

Collier County Public Schools

# Lely Elementary School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# Lely Elementary School

8125 LELY CULTURAL PKWY, Naples, FL 34113

<https://www.collierschools.com/les>

## Demographics

**Principal: Sharon Wheeler**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/26/2021

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: B (57%)<br>2018-19: C (49%)<br>2017-18: C (50%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southwest   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   |   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | N/A   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |   |

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Collier 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

## Lely Elementary School

8125 LELY CULTURAL PKWY, Naples, FL 34113

<https://www.collierschools.com/les>

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | Yes                    | 100%   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 81%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | B       |         | C       | C       |

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Collier 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.**

Providing an engaging environment through the use of digital learning, investigation and differentiation to support the needs of our diverse learners so they can responsibly interact and unlock their academic potential.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

To cultivate an empowering, mindful community of learners through motivation and innovative thinking.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

| Name                 | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|----------------------|---------------------|---|
| Holland, Holley      | Principal           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- oversees daily operations such as arrival, dismissal, discipline, attendance, safety, etc.</li> <li>- oversees and manages school budgets</li> <li>- analyzes multiple data points to make adjustments (staffing, instruction, professional learning needs, etc.).</li> <li>- seeks input from all stakeholders through SAC meetings, faculty meetings, and surveys</li> <li>- observes daily instruction and gives specific feedback</li> <li>- participates in and oversees collaborative planning</li> <li>- oversees compliance and implementation of the Title One Plan and other grants</li> </ul> |
| Wheeler, Sharon      | Assistant Principal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- assists in daily operations such as arrival, dismissal, discipline, attendance, etc.</li> <li>- tracks student attendance and conferences with those with attendance concerns</li> <li>- follows district guidelines concerning student discipline</li> <li>- oversees safety drills</li> <li>- analyzes multiple data points to make adjustments (staffing, instruction, professional learning needs, etc.).</li> <li>- observes daily instruction and gives specific feedback</li> <li>- participates in and oversees collaborative planning</li> </ul>  |
| Jones, Patti         | Math Coach          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- facilitates standards based math planning</li> <li>- engages in coaches cycles with identified teachers</li> <li>- observes math instruction and gives feedback</li> <li>- analyzes math data to make adjustments for re-teaching</li> <li>- supports other school initiatives such as Leader in Me</li> </ul>   |
| Bockius-Smith, Tanja | School Counselor    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- supports sense of belonging and self confidence of students</li> <li>- meets with individual and groups of students to support various needs</li> <li>- facilitates programs such as the Buddy Bench and Helping Hands</li> <li>- provides supports to families</li> <li>- supports school initiatives such as PBIS and Leader in Me</li> </ul>  |
| Morse, Laura         | Other               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- supports exceptional student education instruction and compliance</li> <li>- facilitates IEP meetings</li> <li>- provides supports for for parents of students with special needs</li> <li>- analyzes data for students with disabilities to support adjustments as needed</li> <li>- supports other school initiatives such as PBIS</li> </ul>  |
| Daniels, Amy         | Reading Coach       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- facilitates standards based ELA planning sessions</li> <li>- engages in coaches cycles with identified teachers</li> <li>- observes ELA instruction and gives feedback</li> <li>- analyzes ELA data to make adjustments for re-teaching</li> </ul>   |



| Name              | Position Title              | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|--|
|                   |                             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- provides tier 3 interventions for students</li> <li>- supports teachers in identification of students needing intervention and creating of the SSPs</li> <li>- supports other school initiatives such as Leader in Me</li> </ul>  |
| Bezjak, Christine | Curriculum Resource Teacher | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- facilitates standards based ELA planning sessions</li> <li>- engages in coaches cycles with identified teachers</li> <li>- observes ELA instruction and gives feedback</li> <li>- analyzes ELA data to make adjustments for re-teaching</li> <li>- provides tier 3 interventions for students</li> <li>- supports teachers in identification of students needing intervention and creating of the SSPs</li> <li>- supports other school initiatives such as Leader in Me</li> </ul> |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Thursday 8/26/2021, Sharon Wheeler

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

0

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

13

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

39

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

473

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

5

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.**

6

#### Demographic Data

### Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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                              | 84          | 69 | 78 | 79 | 72 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 459   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 10          | 14 | 10 | 14 | 11 | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 66    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 1           | 2  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 22    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 2           | 12 | 16 | 19 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 49    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 2           | 9  | 14 | 21 | 1  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 47    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 9  | 11 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 33    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 7  | 11 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 30    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 2           | 13 | 16 | 30 | 19 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 93    |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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 | 5 | 15 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 34    |

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 3           | 0 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |
| 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

Friday 9/16/2022

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                              | 78          | 78 | 71 | 83 | 74 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 469   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 7           | 14 | 13 | 14 | 11 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 77    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 3  | 9  | 8  | 5  | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 38    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 3           | 11 | 21 | 15 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 50    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 3           | 5  | 23 | 19 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 50    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 10 | 10 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 42    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 6  | 16 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 51    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 19          | 17 | 20 | 19 | 6  | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 91    |

**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 | 2           | 5 | 14 | 11 | 5 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 53    |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 3           | 2 | 3 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

**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                              | 78          | 78 | 71 | 83 | 74 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 469   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 7           | 14 | 13 | 14 | 11 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 77    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 3  | 9  | 8  | 5  | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 38    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 3           | 11 | 21 | 15 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 50    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 3           | 5  | 23 | 19 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 50    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 10 | 10 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 42    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 6  | 16 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 51    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 19          | 17 | 20 | 19 | 6  | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 91    |

**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 | 2           | 5 | 14 | 11 | 5 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 53    |

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 3           | 2 | 3 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19    |
| 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      | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 53%    | 64%      | 56%   |        |          |       | 51%    | 60%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 65%    |          |       |        |          |       | 50%    | 59%      | 58%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 63%    |          |       |        |          |       | 45%    | 51%      | 53%   |
| Math Achievement            | 54%    | 56%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 57%    | 68%      | 63%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 67%    |          |       |        |          |       | 49%    | 64%      | 62%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 51%    |          |       |        |          |       | 43%    | 55%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 48%    | 72%      | 59%   |        |          |       | 51%    | 59%      | 53%   |

### 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 |
| 01                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 02                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 03                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 52%    | 61%      | -9%                        | 58%   | -6%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 48%    | 58%      | -10%                       | 58%   | -10%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -52%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| ELA               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|                   | 2019 | 48%    | 60%      | -12%                       | 56%   | -8%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -48%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 02                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 03                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 59%    | 68%      | -9%                        | 62%   | -3%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 64%    | 65%      | -1%                        | 64%   | 0%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -59%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 46%    | 67%      | -21%                       | 60%   | -14%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -64%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 46%    | 56%      | -10%                       | 53%   | -7%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

### Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 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 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| SWD                                       | 21       | 44     | 47          | 30        | 60      | 67           | 25       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 55       | 67     | 56          | 47        | 55      | 44           | 48       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 37       | 60     | 58          | 46        | 64      | 64           | 17       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 58       | 67     | 64          | 55        | 62      | 32           | 62       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 60       | 64     |             | 60        | 79      |              | 58       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 48       | 65     | 65          | 51        | 64      | 50           | 41       |         |           |                   |                     |

| 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       | 25     | 33          | 25        | 35      | 30           | 27       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 38       | 32     | 25          | 32        | 43      | 27           | 32       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 26       | 38     |             | 33        | 48      |              | 35       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 47       | 41     |             | 45        | 50      |              | 45       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 71       | 67     |             | 64        | 50      |              | 55       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 39       | 36     | 29          | 41        | 45      | 19           | 35       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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       | 41     | 53          | 25        | 50      | 50           | 9        |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 33       | 42     | 50          | 43        | 46      | 40           | 27       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 36       | 33     | 42          | 42        | 40      | 40           | 37       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 47       | 49     | 46          | 57        | 50      | 44           | 39       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 72       | 73     |             | 73        | 61      |              | 84       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 43       | 48     | 44          | 49        | 47      | 39           | 36       |         |           |                   |                     |

### ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| ESSA Federal Index  |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | N/A  |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 59   |
| 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 | 67   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 468  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 43   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 0    |
| English Language Learners   |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 55   |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | NO   |

| English Language Learners  |     |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%       | 0   |
| 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%        | 0   |
| 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%                  | 0   |
| Black/African American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                | 51  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 59  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               | 0   |
| 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%            | 0   |
| 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%       | 0   |
| White Students   |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   | 64  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                  | 0   |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |    |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 56 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0  |

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

#### What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

According to the FSA data from the past year, students made gains in both ELA and Math. However, proficiency levels continue to be below 60% in all tested subject areas. Math, Science, and ELA proficiency levels have been below 60% for the past 5 years.

In analyzing subgroup data trends, the ESE subgroup has been identified as needing substantial improvement with a proficiency level of only at 21%. Our Black subgroup in science is also substantially lower than other subgroups.

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

ELA, math and science proficiency

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

The contributing factor to the areas for improvement was an absence of understanding of how to incorporate the new and old standards into instruction using the new materials in ELA. Another contributing factor was the high number of students more than one grade level below in both ELA and Math.

To address these factors, we will ensure that on grade levels materials are being utilized daily with standards aligned instruction. The students who were more than one grade level below made substantial gains last year, therefore, will be able to move to proficiency this year.

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The lowest 25% subgroup had a much higher gains percentage than ever before in both ELA and Math.

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

We were very intentional about teaching the on grade level text using scaffolds to support our lowest 25% during core instruction. Another contributing factor was the intentional focus of our differentiated instruction block each day.

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



Teams will participate in weekly collaborative math, science and ELA planning with the support of an academic coach. Questioning aligned to the standards and scaffolds will be planned each week. Increased classroom observations with specific feedback will ensure implementation of plans.

**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.**

Job embedded professional learning will be a focus in grades K-5. With a teacher on special assignment joining us, she will focus on primary grades and the literacy coach will focus on intermediate grades. We will also focus on high yields strategies during planning such as summarization, class discussion, and monitoring.

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

We will continue to highlight best practices through staff members providing professional learning sessions on their successful strategies and implementing instructional rounds.

### **Areas of Focus**

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

According to 2022 FSA data, only 54% of students were proficient in math. Our ELL and SWD subgroups are performing at low levels of proficiency. ELL 47% proficient and SWD only 30% proficient.

**Measurable Outcome:**

**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

If daily standards aligned instruction with classroom discussions would occur, then 60% of students in grades 3, 4, and 5 will be proficient in math according to the F.A.S.T assessment in May 2023.

**Monitoring:**

**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

The progress toward our goal of 60% of students being proficient in math by the end of the year 2023 will be monitored through Assessment Periods 1 and 2 of the F.A.S.T. assessment, unit assessments and our online math support, Redbird.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Sharon Wheeler (wheesh@collierschools.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

The evidence based strategy that will be implemented to support increasing proficiency in math is eliciting and using evidence of student thinking through classroom discussions. Teachers will engage students in showing their work and discussing mathematical problems with partners.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

The strategy of eliciting and using evidence of student thinking is a high yields strategy from the National Council of Teacher of Mathematics. This strategy will make student thinking visible so that teachers can monitor and adjust on the spot. This strategy also aligns with Hattie's high yields strategy of classroom discussion.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will engage in weekly standards-aligned collaborative planning. There will be intentional discussions of how to elicit student thinking and monitor for understanding. Use of white boards, math notebooks, and class discussions will be purposefully planned for each day.

**Person Responsible**

Patti Jones (jonespa@collierschools.com)

Weekly classroom observations will be completed by administration to ensure the use of this strategy.

**Person Responsible**

Sharon Wheeler (wheesh@collierschools.com)

Teachers will participate in professional learning sessions related to eliciting student thinking and classroom discussions.

**Person Responsible**

Patti Jones (jonespa@collierschools.com)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

According to the NGSS science assessment in 2022, only 48% of 5th grade students were proficient in science. There has been very little increase in proficiency over the last 5 years. 61% of our current 5th graders were below the 50% percentile on the end of the year science benchmark assessment in year 2021.

**Measurable Outcome:**

**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

If the 5-E instructional model is used daily, then more than 55% of 5th grade students will be proficient in science by the end of the 2023 school year according to the SSA assessment.

**Monitoring:**

**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

Unit assessment data, as well as quarterly benchmark assessments will be monitored for proficiency.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Holley Holland (hollanho@collierschools.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Utilizing the 5 E (Engage, Explore, Explain, Elaborate, and Evaluate) model for science instruction which will also included the strategy of summarizing.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

The 5 E model is a high yields strategy for science instruction, as well as summarizing being a high yields strategy according to Hattie.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will in engage in professional learning related to the 5E instructional model and summarizing.

**Person Responsible**

Holley Holland (hollanho@collierschools.com)

Teachers will engage in weekly standards aligned science collaborative planning using the 5E instructional model and summarizing.

**Person Responsible**

Holley Holland (hollanho@collierschools.com)

Administrators will observe science instruction weekly to ensure implementation of the 5E lesson plans.

**Person Responsible**

Holley Holland (hollanho@collierschools.com)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

According to the FSA data for 2022, only 53% of students in grades 3-5 were proficient in ELA.

**Measurable Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

If teachers incorporate effective collaborative structures 80% of the time during ELA instruction, then student ELA proficiency scores would increase to more than 60% proficient according to the F.A.S.T assessment in May of 2023.

ELA data will be monitored through iReady, F.A.S.T and module assessments.

**Monitoring:**

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Observation data will also be analyzed monthly to track progress toward the goal of 80% of all teachers receiving the rating of innovating in the element of student engagement using the Marzano framework.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Holley Holland (hollanho@collierschools.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Collaborative structures will be utilized during ELA instruction.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Increased student engagement is a high yields strategy according to Marzano as well as collaborative structures deemed a high yields strategy by Hattie.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will engage in professional learning related to collaborative structures.

**Person Responsible**

Holley Holland (hollanho@collierschools.com)

Instructional coaches will facilitate the discussion of utilization of collaborative structures in each weekly collaborative planning session.

**Person Responsible**

Holley Holland (hollanho@collierschools.com)

Instructional coaches (bi-weekly) and administration (weekly) will do classroom observations with specific feedback on student engagement as related to collaborative structures.

**Person Responsible**

Holley Holland (hollanho@collierschools.com)

## RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

### Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

According to iReady end of the year data:

Kinder - 95% proficient

1st grade - 69% proficient (27% below grade level in phonics)

2nd grade - 53% proficient (47% below grade level in phonics)

K-2 average proficiency - 72%

If focused standards aligned phonics instruction and application tasks would be completed daily, then proficiency in each grade level would increase by the end of the 2023 school year. Kinder would be at 95% proficient. 1st grade at 75% proficient. 2nd grade at 60% proficient.

### Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Only 53% of students were proficient in ELA according to the FSA 2022. Students with disabilities were only at 21% proficiency.

If scaffolded standards aligned instruction occurs daily with summarization strategies, then ELA proficiency would increase to 60% according to the F.A.S.T. data by the end of the year 2023.

**Measurable Outcomes:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

**Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)**

By the end of the school year 2023, more than 80% of the students in grades K-2 will be proficient according to iReady and F.A.S.T. Kinder would be at 95% proficient. 1st grade at 75% proficient. 2nd grade at 60% proficient.

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

By the end of the school year 2023, more than 60% of students in grades 3-5 will be proficient according to iReady and F.A.S.T.

**Monitoring:**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

The F.A.S.T. assessment and iReady diagnostic will be monitored in September, January and May. Module assessments will also be monitored every 3 weeks.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Holland, Holley, hollanho@collierschools.com

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Scaffolded instruction will be planned for and provided during daily ELA instruction.  
Summarization strategies will be planned for and implemented daily.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Scaffolded instruction and summarization are both a high yields strategies according to Hattie and are also a high yield strategies for providing support to students who are not yet reading on grade level.

**Action Steps to Implement:**

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

| Action Step   | Person Responsible for Monitoring               |
|---|---|
| Teachers will engage in weekly collaborative planning supported by academic coaches. Planning will include intentional discussions about how to scaffold instruction with on grade level text and summarization strategies. | Holland, Holley,<br>hollanho@collierschools.com |
| Reading coaches will engage identified teachers in coaching cycles to support scaffolded instruction.   | Holland, Holley,<br>hollanho@collierschools.com |
| Administration will observe ELA instruction on a weekly basis to ensure standards aligned instruction with scaffolding and summarizing is being implemented.  | Holland, Holley,<br>hollanho@collierschools.com |

**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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

**Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.**



School staff, students and parents participate in surveys throughout the year to provide feedback in the areas of safety, sense of belonging and involvement. Schools staff and parents review the surveys to celebrate success and improve areas needed.

Parent meetings will be held at both morning and evening times providing parents the opportunity to attend at their convenience, with translators available.

Parents have the opportunity to provide feedback at monthly SAC Meetings and through parent surveys.

Parents can also schedule meetings with teachers and administration.

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

School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings are held monthly at LES. Parents have the opportunity to provide input in developing the annual parent involvement policy in addition to providing input on parent workshops and school functions. Parent surveys are reviewed for additional input.

Headstart services are provided on our campus. Parents and students are fully included in our school community and invited to participate in our events. Title I Parts A, C, D, SIG 1003g, UniSIG, Title II, Part A and Title IV are managed out of the same department. They share administrative staff so that oversight, coordination, budgeting, staffing, and monitoring are efficiently coordinated. Informal communications and monthly administrative meetings are held to discuss program needs, issues and coordinate efforts.

Parent meetings will be held at both morning and evening times providing parents the opportunity to attend at their convenience.