Strategies will be implemented in to daily instruction. Students will also be placed in flexible intervention groups during WIN Time for 45 minutes daily based on individual needs. In addition to standard curriculum students will work in Imagine Learning as needed. All students, in all subgroups will be placed on their individual needs for standards mastery/enrichment mastery.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We determined that small group instruction will allow teachers to differentiate and target standards that are not being met and are specific to individual student needs. This also allows teachers to enrich those students that have mastered the standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1) Identify students that not meet Math Proficiency during the 2020-2021 School Year based on FSA data.
2) Determine students and standards needed (mastery/enrichment) based on iReady data.
3) Determine intervention/enrichment based on need.
4) 75 minute Math Block to include whole group and small group instruction both on level and reteach standards not mastered.
5) Assess, review data, plan for instruction and change instruction/groups based on needs.

Person Responsible	Marla Vest (marlamv@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.

Tortuga Preserve does not appear on the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org site.
Over the past three years our referral trend has been on the decline. Our areas of concern are insubordination and peer conflict.
Tortuga Preserve Elementary was recognized as a PBIS Model School for the 2019-2020 school year. We will continue to try to decrease referrals by increasing positive behavior in our school and integrating restorative practices. This year we have implemented a House System - 8 houses, 1 family, within our school. We use LIVE School to track student points and are able to collect data based on points given to individual students school-wide. We will track the data points along with referral incidents to focus on needs for students (i.e. mentors, check in/out system, counseling sessions/groups, character ed lessons, etc.).

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.

We take pride in having a positive school culture and involving our stakeholders in our school environment. Since COVID, we have not been able to have visitors on campus but have been able to involve our parents/ families virtually and outside of school. This year we have incorporated the House System into our PBIS program to ensure a sense of community and belonging for all of our staff & students. We are focusing on the positive and doing good things for our community.
Parents, teachers, students, community members and business partners will participate in the comprehensive needs assessment by hosting an Annual Title I Meeting, Curriculum Night, PTA Meetings, SAC Meetings, ESE Parent Meetings, Parent-Teacher Conferences, along with Math and Science Nights. We also have a bi-lingual Parent Involvement Specialist who is available to meet with parents and give resources to them as needed. Stakeholders will participate as the result of our monthly school newsletter, School Messenger, Peachjar, paper flyers, school marquee, school website and Facebook page, email and phone calls. Our events are at various times (before/after school). We enlist community and business partners via our school events, partnering with local agencies for our Spirit Nights and our SAC Meeting.

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

Input from stakeholders will be collected through open discussions and workshop feedback responses. These communications will be flexible in format (such as online, in person or on paper) allowing for all parents to give input. Formats will be in different languages and simple terms that parents can easily understand. Information gathered from this data will be used to identify school needs and create a plan. Stakeholders will be involved in the design, implementation and evaluation of the school-wide plan during attendance and participation in the SAC Meetings. The SAC will openly discuss, make edits and vote as a committee to approve the SIP and the expenditure of the 1% parent involvement dollars. The SAC will also discuss progress monitoring data during all meetings and the progress we are making towards our SIP Goals. Strategies to increase family engagement are included in our Parent Family & Engagement Plan (PFEP).

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
7	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00