

Collier County Public Schools

Estates Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Estates Elementary School

5945 EVERGLADES BLVD N, Naples, FL 34120

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

Demographics

Principal: Jill Rexford

Start Date for this Principal: 7/10/2016

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (63%) 2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: A (64%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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 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.

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	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Estates Elementary School

5945 EVERGLADES BLVD N, Naples, FL 34120

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 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	79%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		A	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 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.

Working together with the community open-mindedly to develop a positive, nurturing environment, and responsible and respectful citizens who are lifelong learners dedicated to productivity within a global society

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing engaged, enriched, and successful students for the world of tomorrow.

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
Rexford, Jill	Principal	Oversee a data-driven focus on school improvement, ensure instruction of a viable and guaranteed curriculum, facilitate continuous development of teachers and staff, build a community of care and collaboration, maintain core values, and manage resources.
Anderson, Lindsey	Assistant Principal	Support the principal's vision of a data-driven focus on school improvement, instruction of a viable and guaranteed curriculum, continuous development of teachers and staff, a community of care and collaboration, core values, and resource management.
Sweeney, Jenn	Reading Coach	Support instruction of a viable and guaranteed curriculum and continuous development of teachers and staff in the areas of English Language Arts.
Mederos, Lucy	Other	Support instruction of a viable and guaranteed curriculum and a community of care and collaboration for our special education students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/10/2016, Jill Rexford

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.*

8

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.*

26

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

69

Total number of students enrolled at the school

833

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

10

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

27

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	117	145	160	149	121	148	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	840
Attendance below 90 percent	18	40	26	30	17	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	164
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	7	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	7	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	8	4	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	0	0	0	4	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	8	4	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
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

Monday 8/15/2022

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	135	141	128	111	123	143	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	781
Attendance below 90 percent	7	18	16	12	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	5	15	36	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Course failure in Math	4	5	22	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	5	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	6	4	10	3	5	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	2	6	2	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	6	4	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	135	141	128	111	123	143	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	781
Attendance below 90 percent	7	18	16	12	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	5	15	36	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Course failure in Math	4	5	22	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	5	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	6	4	10	3	5	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	2	6	2	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	6	4	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	69%	64%	56%				62%	60%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	69%						59%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%						42%	51%	53%
Math Achievement	72%	56%	50%				74%	68%	63%
Math Learning Gains	64%						76%	64%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%						72%	55%	51%
Science Achievement	59%	72%	59%				52%	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	60%	61%	-1%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	66%	58%	8%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2022					
	2019	57%	60%	-3%	56%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

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	60%	68%	-8%	62%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	82%	65%	17%	64%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2022					
	2019	73%	67%	6%	60%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	52%	56%	-4%	53%	-1%
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	41	52	42	54	64	54	41				
ELL	56	57	48	61	57	55	38				
BLK	64	72		64	56	70	61				
HSP	67	66	46	71	67	53	48				
WHT	77	74	70	75	65		83				
FRL	67	68	53	69	62	56	58				
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	38	64		51	27		9				
ELL	51	78	83	66	66	64	47				
BLK	71	80		74	80		60				
HSP	65	81	87	70	70	71	61				
WHT	74	57		77	57		54				
FRL	64	77	73	68	68	67	54				
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	26	36	38	44	72	67	13				
ELL	40	49	38	61	73	68	33				
BLK	43	57		70	76						
HSP	60	55	41	74	77	69	48				
MUL	85	70		92	70						
WHT	71	69	40	75	77	82	62				
FRL	57	58	43	71	76	71	45				

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	63
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	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	501
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	51
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	54
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	65
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	60
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	74
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	62
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?

English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities are performing at a lower level when compared to their peers in ELA, math, and science.

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

We saw drops in ELA gains, ELA gains of the lowest 25%, math gains and math gains of the lowest 25%. Although proficiency will be what is measured this year, we want all students making gains.

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

We had huge increases in these categories between 18-19 and 20-21 making it difficult to maintain. Almost half of students needed 15 or more points to make a gain in both ELA and Math.

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

Although we did not increase proficiency, we maintained our achievement levels for all three categories:

ELA: 69%
Math: 72%
Science: 59%

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

Grade level collaborative planning with coaches and administration is a focus and priority. Teachers are supported through coaching cycles. Strategy staffing supports teachers' success; changes are made when students are not improving. Targeted professional learning that is aligned with school goals.

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

Students are clustered by academic levels so that teachers can push students, increase rigor, and provide enrichment opportunities so that students can make gains.

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.

Cambridge training/strategies.

We will use Title 1 funds to pay for guest teachers so that all teachers new to Estates Elementary can participate in instructional rounds. We will focus on our school wide deliberate practice of "Engagement Strategies" as well as monitoring techniques. Our Focused Teacher Evaluation Model is structured around student evidence and teacher monitoring for the desired effect of each element. This professional development opportunity will strengthen teachers' comfort level and use of our instructional and evaluation model that uses evidence-based strategies for learning.

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

We have teacher led professional development sessions monthly. Topics are selected based on teacher strengths and school needs. Students are in holding areas before school so no funding is needed. This allows us to sustain this practice.

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 ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Although our ELA proficiency did not decrease between the 2020-2021 school year and the 2021-2022 school year, only 41% of our Students with Disabilities demonstrated proficiency in ELA. Also, only 56% of our English Language Learners demonstrated proficiency in ELA.

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

If teachers plan and deliver standards-based instruction using district resources, then Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners will increase proficiency. If Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners increase proficiency, then proficiency for students in 3rd-5th grade will increase from 69% to 75%.

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

During weekly grade level collaborative planning, we (teachers, coach, and administration) plan which tier 1 common assessment will be given to monitor progress and take a data point for the learning goal being taught. The next week we discuss the data we collected and if we need to embed more practice in homework, small group instruction, or whole group review. The data point we collect is also recorded on the teachers' core data spreadsheets that are housed in Office365 TEAMS. After students take their state progress monitoring, we will discuss and analyze the grade level data so we can select the benchmarks and item types that need reteaching. During our weekly leadership team meetings, we identify students who are not making adequate progress and gaps in instruction to intervene properly. During our monthly FTEM observations, we observe instruction and give teachers actionable feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jill Rexford (rexfoj@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy

Using Engagement Strategies

being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

This is a Marzano researched based strategy and our school wide deliberate practice element/goal. This strategy includes: using physical movement, managing response rates, collaborative structures, crispy transitions, enthusiasm, academic games, etc. When administration observes and evaluates teachers using our Focused Teacher Evaluation Model, we will observe and leave feedback for this strategy.

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.

All teachers will participate in one day of instructional rounds where engagement strategies is our look for and focus of observations and discussions.

Person Responsible Jill Rexford (rexfoj@collierschools.com)

Teachers will engage in standards-aligned collaborative planning that incorporate district resources and engagement strategies.

Person Responsible Jill Rexford (rexfoj@collierschools.com)

Teachers will implement weekly lesson plans with fidelity.

Person Responsible Jill Rexford (rexfoj@collierschools.com)

#2. 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.

Although our Math proficiency did not decrease between the 2020-2021 school year and the 2021-2022 school year, only 54% of our Students with Disabilities demonstrated proficiency in Math.

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

If teachers plan and deliver standards-based instruction using district resources, then Students with Disabilities will increase proficiency. If Students with Disabilities increase proficiency, then proficiency for students in 3rd-5th grade will increase from 72% to 77%.

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

During weekly grade level collaborative planning, we (teachers, coach, and administration) plan which tier 1 common assessment will be given to monitor progress and take a data point for the learning goal being taught. The next week we discuss the data we collected and if we need to embed more practice in homework, small group instruction, or whole group review. The data point we collect is also recorded on the teachers' core data spreadsheets that are housed in Office365 TEAMS. After students take their state progress monitoring, we will discuss and analyze the grade level data so we can select the benchmarks and item types that need reteaching. During our weekly leadership team meetings, we identify students who are not making adequate progress and gaps in instruction to intervene properly. During our monthly FTEM observations, we observe instruction and give teachers actionable feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lindsey Anderson (anderl1@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy

Using Engagement Strategies

being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

This is a Marzano researched based strategy and our school wide deliberate practice element/goal. This strategy includes: using physical movement, managing response rates, collaborative structures, crispy transitions, enthusiasm, academic games, etc. When administration observes and evaluates teachers using our Focused Teacher Evaluation Model, we will observe and leave feedback for this strategy.

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.

All teachers will participate in one day of instructional rounds where engagement strategies is our look for and focus of observations and discussions.

Person Responsible Lindsey Anderson (anderl1@collierschools.com)

Teachers will engage in standards-aligned collaborative planning that incorporate district resources and engagement strategies.

Person Responsible Lindsey Anderson (anderl1@collierschools.com)

Teachers will implement weekly lesson plans with fidelity.

Person Responsible Lindsey Anderson (anderl1@collierschools.com)

#3. 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.**

Although our science proficiency did not decrease between the 2020-2021 school year and the 2021-2022 school year, only 41% of our Students with Disabilities demonstrated proficiency in Science. Also, only 38% of our English Language Learners demonstrated proficiency in Science.

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

If teachers plan and deliver standards-based instruction using district resources, then Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners will increase proficiency. If Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners increase proficiency, then proficiency for students in 3rd-5th grade will increase from 59% to 65%.

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

During weekly grade level collaborative planning, we (teachers, coach, and administration) plan which tier 1 common assessment will be given to monitor progress and take a data point for the learning goal being taught. The next week we discuss the data we collected and if we need to embed more practice in homework, small group instruction, or whole group review. The data point we collect is also recorded on the teachers' core data spreadsheets that are housed in Office365 TEAMS. After students take their quarterly district benchmark assessments, we will discuss and analyze the grade level data so we can select the standards and item types that need reteaching. During our weekly leadership team meetings, we identify students who are not making adequate progress and gaps in instruction to intervene properly. During our monthly FTEM observations, we observe instruction and give teachers actionable feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lindsey Anderson (anderl1@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy

Using Engagement Strategies

being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

This is a Marzano researched based strategy and our school wide deliberate practice element/goal. This strategy includes: using physical movement, managing response rates, collaborative structures, crispy transitions, enthusiasm, academic games, etc. When administration observes and evaluates teachers using our Focused Teacher Evaluation Model, we will observe and leave feedback for this strategy.

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.

All teachers will participate in one day of instructional rounds where engagement strategies is our look for and focus of observations and discussions.

Person Responsible Lindsey Anderson (anderl1@collierschools.com)

Teachers will engage in standards-aligned collaborative planning that incorporate district resources and engagement strategies.

Person Responsible Lindsey Anderson (anderl1@collierschools.com)

Teachers will implement weekly lesson plans with fidelity.

Person Responsible Lindsey Anderson (anderl1@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

N/A

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

N/A

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)

N/A

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

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.

N/A

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

N/A

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?

N/A

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

N/A

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.

Each year we have a theme to motivate our staff and students and generate enthusiasm for the year ahead. This year it is "Estates Elementary: America's School". The theme is intertwined into everything we do (morning news, car line banner, thank you cards, bulletin boards, spirit shirts, etc.) We are implementing "Connect for Success 2.0" which is a district developed curriculum intended to improve relationships and a sense of belonging for all students. We have a social committee that works to improve and maintain staff morale and a PTO that supports teachers and student learning.

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

Leadership team-weekly agenda has school culture section so we are deliberate about maintaining a positive culture and environment.

Social committee chair: Rebecca Wuss-meets with committee monthly to create morale boosting activities for staff.

PTO-board of four members-monthly celebrations like National Tea Day and National Chips and Dip day, staff member of the week gifts, fundraising used on student resources

News Crew-Shawn Maas-the theme and PBIS goals are celebrated on the morning news.

Connect for Success-Lindsey Anderson/Jill Rexford monitor the implementation of this district program.