

The School District of Lee County

Rayma C. Page Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	23

Rayma C. Page Elementary School

17000 S TAMIAMI TRL, Ft Myers, FL 33908

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

Demographics

Principal: Valerie Sheckler

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-6
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)	75%
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: A (70%) 2017-18: A (75%) 2016-17: A (71%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Rayma C. Page Elementary School

17000 S TAMIAMI TRL, Ft Myers, FL 33908

<http://rcp.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-6	No	59%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	45%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Rayma C. Page Elementary is to achieve excellence through setting high expectations and building a positive, safe environment that meets the needs of all learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be a world class school system.

Excellence for All...Whatever It Takes! Every Student, Every Family, Every Teacher, Every Day!

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
Sheckler, Valerie	Principal	Principal will oversee all areas of curriculum. Principal will facilitate the creation of intervention groups and enrichment groups. Principal will meet weekly with grade level PLC teams and provide support and resources where needed. Our PLC structure follows the PDSA format and can take place over multiple meetings. While the team leaders are on our leadership team, they are given the flexibility to allow any team member to facilitate the PLC time.
		Theresa Bulanda: Assistant Principal/Safety Leader
		Tina Bryan: Intervention Specialist
		Dennette Foy: Curriculum Specialist /ESOL school contact.
		Robert Straka: 3-5 resource teacher/Testing Coordinator
		Tera Sherman: Guidance Counselor and Threat Assessment Team Leader
		Julie Parks,: Behavior Specialist
		Kaleena Lavariega: K-2 Literacy coach/Assistant Testing Coordinator/Safety Team
Bulanda , Theresa	Assistant Principal	
Foy, Dennette	Instructional Coach	
Straka, Robert	Instructional Coach	
Lavariega, Kaleena	Reading Coach	
Sherman, Tera	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 9/20/2021, Valerie Sheckler

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.*

8

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

59

Total number of students enrolled at the school

825

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

12

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

13

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	132	149	125	142	134	122	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	806
Attendance below 90 percent	10	13	11	10	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	1	18	7	2	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Course failure in Math	0	6	5	3	11	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	18	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
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	9	4	3	13	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	2	1	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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
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 FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA 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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	136	134	130	131	151	157	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	839
Attendance below 90 percent	13	10	6	15	15	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	2	4	4	6	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in Math	1	4	4	6	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	7	15	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	2	2	11	21	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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	1	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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				68%	57%	57%	71%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				65%	56%	58%	75%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	50%	53%	68%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				77%	62%	63%	76%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				87%	65%	62%	85%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				78%	54%	51%	73%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				64%	52%	53%	75%	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	68%	58%	10%	58%	10%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	67%	55%	12%	58%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
05	2021					
	2019	67%	54%	13%	56%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	70%	61%	9%	62%	8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	76%	62%	14%	64%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
05	2021					
	2019	81%	58%	23%	60%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-81%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	66%	50%	16%	53%	13%
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	25/28.7	46/49.5	1/5
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	1/10	1/9.1	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17/19.5	33/35.9	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/50	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	1/10	1/10	0/0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	28/23.1	61/49.6	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/20	3/27.3	0/0
	English Language Learners	1/6.7	3/18.8	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10/8.3	33/27	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/18.2	2/18.2	0/0
	English Language Learners	1/6.3	1/6.3	0/0
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	55/43.7	83/60.6	88/64.7
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	4/20	4/18.2	7/31.8
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	3/15.8
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19/15.1	61/44.5	82/60.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/10	5/22.7	8/36.4
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/5.6	4/21.1

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	53/45.3	78/64.5	80/65
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/11.1	1/10
	English Language Learners	1/10	4/33.3	4/33.3
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	20/17.4	58/48.3	71/57.7
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/11.1	2/20
	English Language Learners	0/0	2/16.7	5/41.7
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	44/37.9	69/55.2	73/58.4
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/6.7	2/13.3	2/13.3
	English Language Learners	1/7.7	3/23.1	4/30.8
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	36/30.8	54/43.5	63/50.4
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/7.1	0/0	2/13.3
	English Language Learners	0/0	3/23.1	2/15.4
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	39/33.9	60/50.4	72/58.1
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/7.1	2/16.7	6/37.5
	English Language Learners	1/8.3	4/30.8	3/25

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

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	32	50	45	56	69	64	29				
ELL	43	48		66	67		16				
ASN	86			95			90				
BLK	64			55							
HSP	50	56	50	67	62	57	33				
WHT	80	77		88	74		73				
FRL	58	54	45	69	62	64	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	18	32	35	34	59	65	11				
ELL	55	68	60	72	92	88	56				
ASN	87	79		100	100		92				
BLK	39	50		40	53						
HSP	55	63	54	70	86	80	45				
WHT	78	66	57	83	89	88	71				
FRL	57	60	54	67	82	75	61				
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	31	53	50	35	62	54	37				
ELL	44	70	62	56	76	70	42				

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
ASN	89	89		100	100						
BLK	42	76		46	65		60				
HSP	59	69	62	68	77	67	70				
WHT	81	77	67	83	92	88	81				
FRL	62	69	69	68	79	70	68				

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	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	517
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
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	90
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	60
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	78
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	55
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?

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

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

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

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

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

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.

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

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ELA L25% scores were identified as an Area of Focus due to a significant decrease in prior year data as measured by 2020-21 FSA ELA scores. After reviewing and analyzing the growth of our L25% it was determined that L25% score is 54% compared to the overall ELA proficiency of 68%.

Measurable Outcome: Lowest 25% students in grades 4 and 5 will increase overall ELA learning gains from 54% to 70% as measured by the 2021-2022 ELA FSA Statewide Assessment.

Monitoring: Monitor bi-weekly progress of our ELA lowest 25% as a routine item of grade level data chats and weekly grade level PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Valerie Sheckler (valeriees@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students identified as the L25% on the 20-21 FSA ELA in grades 4 and 5 will receive intensive reading instruction through small group instruction, Read 180, technology, and Really Great Reading phonics to fill foundational gaps.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Evidence shows that in order to increase student achievement in Reading you must first identify the root of each learners deficiency. Using the Florida Reading Model to determine and pinpoint gaps, teachers will create fluid groups based on student need. Extra reading support will be provided by reading support personnel and identified students will receive additional instruction through extended day tutoring program.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implement Really Great Reading phonics Tier 3 instruction through MTSS support program.
2. Implement SIOP strategies in which all teachers have been trained.
3. Create small groups for ESOL and MTSS support.
4. Work through the Read 180 curriculum designed to meet students where they are based on Lexile Level.
5. Track all students with an emphasis on our L25% through are Data Wall and Data Dashboards concentrating on this target population during weekly team PLC time.
6. Teacher led small group centers homogeneously grouped based on achievement levels using the Florida Reading Model.
7. Provide additional resource support for our L25% ELA students to ensure small group instruction.
8. Students will track their progress on ELA standards by grade level.
9. Monitor bi-weekly progress of our ELA lowest 25%. during data chats and PLCs.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	SWD scores were identified as an Area of Focus due to a significant decrease in prior year data as measured by 2020-21 FSA ELA scores. After reviewing and analyzing the growth of our SWD it was determined that our score of 32% is significantly lower than the overall ELA proficiency of 68%.
Measurable Outcome:	Students with Disabilities subgroups in grades 4 and 5 will increase their overall ELA learning gains from 32% to 50% as measured by the 2021-2022 ELA FSA Statewide Assessment.
Monitoring:	Monitor bi-weekly progress of our SWD as a routine item of grade level data chats and weekly grade level PLCs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students identified as SWD on the 2020-21 FSA ELA in grades 4 and 5 will receive intensive reading instruction through small group instruction, Read 180, technology, and Really Great Reading phonics to fill foundational gaps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence shows that in order to increase student achievement in Reading you must first identify the root of each learners deficiency. Using the Florida Reading Model to determine and pinpoint gaps, teachers will create fluid groups based on student need. Extra reading support will be provided by reading support personnel and identified students will receive additional instruction through extended day tutoring program.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implement Really Great Reading (RGR) phonics.
2. Implement SIOP and RGR strategies in which all ESE teachers have been trained.
3. Work through the Read 180 curriculum designed to meet students where they are based on Lexile Level.
4. Track all students with an emphasis on our L25% through are Data Wall and Data Dashboards concentrating on this target population during weekly team PLC time.
5. Teacher led small group centers homogeneously grouped based on achievement levels using the Florida Reading Model.
6. Students will track their progress on ELA standards by grade level.
7. Monitor bi-weekly progress of our ELA including all subgroups.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ELL scores were identified as an Area of Focus due to a significant decrease in prior year data as measured by 2020-21 FSA ELA scores. After reviewing and analyzing the growth of our EL learners it was determined that our score of 55% is lower than the overall ELA proficiency of 68%.

Measurable Outcome: 3rd-5th grade ELL students ELA Proficiency will increase from 55% to 70% as measured by the 2021-2022 ELA FSA Statewide Assessment.

Monitoring: Monitor bi-weekly progress of our subgroups as a routine item of grade level data chats and weekly grade level PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Students identified as ELL on the 2020-21 FSA ELA in grades 4 and 5 will receive intensive reading instruction through small group instruction, Read 180, technology, and Really Great Reading phonics to fill foundational gaps.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Evidence shows that in order to increase student achievement in Reading you must first identify the root of each learners deficiency. Using the Florida Reading Model to determine and pinpoint gaps, teachers will create fluid groups based on student need. Extra reading support will be provided by reading support personnel and identified students will receive additional instruction through extended day tutoring program.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implement Really Great Reading (RGR) phonics.
2. Implement SIOP and RGR strategies in which all teachers have been trained.
3. Work through the Read 180 curriculum designed to meet students where they are based on Lexile Level.
4. Track all students with an emphasis on our L25% through are Data Wall and Data Dashboards concentrating on this target population during weekly team PLC time.
5. Teacher led small group centers homogeneously grouped based on achievement levels using the Florida Reading Model.
6. Students will track their progress on ELA standards by grade level.
7. Monitor bi-weekly progress of our ELA including all subgroups.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Fifth grade Science scores were identified as an Area of Focus due to a decrease in prior year data.

Description and Rationale: After reviewing and analyzing 2021 FCAT Science data it was determined that our score had decreased by 7% compared to 2019. Students who perform proficiently in Science have an increased probability of showing success in secondary science based classes.

Measurable Outcome: 5th Grade Science Proficiency will increase from 57% to 70% as measured by the 2021-2022 Science Statewide Assessment.

Monitoring: Monitor bi-weekly progress of 5th grade science performance as a routine item of grade level data chats and weekly grade level PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will identify students scoring a level one in FSA ELA and provide increased time on reading strategies and science concepts in order to improve comprehension and understanding of science content and concepts.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Evidence shows that students scoring a level one on Science FCAT, also scored low on FSA ELA assessment. Leadership team reviewed and analyzed trends in Science and Reading and determined a positive correlation between students scoring a level one on both Science and Reading assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify students entering 5th grade with a level one scored on 4th grade ELA FSA assessment..
2. After implementing the baseline Science progress monitoring assessment, teachers will create intervention groups for Science instruction.
3. Increase amount of leveled Science reading materials and apply basic reading strategies to support comprehension of material.
4. Teachers implement the numbered heads strategy to engage students in critical thinking.
5. Students will be develop and test hypothesis statements and utilize hands-on science manipulatives to increase understanding of science concepts.
6. Monitor progress of students' Science standards through weekly assessments and reviewing data weekly to provide targeted small group instruction.
7. Provide targeted intervention as needed through small group instruction.
8. Increase participation in Science Fair projects to apply science standards and the scientific method

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The number of discipline referrals will decrease from 73 to 63 schoolwide, which is a 14% decrease as measured by May 2022 Focus discipline reports.

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
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00