

Collier County Public Schools

Calusa Park 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	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Calusa Park Elementary School

4600 SANTA BARBARA BLVD, Naples, FL 34104

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

Demographics

Principal: Renee Hanson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/24/2020

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 (62%) 2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (60%)
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	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Calusa Park Elementary School

4600 SANTA BARBARA BLVD, Naples, FL 34104

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

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	81%

School Grades History

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

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 educate students to the fullest extent of their ability while encouraging well-rounded character and instilling a vision for their future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students will achieve their full academic potential, develop well-rounded character, and be valued and recognized as unique individuals.

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
Hanson, Renee	Principal	Instructional leader for staff and students. Supports collaborative planning and monitors instruction to ensure focus on the standards. Provides evaluative feedback to teachers and ensures that student achievement is tracked and utilized as a base to provide differentiated instruction. Monitors all safety and security aspects and ensures that all protocols are followed.
Finger, Loren	Assistant Principal	Develops, leads, and evaluates CORE programs; models effective instruction and coaches teachers through the coaching cycle; 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 of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.
Smith, Debra	Reading Coach	Develops, leads, and evaluates CORE programs; models effective instruction and coaches teachers through the coaching cycle; 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 of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.
Luciano, John	Math Coach	Develops, leads, and evaluates CORE programs; models effective instruction and coaches teachers through the coaching cycle; 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 of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.
Ward, Courtney	Instructional Coach	Develops, leads, and evaluates CORE programs; models effective instruction and coaches teachers through the coaching cycle; 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 of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.
Hamburg, Stacy	School Counselor	Participates in student data collection, integrates behavioral intervention materials/activities into instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching, PBIS strategies and interventions.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/24/2020, Renee Hanson

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.*

3

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

Total number of students enrolled at the school

686

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.

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	94	102	123	114	100	114	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	647
Attendance below 90 percent	7	16	20	14	12	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
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	5	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	8	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	84	109	106	108	107	120	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	634
Attendance below 90 percent	7	15	16	13	14	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	1	11	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in Math	0	7	12	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	10	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	13	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
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	3	5	6	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	2	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	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	84	109	106	108	107	120	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	634
Attendance below 90 percent	7	15	16	13	14	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	1	11	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in Math	0	7	12	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	10	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	13	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
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	3	5	6	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	2	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	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	62%	64%	56%				63%	60%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	62%						60%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%						42%	51%	53%
Math Achievement	68%	56%	50%				73%	68%	63%
Math Learning Gains	76%						71%	64%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%						58%	55%	51%
Science Achievement	57%	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	65%	61%	4%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	56%	58%	-2%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2022					
	2019	58%	60%	-2%	56%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

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	75%	68%	7%	62%	13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	64%	65%	-1%	64%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				
05	2022					
	2019	69%	67%	2%	60%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	49%	56%	-7%	53%	-4%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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	34	46	36	48	66	45	14				
ELL	56	65	48	63	65	48	46				
BLK	52	63	50	53	70	50	55				
HSP	61	64	50	72	79	65	62				
WHT	78	61		76	76		45				
FRL	60	62	53	65	75	57	56				
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	19	40		33	20		21				
ELL	47	43	33	58	66		37				
BLK	56	45		52	70		30				
HSP	55	47	55	65	76	60	54				
WHT	70	75		66	72		74				
FRL	54	45	41	58	67	53	49				
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	42	35	42	67	59	7				
ELL	55	61	46	66	66	56	38				
BLK	40	41		65	46	40					
HSP	58	60	43	70	74	63	44				
WHT	81	72		81	76		77				
FRL	57	54	41	69	67	55	42				

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	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	491
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
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 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	55
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	65
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	67
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	61
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?

When comparing our progress to the overall District average, we scored higher than the District average in 5 of the 7 graded categories. We scored lower than the District in Science as well as with our L25 Gains.

Reading: 5 out of 6 subgroups scored lower than the school average.

Math: 4 out of 6 subgroups scored lower than the school average.

Science: 5 out of 6 subgroups scored lower than the school average and our school average was 3% below the District average.

Reading Making Gains: 2 out of 6 subgroups scored lower than the school average.

Math making Gains: 4 out of 6 subgroups scored lower than the school average.

Reading L25 Gains: 2 out of 6 subgroups scored lower than the school average

Math L25 Gains: 3 out of 6 subgroups scored lower than the school average

Our SWD Subgroup scored below the District average in all 7 graded categories and below the State average in 6 of the 7 graded categories.. Our ELL subgroup scored below the overall school average in 5 of the 7 graded categories but did outperform the State in both Math and Reading making gains.

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

Reading: 5 out of 6 subgroups scored below our overall school average and 3 of the subgroups scored below the District average (Black, ELL, SWD).

Math: 4 out of 6 subgroups scored below our overall school average and 3 of those subgroups scored below the District average (Black, ELL, SWD).

Math L25 Making Gain: Three subgroups scored significantly below the District average as reflected here. Black (-8), ELL (-10), and SWD (-13). Our overall school average was 1% below the overall District average so this discrepancy stands out for these subgroups.

Science: 5 out of 6 subgroups scored below our overall school average and all 5 of those also performed below the State average. (Concern with SWD student scores that show only 14% of these students scored proficient.)

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

- Teacher and student attendance have been factors that are addressed on a regular basis through attendance meetings and discussions.
- New ELA standards and new curriculum materials that teachers needed to learn. Lack of textbooks at the beginning of the year.
- Loss of 5th grade teacher replaced by first year teacher.
- Inconsistent team support for two newer teachers on 4th grade team.
- Teacher placements on new grade levels, Continue to address attendance issues/concerns.
- Continue coaching support and intervention as needed.
- Identify students needing support early to try to close the learning gap.
- Use of Math Interventionist as well as Reading Interventionist in primary grades to help continue building foundational skills.
- Use of instructional coaches and Title I funded resource teachers to support student achievement.

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

Math L25 Making Gains increased by 12%.

Reading L25 Making Gains increased by 10%.

Math Meeting Standards Increased by 5%.

Reading Making Gains increased by 4%.

Reading Meeting Standards increased by 3%.

Math Making Gains increased by 3%.

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

Hiring of academic coach to support science allowed math coach to only focus on math coaching and instruction.

Hiring of academic coach allowed for additional reading support alongside current literacy coach to provide support to new teachers, coaching support to veteran teachers, and student support through strong standards based instruction.

New ELA Standards and Curriculum with extensive District training and support for teachers.

Coach supported planning to ensure curriculum maps are followed and lessons are standards based.

Consistent walkthroughs by administration to ensure that instruction is focused and students are engaged.

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

Continued focus on coach supported planning. Alignment of instruction with State standards and District provided curriculum maps. Early and consistent interventions and regular monitoring of instruction.

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.

District supported planning for instructional staff on new standards.
Continue coach supported planning to ensure alignment of standards and instruction.
Workshops to ensure teachers understand new curriculum materials and resources.

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

Continue to work to build capacity with teachers. Coaches will continue to attend District provided trainings and workshops to learn how to provide needed support. Focus on support of newer teachers. Follow MTSS systems including early identification and intervention.

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

Instructional practice specifically related to standards-aligned instruction.

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

Rationale: SY22 student performance in fifth grade science indicated a three year trend of scoring below our SY18 average of 60% proficiency. Teacher changes on grade level adding teachers new to subject area indicate a need for explicit planning support and intentional modeling of instruction aligned to the intended learning of the benchmark.

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 the 5E model and District resources, fifth grade proficiency on the Spring 2023 Grade 5 Statewide Science Assessment will increase 5 percentage, from 57% to 62%.

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

Formative and Summative assessments will be monitored to determine areas needing additional support. Formal and informal observations will be conducted by our science coach and administrative team to monitor science instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Courtney Ward (wardc1@collierschools.com)

Provide professional development for 3rd - 5th grade teachers on the implementation of the 5E model for high quality, standards-aligned science instruction.

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

Teachers will engage in standards-aligned, collaborative planning that incorporates the 5E model and implement the planned lessons with fidelity.

Science Coach to support collaborative planning, provide modeled instruction, and general coaching support as needed based on the continuing monitoring of data along with classroom observations including both formal and informal.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

We have two teachers new to teaching science on our 5th grade team and we had multiple grade level staff changes in the last couple of years. By providing coaching support and modeling of instruction along with strong collaborative planning, we will strengthen our core instruction.

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 3rd - 5th grade teachers will participate in professional development on the 5E model for high quality, standards-aligned science instruction.

Person Responsible

Courtney Ward (wardc1@collierschools.com)

Teachers will engage in standards-aligned collaborative planning with coaching support that incorporates best practices and will implement the lessons with fidelity utilizing District provided resources.

Person Responsible Courtney Ward (wardc1@collierschools.com)

Science Coach will provide support through coaching and modeling as determined by formal and informal observations.

Person Responsible Renee Hanson (hansonre@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 overall student performance in 3rd - 5th grade showed that 62% of our students tested proficient compared to 58% District proficiency. However, we have not reached our previous higher scores from FY17 and FY18 during which we scored 66% proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

When teachers deliver standards-aligned instruction, ESE & ELL staff provides instructional support during the independent or small group work time, and our students are offered before and after school support, our overall ELA proficiency will increase 8%, from 62% to 70%.

Monitoring:

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

Formative and Summative assessments will be monitored to determine areas needing additional support. Formal and informal observations will be conducted by our literacy coach and administrative team to monitor ELA instruction of the B.E.S.T. standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Renee Hanson (hansonre@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

Data Driven Decisions to Improve Achievement: Engage in timely and meaningful conversations with all stakeholders to examine our subject specific data to identify the most pressing needs of our students and teachers. Implement impactful interventions based on the District's MTSS guidelines.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

By examining data and taking appropriate action through the implementation of our action steps listed below, we can increase our overall proficiency. Also, by following our District MTSS guidelines with fidelity and utilizing appropriate interventions, we will increase achievement for many of our ESSA subgroups which will have a positive impact on overall proficiency.

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 3rd - 5th grade teachers will participate in District and school-based professional development on the new B.E.S.T. ELA standards as well as our new curriculum materials.

Person Responsible

Debra Smith (smithd2@collierschools.com)

Teachers will engage in standards-aligned collaborative planning with coaching support that incorporates best practices and will implement the lessons with fidelity utilizing District provided resources.

Person Responsible

Debra Smith (smithd2@collierschools.com)

Ensure that daily instruction is standards aligned and differentiated.

Person Responsible

Debra Smith (smithd2@collierschools.com)

Ensure that ESE/ELL staff provide scheduled support during independent or small group time rather than during on-grade level instruction.

Person Responsible Renee Hanson (hansonre@collierschools.com)

Ensure that our SWD (lowest performing ESSA Subgroup) are offered before and after school opportunities to work within the ELA standards.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#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 overall student performance in 3rd – 5th grades averaged 68% proficiency compared to our District's performance of 65% proficiency, however, our FY19 proficiency averaged 73% so we are still scoring 5% below that previous score.

Measurable Outcome:

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

When teachers deliver standards-aligned differentiated instruction, ESE/ELL staff provides instructional support during the exploratory work time, overall proficiency will increase by 7% from 68% to 75%.

Monitoring:

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

Formative and Summative assessments will be monitored to determine areas needing additional support. Formal and informal observations will be conducted by our math coach and administrative team to monitor math instruction. Teachers new to grade levels will receive additional monitoring and support from math coach.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Loren Finger (fingerlo@collierschools.com)

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

Data Driven Decisions to Improve Achievement: Engage in timely and meaningful conversations with all stakeholders to examine our subject specific data to identify the most pressing needs of our students and teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

By examining data and taking appropriate action through the implementation of our action steps listed below, we can increase our overall proficiency.

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 3rd - 5th grade teachers will participate in District and school-based professional development on the new B.E.S.T. Math Standards as well as our new curriculum materials.

Person Responsible

John Luciano (luciaj@collierschools.com)

Teachers will engage in standards aligned collaborative planning with coaching support that incorporates best practices and will implement the lessons with fidelity using District provided resources.

Person Responsible

John Luciano (luciaj@collierschools.com)

Ensure that our SWD are offered additional morning support as well as after school opportunities to work within the math content which will support increasing our overall proficiency levels.

Person Responsible

Renee Hanson (hansonre@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.

Our school works to develop a Parent and Family Engagement Plan that incorporates input from all stakeholders. We host our PTO/SAC meetings as well as Student Led Conferences and other parent events to try to engage families in their child's education. We are launching Leader in Me this year and hope to learn additional strategies to strengthen our school culture and create school-wide systems of accountability across all stakeholders. Last year we hosted the Leader in Me Book Club and this year we have had all instructional staff trained in the 7 Habits of High Effective People. We have all also participated in the Leader in Me Core 1 Training. We are going to be adapting our PLC groups to become Action Teams. We have a strong veteran staff that continues to be forward thinking and always wants to do what is best for children. Our Leadership and Lighthouse Teams are committed to excellence and we work hard to create a very positive school culture where everyone is welcome and feels safe.

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

Administrators - oversee all school-wide attendance & discipline, PBiS initiatives, student recognition, staff recognition, weekly communication to parents/families, plan family engagement events

Leadership Team - provides support to all staff members through coaching and collaborative planning and the creation of a supportive work environment

Teachers - implementation of school-wide PBiS, classroom recognition for student achievement, planned engagement strategies during lessons, Connect for Success Lessons, and this year we are Launching Leader in Me.

Students - actively participate in lessons and all school initiatives, data binders/goal tracking, student led conference preparation and presentation. Students know they are to be Respectful, Responsible, Prepared, and Safe.

Parents - engage in SAC, PTO, school initiatives/events and support student academics through parent conferences, student led conferences

Community Members - attend SAC meetings, build business partnerships