

Collier County Public Schools

# Lake Park 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>

# Lake Park Elementary School

1295 14TH AVE N, Naples, FL 34102

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Katie Maya**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/11/2022

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	73%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: A (76%) 2018-19: A (74%) 2017-18: A (76%)
<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](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.

Table of Contents	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

## Lake Park Elementary School

1295 14TH AVE N, Naples, FL 34102

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

### 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	No	73%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	41%

### 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.**

To create a collaborative learning community that inspires success through high quality data driven instruction, purposeful learning and amazingly positive experiences for all stakeholders, in a safe and caring environment.

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

Success for every student...every day!

### 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
Maya, Katie	Principal	<p>Ensures a safe and high-quality learning environment for all students, while including all stakeholders in the data-based decision-making process. Monitors and ensures that MTSS is being implemented with fidelity, along with scheduling that supports common team planning, alignment of push in support and implementation of interventions. Serves as an instructional leader in the building by providing a clear school-wide focus, monitoring the implementation of curriculum, and supporting teachers in making data driven decisions, that meet the needs of all students. Oversees the implementation of intentional and purposeful instructional practices in each content area, to guide the selection of instructional resources and strategies to maximize student achievement school-wide. Promotes the use of the See, Do, Get Model to ensure alignment and execution of school goals in the areas of leadership, culture and academics.</p>
Galloway, Heather	Assistant Principal	<p>Assists the principal in maintaining a common vision for use of data based decision making. Assists the principal in providing leadership and support of the MTSS process; conducts root cause analysis to determine future instructional strategies and areas of focus, ensures that MTSS is being implemented with fidelity; conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation; allows scheduling that supports common team planning and implementation of interventions; monitors curriculum, instruction, assessments, and evidence of impact; ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation; communicates with parents regarding school based MTSS plans and activities. Oversees the implementation of best practices in each content area that will guide the selection of both instructional resources and strategies to maximize student achievement school-wide; communicates with families regarding attendance and discipline.</p>
Arcand, Aimee	Instructional Coach	<p>Develops, leads, and evaluates CORE programs; identifies and analyzes literature on research-based intervention strategies; identifies systematic patterns of student need; assists with universal screening process; assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery. Attends and supports collaborative planning and instructional delivery methods to ensure a laser focus on standards based instruction tailored to each students learning needs.</p>
Saba, Janice	School Counselor	<p>Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students, small and large groups; provides interventions to the school and families to support the child's academic, personal/social, career development, and community involvement; promotes social emotional</p>



Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		learning lessons throughout the school; provides mentor opportunities for students in need.
Byington, Amy	Instructional Media	Promotes literacy activities throughout the school; Plans, organizes, and facilitates literacy meetings and events; Participates in student data collection; integrates core instructional activities into Tier II and III instruction; collaborates with general education teachers through co-teaching models; provides support for the development and implementation reading interventions.
Meister, Brittany	Other	Facilitates school procedures, training and activities regarding student academic achievement and student intervention and provides early intervening services for students in targeted area(s) of deficiency. Acts as the LEA in school based IEP and 504 meetings. Communicates with parents regarding student eligibility, consent for testing and student placement. Tracks student data to make informed decisions regarding student supports.

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 7/11/2022, Katie Maya

**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.*

6

**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.*

3

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

36

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

497

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

7

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

4

#### 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	73	81	72	79	97	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	484
Attendance below 90 percent	3	7	8	7	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	10	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	5	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	4	8	5	10	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	2	4	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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

Wednesday 8/24/2022

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	89	73	81	97	85	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	505
Attendance below 90 percent	4	7	6	6	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
One or more suspensions	0	4	1	5	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	9	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	4	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	1	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	89	73	81	97	85	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	505
Attendance below 90 percent	4	7	6	6	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
One or more suspensions	0	4	1	5	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	9	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	4	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	1	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	4	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	80%	64%	56%				76%	60%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	74%						67%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%						55%	51%	53%
Math Achievement	83%	56%	50%				85%	68%	63%
Math Learning Gains	81%						84%	64%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	68%						79%	55%	51%
Science Achievement	84%	72%	59%				70%	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	71%	61%	10%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	73%	58%	15%	58%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	87%	60%	27%	56%	31%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				

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	80%	68%	12%	62%	18%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	92%	65%	27%	64%	28%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
05	2022					
	2019	86%	67%	19%	60%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-92%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	71%	56%	15%	53%	18%
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	43	45	43	55	65	62	38				
ELL	45	56	50	59	63	50					
BLK	52	63	60	52	63	55					
HSP	72	68	50	78	81	67	81				
WHT	88	80	72	91	86	79	91				
FRL	72	69	58	73	76	62	77				

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	33	50	54	32	43	23	48				
ELL	41	64		55	73		45				
BLK	42	55		47	50		25				
HSP	77	80		74	87		94				
WHT	87	90		85	69		91				
FRL	68	74	64	69	67	33	70				
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	31	39	38	57	74	75	7				
ELL	43	63	64	54	79	71	43				
BLK	38	43	46	53	71	67	25				
HSP	69	50	46	80	85	77	50				
MUL	80			80							
WHT	86	78	67	93	86	88	84				
FRL	60	62	52	74	83	76	49				

### 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	75
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	600
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	56

English Language Learners	
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	58
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	70
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	84
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	69
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?

We continue to move our students in an upward trend across all grade levels and content areas when looking at proficiency. Grade 5 science SWD subgroup had a downward trend moving from 45% proficient in 2021 to 38% proficient in 2022.

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

Math proficiency for all students  
 Reading proficiency for all students  
 Science proficiency for students with disabilities

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

In the areas of math and reading we continue to have the need to increase the number of students performing at the proficient level. New actions to improve in these areas are literature logs to include note booking best practice strategies and strong standards driven core instruction to include productive struggle time.

In the area of science specifically the SWD subgroup, we want to increase the number of students performing at the proficient level. A contributing factor for students in this category is they had a guest ESE inclusion teacher during the 2021 school year. New actions are that we have hired a seasoned ESE inclusion teacher that is serving students. Purposeful, consistent, and intentional scheduling of push in support will help to provide instructional support focused on closing the achievement gap.

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

The area with the greatest improvement was Math for our students in the L25%. These students moved from 33% proficient in 2021 to 68% proficient in 2022.

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

Our teachers and push in support staff, scaffold and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all learners, along with providing small group instruction. Teachers continuously use a spiral review of standards in addition to pulling small groups to reteach specific standards. Productive struggle time for students will be deliberate and allow time for practice and examining reasoning of math BEST standards.



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

Implementation of B.E.S.T. standards to include collaborative planning with literacy coach with an intentional focus on strong core instruction. Note booking to include thinking map strategies.

**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.**

Monthly math PLC to target instructional strategies and provide time for vertical articulation to best meet the needs of our students.  
PD on virtual and ERD days that is focused on teacher deliberate practice elements and our school wide element of Using Formative Assessments to Track Progress.  
Monthly Literacy Leadership PLC to accelerate reading proficiency.  
Monthly note booking PLC to include thinking maps strategies and best practices.

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

Differentiated Instruction time scheduled in every classroom, intentional scheduling of support staff to include, ELL, Speech, ESE Inclusion, and non instructional staff. After school Panther Pack program to target specific standards and students in need of remediation.

**Areas of Focus**

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

:

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities****Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

SY22 student performance in fifth grade science indicated a two-year downward trend in proficiency from FY21-FY22, particularly related to The Nature of Science and Life Science. ESSA data pertaining to SWD, indicates a need for explicit and intentional instruction aligned to the intended learning of the benchmark through intentional note booking.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

When teachers deliver standards-based instruction that utilizes intentional note booking through the 5E model, grade 5 SWD's proficiency on the Spring 2023 Statewide Science Assessment will increase 12 percentage points, from 38% to 50%.

**Monitoring:**

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

The area of focus will be monitored through classroom observations, lesson plans, student work, quarterly benchmarks and other formative assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Katie Maya (mayak@collierschools.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

The 5E instructional model strategy will be implemented specifically aligned to note booking.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

The 5E Instructional Model is a research-based approach to designing instructional sequences within a unit where each phase (engage, explore, explain, elaborate, and evaluate) is used as the basis for one or more lessons.

**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.

A teacher from each grade level will attend a monthly note booking PLC that is based on the 5E model and includes thinking map best practices. Teachers will provide inquiry based instruction as a result of the professional learning that is provided.

**Person Responsible**

Heather Galloway (galloh@collierschools.com)

Teachers will plan and instruct using the 5E model and note booking strategies to ensure all students, specifically our students with disabilities are receiving rigorous instruction to increase their level of proficiency.

**Person Responsible**

Heather Galloway (galloh@collierschools.com)

**#2. 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.**

SY22 student performance in ELA proficiency indicates an upward trend in proficiency from FY21-FY22. Data pertaining to ELA proficiency, indicates a need for explicit and intentional instruction aligned to the intended learning of the benchmark through literature logs and the use of instructional conversations.

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

When teachers deliver standards-based instruction that utilizes intentional note booking along with instructional conversation, ELA proficiency on the Spring 2023 assessment will have an overall increase of 5 percentage points, from 80% to 85%.

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

The area of focus will be monitored through classroom observations, lesson plans, student work, FAST progress monitoring, iReady, and other formative assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Aimee Arcand (arcandai@collierschools.com)

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

Instructional Conversations and Literature Logs

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for**

Instructional conversations to include small-group discussions. Acting as facilitators, teachers engage students in discussions about stories, key concepts, and related personal experiences, which allow them to appreciate and build on each other's experiences, knowledge, and understanding. Note booking through Literature Logs require students to respond in writing to prompts or questions related to sections of stories. These responses are then shared in small groups or with a partner. This work will be aligned to our Monthly Literacy Leadership PLC.

selecting 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.

A teacher from each grade level along with administration, media specialist, and the literacy coach, will attend a monthly Literacy Leadership PLC that is based on literacy best practices.

**Person Responsible**                      Aimee Arcand (arcandai@collierschools.com)

Teachers will plan and instruct using the instructional conversation strategies to ensure all students are receiving rigorous instruction to increase their level of proficiency.

**Person Responsible**                      Aimee Arcand (arcandai@collierschools.com)

**#3. 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.

SY22 student performance in Math proficiency indicates an upward trend in proficiency from FY21-FY22. Data pertaining to Math proficiency, indicates a need for explicit and intentional instruction aligned to the intended learning of the benchmark through supporting and providing time for productive struggle in learning mathematics.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

When teachers deliver standards-based instruction that allows time for productive struggle, Math proficiency on the Spring 2023 assessment will have an overall increase of 7 percentage points, from 83% to 90%.

**Monitoring:**

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

The area of focus will be monitored through classroom observations, lesson plans, student work, quarterly benchmarks, FAST, STAR, and other formative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katie Maya (mayak@collierschools.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Support the opportunity for productive struggle in learning mathematics.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Productive struggle time is a research based strategy that allows students to work through their mathematical thinking and any misconceptions they may have. Teachers will plan for time to consistently provide students, individually and collectively, with opportunities and supports to engage in productive struggle as they grapple with mathematical ideas and relationships.

**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.

A teacher from each grade level along with administration, and our building Math POC, will attend a monthly Math PLC that is based on Math best practices and aligned to productive struggle time. Vertical articulation and best practices will be shared at our monthly Math PLC's to increase student proficiency levels in math.

**Person Responsible**

Katie Maya (mayak@collierschools.com)

Teachers will participate in professional learning focused on our school improvement plan goals and aligned to our school wide deliberate practice element. Teachers will have strong core math instruction as a result of the professional learning that is provided.

**Person Responsible**

Katie Maya (mayak@collierschools.com)

Teachers will plan and instruct providing productive struggle time strategies to ensure all students are receiving rigorous instruction to increase their level of proficiency. Productive struggle will include meaningful math discourse, posing of powerful questions, and promoting reasoning and problem solving skills.

**Person Responsible** Katie Maya (mayak@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.**

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. At Lake Park, a positive culture is created and reinforced through our PBIS system, school wide theme-Planting Positivity and Growing Great Leaders, Connect for Success, staff and student recognition on the morning news show, and pawsome tickets for students demonstrating our LPE expectations.

#### **Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive 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. Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies. All stakeholders are privileged to school information that relates to teaching and learning. Data and other pertinent information will be shared at PTO and SAC meetings. Our positive school culture and environment is a team effort where we believe all students can and will be successful. We provide intentional life skill learning through our Connect for Success lessons. We believe a students' potential can only be realized in an environment where they are safe and feel safe. All stakeholders play a role in the social, emotional, and academic success of all students.