The School District of Lee County

Treeline Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Treeline Elementary School

10900 TREELINE AVE, Fort Myers, FL 33913

http://tre.leeschools.net/

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Wilcken

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	No
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

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

Treeline Elementary School

10900 TREELINE AVE, Fort Myers, FL 33913

http://tre.leeschools.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	82%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	71%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Treeline Elementary's mission is to prepare all students to succeed in a caring, learning community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Treeline Elementary's vision is to provide quality education that empowers individuals to become caring, global, responsible citizens who value learning.

Treeline's Core Values are: Respect, Trust, Integrity, Loyalty, Collaboration, Fun and Joy

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
Wilcken, Jennifer	Principal	
Cook , Franklin	Assistant Principal	
McFee, Donna	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

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

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.*
3

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.*
10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,093

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	167	170	175	182	203	196	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1093
Attendance below 90 percent	12	24	21	21	22	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	1	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA	1	4	3	6	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in Math	1	3	1	7	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	60	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	66	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
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	4	3	8	53	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111

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	5	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	150	156	171	186	168	174	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1005
Attendance below 90 percent	7	9	13	12	15	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
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	1	4	0	2	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	150	156	171	186	168	174	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1005
Attendance below 90 percent	7	9	13	12	15	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
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	1	4	0	2	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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				56%	57%	57%	52%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				60%	56%	58%	51%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	50%	53%	33%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				63%	62%	63%	56%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				68%	65%	62%	43%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	54%	51%	28%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				54%	52%	53%	49%	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	59%	58%	1%	58%	1%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	52%	55%	-3%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2021					
	2019	53%	54%	-1%	56%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	64%	61%	3%	62%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	56%	62%	-6%	64%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2021					
	2019	63%	58%	5%	60%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	52%	50%	2%	53%	-1%
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	13/11.2	38/31.9	1/100
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	2/25	1/100
	English Language Learners	0/0	2/12.5	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10/8.7	28/23.7	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/12.5	0/0
	English Language Learners	1/6.3	1/6.3	0/0

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33/19.4	76/41.8	1/33.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/12.5	3/17.6	0/0
	English Language Learners	2/10	4/19	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16/9.8	40/22	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/6.7	1/5.9	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27/17.3	56/32	77/43.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/5.0	3/15
	English Language Learners	1/4.5	2/8	4/16
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15/9.8	37/21.3	60/33.9
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	1/5
	English Language Learners	0/0	3/12	5/20

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	53/31.9	69/39.2	87/48.9
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/4.2	2/7.7	4/14.8
	English Language Learners	0/0	2.9.1	1/4.5
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14/8.5	46/26.3	64/36.0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	3/11.5	5/18.5
	English Language Learners	0/0	2/9.5	2/9.1

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	62/37.8	76/44.4	94/54
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/6.7	1/3.3	3/9.7
	English Language Learners	1/6.3	2/11.8	2/11.1
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25/15.4	44/25.7	61/35.7
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/3.3	2/6.9
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47/28.8	58/34.7	78/47.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/6.9	1/3.3	3/11.1
	English Language Learners	1/5.9	2/12.5	2/11.1

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	19	35	38	17	10	11	11				
ELL	27	65	55	31	39		11				
ASN	67			71							
BLK	38	40	38	36	12	7	24				
HSP	45	71	53	46	45	25	37				
MUL	68			67							
WHT	71	64		69	47		60				
FRL	43	56	46	39	29	22	25				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	16	40	43	18	41	43	17				
ELL	34	55	37	41	67	65	33				
ASN	71	69		88	81						
BLK	39	53	56	45	55	43	32				
HSP	51	55	45	57	64	59	48				
MUL	65	70		70	90						
WHT	76	71		83	85		81				
FRL	43	54	51	50	59	48	40				
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	11	18	16	15	25	26	17				
ELL	25	39	38	38	39	33	31				
ASN	68	71		82	79						
BLK	37	49	38	33	25	27	35				
HSP	43	44	29	51	36	30	44				
MUL	75			58							
WHT	73	58	17	75	60	27	64				
FRL	43	46	31	46	36	26	43				

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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	382
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	20
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	42
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	70
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	28
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	48
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	68
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	62
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	41
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?

The area of ELA was (overall) the lower component for Treeline with 56% scoring in the proficient range and 60% making learning gains. The subgroup making the least amount of learning gains in both ELA and mathematics for the 19-20 school year was the students with disabilities and the lowest 25%. In the area of ELA, only 43% made gains in ELA, and in the area of mathematics, only 43% made learning gains.

The subgroup noted with the lowest proficiency is SWD (student with disabilities), scoring at only 16%. A trend is evident with this subgroup, as their math proficiency was at 18%.

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

The data component showing the greatest need for improvement is 3-5 ELA with 51% proficiency. Regarding subgroup performance, the lowest 25% represents the largest need for improvement with proficiency at 49%.

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

By focusing on consistent focus on data, strategic PLC processes, ELA Tutoring Program, Teacher Data Chats and PDPs (professional development plans), Teacher Coaching/ Mentoring and walkabouts, Common Planning Time, Strategic Grade Level Placement of 2021-2022 Teachers, Highly Effective Reading Coaches remediate MTSS groups 3rd-5th (Tier 3 students).

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was 5th grade ELA proficiency. Fifth grade ELA proficiency was 57% compared to 53% in 2018-2019 which is an increase of 4%.

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

The improvement can, in part, be attributed to the school's implementation of more purposeful PLCs, common Planning Time/ Team Planning, and strategic planning of intervention blocks. Teachers will be using programs like Really Great Reading, Read 180, and enrichment room for students that are working above grade level.

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

In order to accelerate student learning teachers will receive continuous training and development with high yield strategies such as Kagan, thinking maps, distributive summarizing, chunking and more. Teachers within plcs will address how students will learn and will backwards design plan using standards mastery exemplars.

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.

All teachers have optional professional development training offered monthly. These trainings are facilitated by our veteran teachers and literacy coaches. Literacy coaches and our intervention specialist planned content-based training to deliver to grade levels based upon school SIP goals and teacher feedback. In quarter 1 several training sessions will be mandatory for grade levels. These were vocabulary strategies, iready data analysis and thinking maps with writing. New to Treeline teachers received a thinking maps training and those new to teaching received classroom management and center structures and strategies. Other trainings offered to teachers consisted of high yield strategies, monthly kagan clubs, communicating with parents, and more.

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

Emphasize Social and Emotional Learning
Allow for additional time to integrate necessary prerequisite skills
Customize instruction based on strengths and areas of growth for each student
Leverage student interests that lead to deep, engaging learning
Small group instruction

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Although Treeline increased the ELA Learning Gain of L25% for students with disabilities from 16% in 2018 to 43% in 2019, there is still a need to increase more in order to raise the ESSA Federal Index for this group from 35% to 41%. During the 2021-2022 school year, Treeline will increase ELA Learning Gains of L25% of students with disabilities from 43% to 45%.
Measurable Outcome:	Treeline's goal is to achieve a 45% ELA Learning Gain for L25% of students with disabilities in the 2021-2022 school year. To achieve this goal, we will implement reading strategies in reading and intervention blocks with research-based district-provided materials and professional development opportunities to obtain additional strategies that can be used across the curriculum in reading in all grade levels.
Monitoring:	ESE resource teachers monitor students with disabilities by using objective measures such as anecdotal reports and teacher or student perceptions. ESE resource teachers and classroom teachers measure frequently and systematically based on the student's IEP goals, objectives, and use of accommodations. ESE resource teachers must monitor accommodations in the classroom regarding small group instruction and testing. As a school, we use a spreadsheet that shows lists accommodations with students with a IEP and 504 plan. Analyzing data from formative assessments given to students before the start of a new standard is taught enables teachers to differentiate instruction to what the individual student needs. Monitoring student progress towards focus goals using I-READY diagnostic, Dibels, and exemplar assessments. Administration monitors individual student progress using the IReady progress monitoring assessments throughout the school year. Teachers participate in one on one data chats with the administration to ensure student success. Evaluating current data and creating action plans during grade-level PLCs to ensure student success tailored to students with disabilities.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Wilcken (jenniferkw@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instruction Differentiated instruction Use of graphic organizers such as thinking maps Use of visuals to improve understanding and mastery HD Word to guild decoding skills especially multi syllabic words Read180 program for those students with disabilities who can read but have trouble comprehending Metacognitive Strategies such as previewing text, making predictions, building background knowledge, making connections, rereading for clarity, GIST summarizing
Rationale for	HD Word is a program for students needing to master decoding skills especially multisyllabic words. Read 180 is another evidence-based program that is used for students

Evidence-based Strategy:	who know how to read but have difficulty comprehending the content. Teachers are trained to implement and monitor, with fidelity, students in the HD Word and Read 180 intervention programs to students with these specific needs.

Action Steps to Implement

ESE resource teachers work with classroom teachers to discuss and plan special education plans, and collaborating or co-planning around programming for students.

Our resource teachers push in and/or pull out students with disabilities to work on their specific IEP goals. Resources teachers will conduct small groups with students with similar goals. Each resource teacher must create a lesson plan that focuses on students' goals and objectives.

Progress reports are created by ESE resource teachers for each student and sent home every 9 weeks to track and measure student progress.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Wilcken (jenniferkw@leeschools.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During the 2021-2022 school year, Treeline will increase ELA proficiency of the Lowest 25th Percentile from 49% to 51%. Even though this percentage increased from 33% in 2018 to 49% in 2019, there is still a need for improvement. The Lowest 25th Percentile group includes Students with Disabilities.
Measurable Outcome:	Treeline will increase ELA proficiency of the Lowest 25th Percentile from 49% to 51 in the 2021-2022 school year. IReady progress monitoring diagnostic reports will be used to monitor and analyze the progress of our L25 and student with disabilities throughout the school year. Quarterly, classroom teachers will review their progress based on their report cards grades, teacher observation, various assessments to determine which interventions are necessary in order for student success.
Monitoring:	Administration, classroom teachers, and coaches will monitor student progress towards focus goals using I-READY diagnostic reports, Dibels fluency assessment scores, and exemplar assessments scores. Assessment scores will allow teachers and coaches to see which students are on grade level and which students need additional support. Teachers and ESE resource teachers will evaluate current data and create action plans during grade-level PLCs to ensure student success tailored to students with disabilities.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Wilcken (jenniferkw@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Google classroom activity list tailored to the child's IEP goals with differentiated lessons. Snap and read are used to reload, simplify difficult vocabulary, and translate English into other languages. Small group instruction Differentiated instruction Use of graphic organizers such as thinking maps Use of visuals aids to improve understanding, communication, and mastery HD Word and Haggerty's lessons to guild decoding skills especially multisyllabic words Read180 program for those students with disabilities who can read but have trouble comprehending Metacognitive Strategies such as previewing text, making predictions, building background knowledge, making connections, rereading for clarity, GIST summarizing
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	HD Word is a program for students needing to master decoding skills especially multisyllabic words. Read 180 is another evidence-based program that is used for students who know how to read but have difficulty comprehending the content. Teachers are trained to implement and monitor, with fidelity, students in the HD Word and Read 180 intervention programs to students with these specific needs. Google classroom activity lists are tailored to the child's IEP goals with differentiated lessons. Google activity lists can be used during centers and can use to accommodate personalized lessons. Snap and read are used to reload, simplify difficult vocabulary, and translate English into other languages. Snap and read can support students with reading larger texts and assist

with vocabulary. Students can listen to each text numerous times and allows them to pause to take notes if needed.

Small group instruction provides the classroom teacher and ESE resource teacher opportunities to use differentiated instruction based on student needs and progress.

The use of thinking maps, visual aids, and interactive notebook allows our students to improve understanding, communication, and master skills at their pace with support.

Read180 program for those students with disabilities who can read but have trouble comprehending
Metacognitive Strategies such as previewing text, making predictions, building background knowledge, making connections, rereading for clarity, GIST summarizing.

Action Steps to Implement

Small group instruction- provides the classroom and ESE resource teacher opportunities to use differentiated instruction based on student needs and progress. Students will be identified and grouped by assessment data and current test scores. Classroom teachers and ESE resource teachers will use differentiated lesson plans to assess the needs of each child by creating a plan of action that will allow students with disabilities and our L25 students the ability to reach their goals.

Intervention Groupings - Treeline has a process where teachers and coaches are responsible for using dibels fluency, reading inventories, and IREADY.

Person Responsible Jennifer Wilcken (jenniferkw@leeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	2019 ELA FSA data indicates that 3rd Grade Proficiency increased from 52% in 2018 to 59% in 2019, 4th Grade Proficiency decreased from 53% in 2018 to 52% in 2019, and 5th Grade Proficiency increased from 44% in 2018 to 53% in 2019. Overall 3rd 4th and 5th Grade ELA FSA combined proficiency was 51% and our goal is to reach 54% proficiency. By focusing on consistent focus on data, strategic PLC processes, 3rd ELA Tutoring Program, Teacher Data Chats and PDPs (professional development plans), Teacher Coaching/ Mentoring and walkabouts, Common Planning Time, Strategic Grade Level Placement of 2021-2022 Teachers, Highly Effective Reading Coaches remediate MTSS groups 3rd-5th (Tier 3 students).
Measurable Outcome:	During the 2021-2022 school year, Treeline will increase reading proficiency with students in grades 3-5 from 56% to 58% in the upcoming school year. To achieve this goal, we will implement reading strategies in reading and intervention blocks with district-provided materials and professional development opportunities to obtain additional strategies that can be used across the curriculum in reading in all grade levels.
Monitoring:	iReady Progress Monitoring District ELA Assessments Summative Assessments
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Wilcken (jenniferkw@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	3rd ELA Tutoring Program using research-based curriculum resources and structured implementation plan Curriculum Maps & Guides for Teachers Teacher Data Chats and PDPs Teacher Coaching/ Mentoring and walkabouts Common Planning Time Team Planning Intervention Blocks with Differentiated Instruction PLCs Strategic Grade Level Placement of 2021-2022 Teachers Highly Effective Reading Coaches remediate MTSS groups 3rd-5th (Tier 3 students) As a school, we also implement half-day planning for grades K-5 for all teachers. PLCs to identify standards not mastered in reading and creating a planned action to increase student achievement in reading across all grade levels. Also, we will use differentiated structured curriculum plans with fidelity and scaffolding in grades K-5th.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Overall 3rd, 4th, and 5th Grade ELA FSA combined proficiency was 51% and our goal is to reach 54% proficiency. Our 4th-grade proficiency decreased from 53% to 52% which tell us that our focus needs to remain on the intermediate grade levels.
Action Steps to Implement	

1. Common Planning Time/ Team Planning- Grade levels will be scheduled a common planning time to collaborate and increase to engaging and differentiated lessons with rigor and higher-order thinking strategies.
Extra half-day planning for grade levels for science and writing is established immediately after district-led professional development.

2. Intervention Blocks- At this time, planned, rigorous, and differentiated interventions, as determined by data will be administered. Teachers use programs Really Great Reading and Read 180, and Florida materials to reach comprehension mastery.

3. Curriculum Guides and Maps- Maps will support teams to ensure each standard is being taught towards mastery during the school year. The guides supply teachers with rigor and vetted-based lessons, strategies, and curriculum.

4. PLCs- All grade levels meet every Wednesday during their planning time as they collaborate, plan, and train for student achievement and use data to drive their action plans. Administrators and coaches attend weekly PLCs to offer immediate feedback to facilitators in order to build the leader capacity necessary for academic achievement. The entire school uses the same online data spreadsheet to display and analyze individual student, classroom, subgroup, grade level, and school data. All student data is updated upon the completion of each iReady Progress Monitoring Assessment to allow teachers to view and plan for school progression towards final goals. Grade level teams backward design curriculum from district exemplars which ensure that the grade labels plan for the rigor necessary for student mastery.

5. Data Chats & Coaching - Administration will conduct individual data chats with teachers within the grade levels they are supporting. Our ESSA subgroup, students with disabilities, will always be a topic during the discussion and to ensure that the data is analyzed to support the achievement needs. The same administrators conduct classroom observations throughout the year and support teachers' needs through individualized coaching in identified areas. Teachers use their professional development plans to help guide their discussions toward their goals.

6. Treeline will continue to implement Kagan strategies throughout each classroom for the entire school year. In addition, each grade level is responsible for focusing on one specific additional Kagan Structure within their classrooms for the school year resulting in more natural and fluid use of that structure in the years to come. New teachers participate in Kagan and thinking map training at the beginning of the year and focus on a few structures or maps at a time until they have mastered the skills.

8. Teacher Placement - Strategic placement changes of teachers in grades 3-5 will further support the school's ELA goals. As well as teacher placement for intervention rooms.

9. Highly Effective Reading Coaches (2) and the Intervention Specialist pull out K - 5th grade TIER 3 MTSS student groups for ELA interventions 5 days per week. Progress is measured by using iReady ELA and dibels, and reading surveys.
All of the action steps above will be monitored through iReady progress monitoring, classroom walkthroughs, teacher observations, data chats, and lesson plans.

10. 3rd grade ELA tutoring plan- In the second semester, academic coaches will pull students close to proficiency for targeted instruction. Students are identified looking closely by looking at the trend line based on FSA and IREADY diagnostic reports.

11. As a school we offer ongoing optional professional development training on Fridays for all teachers. Training is facilitated by our veteran teachers and literacy coaches. Literacy coaches and our intervention

specialists deliver content-based information and strategies based upon school SIP goals and teacher feedback. In quarter 1, two training sessions are mandatory for each grade level. Training topics include vocabulary strategies and thinking maps with writing. Instructional coaches utilize teacher feedback from a professional development survey sent at the beginning and end of the year to determine optional in-service training. This training supports the teachers in implementing these evidence-based strategies such as thinking maps and tiered vocabulary in their classrooms. Teachers take advantage of these offerings to enhance their teaching skills.

Person Responsible   Jennifer Wilcken (jenniferkw@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.

Based on the safeschoolsforalex.org dashboard, Treeline Elementary is ranked 287 out of 1395 statewide. Which is considered "low" for school-wide incidents. The school incident ranking is based on the number of incidents per 100 students. One area of concern is peer conflict amongst students. As a school, we implement character educational strategies. Character education is a school-wide strategy where students have a character education word of the week. On the morning news, students are introduced to the "word of the week" and they are given the definition and examples on how to model each character education word. It is an expectation that teachers and staff remind and display these keywords in their learning environments. Our guidance counselor meets with individuals and groups of students to teach social skills in learning how to interact with others. Administration proactively holds peer conflict strategy conferences in order to resolve and teach all levels of conflict in a respectful manner. Administration and staff monitor the number of peer conflicts by the number of referrals. As a school, we are proactively checking in/out with students that have had peer conflicts in the past to ensure school expectations and student accountability are modeled.

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.

Treeline has a large volunteer base who are assigned to specific classrooms usually to support ELA or Math group centers. The volunteers are known to establish positive and trusting relationships with students in the class they support. Treeline holds many family events at the school each quarter with high participation and support from a strong PTO group. Teachers participate in individual data chats with the administration at various
progress monitoring stages during the entire school year. Action plans are implemented to reach individual, classroom, and school achievement goals.

Treeline is a PBS school where students are rewarded for positive behavior. The students receive individual Coqui Cash and/or classroom Coqui Cash that they can turn in for prizes for adhering to the Treeline expectations of being Responsible, Respectful, and Safe. All students know these expectations and can recite them. The classroom is equipped with a positive behavior clip chart where students start on good behavior every day and have chances to correct their behavior during the school day. Treeline has a Check In/Check Out mentor program where staff members meet briefly with their mentee before and after school and encourage a safe and supportive relationship. Each classroom administers Sanford Harmony's Meet Up/Buddy Up structure daily where students have the opportunity to socialize and get to know classmates that they wouldn't necessarily talk to otherwise.

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

Every year the school reviews the draft of the School Improvement Plan with the SAC committee consisting of parents, teachers, community members, and business partners for input and amendments. Data for all student groups are analyzed and discussed, proposed initiatives, and school goals are talked about in length. From there, the SAC committee votes on the implementation of the entire SIP plan. SIP plan data and goals are revisited with the SAC committee after each progress monitoring assessment during the school year. SAC meetings are held in the evening, after normal business hours, to maximize parent, community, and business partner participation, and invitations are sent through the school's online newsletter, school messenger, and student planners. Input from stakeholders is collected through open discussion. The feedback resulted in the implementation of a preschool professional development for teachers on behavior in classrooms.

During the open house, parents are told that their child participates in data chats with their teacher throughout the school year. Discussions and plans are made during these data chats. Students update their data binder throughout the school year that includes goals to achieve at various progress monitoring stages of the school year. Students share their progress monitoring data and goals with their parents during student-led conferences and curriculum nights held at Treeline each semester.

Treeline holds a curriculum night in the Fall for all parents to obtain detailed knowledge of the curriculum that their child will receive throughout the school year.

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: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00