Ray V. Pottorf Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Ray V. Pottorf Elementary School

4600 CHALLENGER BLVD, Fort Myers, FL 33966

http://rvp.leeschools.net/

Demographics

Principal: Brandy Macchia

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: B (59%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: D (40%)
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

Ray V. Pottorf Elementary School

4600 CHALLENGER BLVD, Fort Myers, FL 33966

http://rvp.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	88%

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.

Ray V. Pottorf Elementary is committed to creating a positive school environment where students are engaged, educated, and empowered; by holding themselves accountable for their learning and choices through collaborative relationships ensuring they will become positive contributing members of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be a school of excellence where all students achieve their highest potential.

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
Macchia, Brandy	Principal	
Knight, Tonya	Assistant Principal	
McCaslin, Angela	Assistant Principal	
Guarno, Phyllis	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 9/20/2021, Brandy Macchia

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.*
8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Total number of students enrolled at the school
731

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	120	117	125	151	115	103	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	731
Attendance below 90 percent	4	36	38	44	28	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	179
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	7	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	27	18	49	13	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
Course failure in Math	0	19	13	34	13	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	30	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	35	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	22	12	43	30	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146

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	9	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/20/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Number of students enrolled		
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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				45%	57%	57%	37%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				56%	56%	58%	50%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	50%	53%	60%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				60%	62%	63%	49%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				84%	65%	62%	62%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				85%	54%	51%	52%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				27%	52%	53%	22%	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	41%	58%	-17%	58%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	52%	55%	-3%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
05	2021					
	2019	38%	54%	-16%	56%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	50%	61%	-11%	62%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	70%	62%	8%	64%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2021					
	2019	55%	58%	-3%	60%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	27%	50%	-23%	53%	-26%
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	27/27.8	39/39	48/48
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/16.7	1/7.1	2/15.4
	English Language Learners	2/105	1/5.6	5/22.7
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31/33	44/44.4	50/51
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	3/25	4/28.6	3/23.1
	English Language Learners	4/22.2	6/35.5	9/40.9

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	21/21.4	34/32.4	44/41.9
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	2/12.5	4/25
	English Language Learners	4/12.9	6/18.2	5/15.2
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	21/22.1	32/30.5	36/34.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	3/20	2/12.5	2/14.3
	English Language Learners	5/16.1	8/24.2	10/30.3

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	19/20.4	36/34.6	42/37.8
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/14.3	2/14.3	4/28.6
	English Language Learners	1/10	1/10	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	27/29	39/37.5	35/31.8
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/14.3	5/35.7	3/23.1
	English Language Learners	1/10	1/10	1/7.7

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20/25.6	23/27.4	30/34.9
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/11.1	1/11.1	2/20
	English Language Learners	1/5.3	4/19	3/14.3
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19/24.8	32/39.5	40/47.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/11.1	2/25	3/37.5
	English Language Learners	2/10.5	4/19	7/35

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16/39	16/37.2	20/45.5
	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	12/30	21/48.8	22/50
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	2/50	2/50	3/75
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14/38.9	28/65.1	28/63.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/33.3	1/25
	English Language Learners	2/50	2/50	3/75

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	15	39	55	24	30	30	26				
ELL	22	46	18	52	63		27				
BLK	25	38		37	44	45	17				
HSP	41	44	29	57	58	62	46				
WHT	59	58		73	67		55				
FRL	34	42	47	49	51	52	26				

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	17	51	57	37	73	81					
ELL	29	52	53	60	88	92	40				
BLK	33	56	73	49	85	85	7				
HSP	52	54	33	68	89	86	38				
MUL	64			75							
WHT	62	67		67	57		62				
FRL	41	54	61	57	83	82	18				

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	13	45	41	16	38	35	8				
ELL	21	63		43	76						
BLK	28	42	48	44	52	50	17				
HSP	42	62	80	52	74	60	24				
WHT	65	58		59	75						
FRL	35	48	60	47	60	52	18				

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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	373
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	95%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	40
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	37
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	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	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	44
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 lowest performance is ELA and Science achievement. Low ELA achievement (Lv3-5) is a trend for the past 5 years (except FY20 when no FSA was administered). ELA achievement has been 15-16: 31, 16-17: 43, 17-18: 40, 18-19: 37, 20-21: 38. ELA Level 3 and above remain below the district's achievement level of 51%. Although science achievement is our lowest scoring category, it has increased 9 points from 27 in 18-19 school year to 36 in 20-21.

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

ELA achievement demonstrates the greatest need for improvement with 38% of our 3-5 students achieving a Lv 3 or higher on the 2021 state assessments and a 45% Lv 3 or higher on 2019 state assessments. Our progress monitoring data, STAR Reading from 2020-21 school year showed 37% of 3rd grade, 27% of 4th grade, and 22% of 5th grade in March of 2021.

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

Contributing factors for this need for improvement are multiple months of missed school and virtual learning due to Covid restrictions. Our school had been making improvements in ELA and 2018-19 was the highest achievement scores since our students have been taking FSA.

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

Math achievement, math learning gains, and math learning gains of our lowest quartile saw the largest improvement based off our STAR Math progress monitoring and our 2019 FSA. In 2019, we

saw 60% of our third through fifth graders reach Lv 3-5, 84% achieved a learning gain, and 85% of our L25 achieved a learning gain.

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

Contributing factors for improvement in Math achievement were because of additional math PD provided to teachers such as Cognitively Guided Instruction, as well as a shift in supports specific to math via math coaches who delivered PD, provided coaching, and led PLCs.

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

Teachers will implement themed reading units to systematically develop background knowledge to support students ability to understand text, absorb and retain information, and build vocabulary. Additionally, teachers formed a Writing team to create a school-wide approach to writing across the grade levels so students are equipped to communicate their ideas in writing across content areas.

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.

A Writing team was formed at the end of the 20-21 school year. The Writing team utilized the "The Writing Revolution" book to create a systematic approach to writing in our school. Each grade level has a representative on the Writing team to learn the information and share back with the team as they discuss writing in their PLCs. Additionally, at the end of 20-21 school year, grade level teams were given a day of planning to identify themes aligned to the new BEST standards, to plan engaging, differentiated, vocabulary rich lessons that supported students in developing background knowledge needed to increase comprehension. Furthermore, a book study using the book "The Knowledge Gap" will meet monthly as teachers learn how to close the gap of achievement in ELA in our school.

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

On Fridays, students will partake in a club activity of their choosing to give opportunities to students to develop and apply skills for college/career. Leveraging our special area teachers as well as teacher expertises in our building, students engage in activities that build knowledge, critical thinking skills, responsibility, and dispositions needed to be successful in a career or college. As new teachers join our teams we are providing trainings and support on initiatives that have been put into place school wide that have lead to growth in Math, ELA, and Science so that they also can incorporate these best practices in their classrooms. Additionally, we are providing trainings on the BEST standards so teachers have a deeper understanding of the standards and are able to apply/teach to the standards no matter the changes in resources/curriculum.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Looking over our data from last year and prior years, ELA achievement is still underperforming our district and state achievement levels. Only 38% of all third, fourth, and fifth graders are reading at a Level 3 or higher as determined on FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA achievement has been 15-16: 31, 16-17: 43, 17-18: 40, 18-19: 37, 20-21: 38. ELA Level 3 and above remain below the district's achievement level of 51%.
Monitoring:	ELA data will be monitored through IReady diagnostics given 3x during the school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brandy Macchia (brandyam@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	To increase ELA data, our teachers will utilize the Accelerated Reader program to encourage independent reading, increase vocabulary and comprehension.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	AR was selected because "analyses indicated that AR had a statistically significant positive impact on student reading gains when compared with traditional reading instruction alone." and it meets the ESSA requirements for strong evidence. Students using the program were nearly twice as likely to be college and career ready.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly teachers will turn in their AR reports with the number of students meeting the identified goal out of the total number of students.

Person Responsible	Angela McCaslin (angelamda@leeschools.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	On the ESSA report, SWD was identified at 47% achievement, which is the lowest out of the 7 categories on Ray V Pottorf's ESSA.
Measurable Outcome:	On the 21-22 ESSA report, SWD will achieve 50% or higher.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored by the I-Ready Diagnostics taken 3x yearly. ESE teachers will meet monthly with administration to discuss growth in-between testing. ESE teachers will monitor this data and make adjustments to instruction as needed.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tonya Knight (tonyafk@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategies being implemented for this Area of Focus are co-teaching classrooms with flexible grouping to differentiate and meet student needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Flexible grouping is important in proactive instructional planning to ensure that students have the opportunity to work with a wide variety of peers.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers with SWD students will identify and monitor these students as a separate group to ensure growth. If students are not showing growth, differentiated plans will be created based on identified needs.

Person Responsible　Brandy Macchia (brandyam@leeschools.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	On the ESSA report, Black/African-American was identified at 59% achievement, which is the fourth lowest out of the 7 categories on Ray V Pottorf's ESSA. Although, this group is not the second lowest as identified on ESSA, we have more than tripled our ELL population in the past three years.
Measurable Outcome:	On the 21-22 ESSA report, ELL students will achieve 62%.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored by the I-Ready Diagnostics taken 3x yearly. Classroom teachers will meet monthly with administration to discuss growth in-between testing. Classroom teachers will monitor ELL data and make adjustments to instruction as needed.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brandy Macchia (brandyam@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	An evidence-based strategies being implemented for this Area of Focus is a small-group pullout based on identified need on ELA skills. ESOL paraprofessionals will meet with students daily utilizing the Explode the Code series. Additionally, teachers with have monthly opportunities to observe and ELL professional model SIOP strategies that can be incorporated in all content areas. ELL students identified by WIDA and CELLA as needing additional support will also have access to Imagine Learning. Classroom teachers will monitor student usage while the ESOL contact will monitor.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Explode The Code® is a research-based, teacher-tested program that builds essential foundational literacy skills for students at a variety of levels. It is a multisensory phonics program for grades pre-K to 4, geared towards improving literacy with direct, systematic, phonics instruction. The Imagine Learning Language Advantage™ is a theory of action that promotes rigorous and equitable development of language that accelerates learning across all subjects, transforming students into stronger and more confident learners.

Action Steps to Implement

ESOL paraprofessionals, ESOL contact, and ESOL admin contact meet monthly to monitor progress and make adjustments to student groups as needed.

Person Responsible	Tonya Knight (tonyafk@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.

RAY V. POTTORF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL-0162 reported 0.7 incidents per 100 students. This rate is less than the Statewide elementary school rate of 1.0 incidents per 100 students. Primary area of concern is bullying with a secondary area of concern of fighting. Through the use of restorative practices, peer mentors, and behavior support specialist as a school we will provide a culture that builds community, supports conflict resolution, and self-care. Administrations, behavior specialist, teachers, and peer mentors will utilize Restorative Questioning to promote self-reflection, ownership, and change in behavior. Questions include: What happened? What was your part? What were you thinking of at the time? Who was impacted by your actions? How do you think they were affected? What can you do to repair the harm?

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.

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

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00