Mike Davis Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Mike Davis Elementary School

3215 MAGNOLIA POND DR, Naples, FL 34116

https://www.collierschools.com/mde

Demographics

Principal: Melissa Stamper

Start Date for this Principal: 7/10/2020

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: C (52%) 2017-18: B (55%)
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

Mike Davis Elementary School

3215 MAGNOLIA POND DR, Naples, FL 34116

https://www.collierschools.com/mde

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	92%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Mike Davis Elementary School will provide a learning environment that will empower students reach their full potential, both personally and academically. This will be accomplished through the implementation of best practices and strong partnerships among parents, community members and staff members.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Mike Davis Elementary School, students will achieve personal success in their learning and will become responsible and productive citizens.

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
Stamper, Melissa	Principal	Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making; verbalizes support of the MTSS process; 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, and assessment; ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation; communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities. Systems for monitoring will include, but not limited to: iObservation (FTEM), Canvas learning management system, data warehouse, and iReady.
Leiti, Meghan	Assistant Principal	Assists the principal in providing leadership and support of the MTSS process; regularly attends meetings to support and provide assistance/ resources to teams as needed. Systems for monitoring will include, but not limited to: iObservation (FTEM), Canvas learning management system, data warehouse, and iReady.
Wherry, Meagan	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.
Paula, Charlene	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.
Pflaumer, Amy	Teacher, K-12	Fosters student achievement and development. Serves as an on-staff specialist with expertise in Library/Media services. Works with and through the department/grade level chairpersons, and all teachers and staff to support curriculum, technology, and student services. Collaborates with colleagues for the purpose of improving instruction and student performance. Adheres to the Code of Ethics and Principles of Professional Conduct of the Education Profession in Florida and the district's code of ethics policy, and the professional practices of the American Library Association Organizes and supervises use of the Library Media Center by all

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		students and teachers, and supervises library personnel, media and equipment. Promotes and maintains a dynamic, richly diverse, up-to-date library collection in all formats; designed and continually evaluated to best support the school curriculum and meet the reading needs of the student community. Provides group and individual instruction to students in research, technology, reading selection, and information skills.
Lefever, Rachael	School Counselor	Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students; provides interventions to link child-serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social needs.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/10/2020, Melissa Stamper

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.*

16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Total number of students enrolled at the school

575

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

3

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

10

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	95	99	91	105	82	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	559
Attendance below 90 percent	11	24	17	14	14	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	8	4	8	13	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in ELA	1	33	27	40	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
Course failure in Math	1	27	28	21	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	19	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	8	20	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	38	24	28	25	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	16	12	15	16	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68

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	1	4	4	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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	80	81	86	91	82	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	509
Attendance below 90 percent	2	19	7	12	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	0	5	1	8	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	18	16	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Course failure in Math	0	7	25	19	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	16	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	8	15	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	15	29	40	40	65	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	224

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	8	5	9	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	0	6	4	12	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
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	80	81	86	91	82	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	509
Attendance below 90 percent	2	19	7	12	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	0	5	1	8	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	18	16	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Course failure in Math	0	7	25	19	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	16	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	8	15	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	15	29	40	40	65	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	224

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	8	5	9	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	0	6	4	12	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
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	48%	64%	56%				47%	60%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	67%						50%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%						46%	51%	53%
Math Achievement	63%	56%	50%				58%	68%	63%
Math Learning Gains	84%						61%	64%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	82%						53%	55%	51%
Science Achievement	33%	72%	59%				46%	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	50%	61%	-11%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	43%	58%	-15%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	37%	60%	-23%	56%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

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	64%	68%	-4%	62%	2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	48%	65%	-17%	64%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2022					
	2019	51%	67%	-16%	60%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	40%	56%	-16%	53%	-13%
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	20	51	53	41	83	81	24				
ELL	43	65	58	61	81	75	21				
BLK	50	72	55	56	94	100	24				
HSP	46	65	58	65	81	73	36				
WHT	52	80		67	80						
FRL	50	66	60	65	84	81	34				

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	18	47	55	29	58	45	25				
ELL	44	62	64	49	67	50	53				
BLK	44	59		42	59		50				
HSP	53	73		57	73	64	61				
WHT	54			54							
FRL	52	67	68	53	68	61	58				
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	33	48	42	45	56	36	33				
ELL	42	47	47	54	57	59	38				
BLK	34	38	50	56	71	71	43				
HSP	51	54	50	58	59	51	47				
WHT	41	46		65	46						
FRL	46	50	44	58	61	52	46				

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	64
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	72
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	509
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	54
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	60
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	62
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	63
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	70
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	64
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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

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

According to the data from the last five years, student learning gains have had the biggest increase. Reading gains have improved 14 points since 2017, and Math gains have improved 20 points since 2017. Although we have been making significant gains, our proficiency levels in Reading and Science show the biggest need for improvement.

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

Although Reading proficiency levels have improved by 10 percentage points since 2017, they are still significantly low at 48%. Additionally, Science proficiency has dropped to 33%.

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

The factors that contributed to this decline resulted from the need for a more systemic approach to interventions and standards focused tier one instruction. For the second year, we will have an additional 30 minutes added to each day. Teachers also meet every 6 weeks to discuss data related to interventions, as well as weekly to plan for effective differentiated instruction.

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

According to the data from the last five years, student learning gains have had the biggest increase. Reading gains have improved 14 points since 2017, and Math gains have improved 20 points since 2017.

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

We used the additional thirty minutes of instruction to provide targeted instruction to students based on data. We also streamlined our intervention systems so that we were making informed instructional decisions to maximize gains.

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

ELA: Continue to utilize on-grade level text for CORE instruction with scaffolded support. Additionally, students will be provided individualized interventions, re-teaching opportunities, and enrichment activities during the 30-minute differentiated instruction block. All grade levels will have a designated amount of time to address foundational reading skills.

Math: The instruction block will have an additional 30 minutes built into the master schedule, which will be used for core math instruction and immediate intervention in grades 3 through 5. In addition, 3rd, 4th, and 5th-grade students will use the Redbird program, an adaptive computer program that continuously reviews previously taught content.

Science: With increased exposure to on-grade level text, students can tackle science content with instructional strategies they have learned through ELA instruction. Students will also have more exposure to NGSSSS-style questions and hands-on learning opportunities.

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.

Throughout the year, grade-level teams meet weekly with content area coaches during collaborative planning. This provides opportunities to unpack content standards, plan for effective instruction strategies, determine evidence of student mastery, and select appropriate interventions for individual students. Additionally, teachers also have the opportunity to share best practices as well as engagement strategies that impact student learning.

Once a month, teachers either attend or present best practices through our optional PD offerings. Each month these will vary but will focus on content-specific engagement strategies, specific elements using Marzano's framework, or acceleration/differentiation techniques.

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

As we streamline our MTSS process and ensure decisions are based on data, we are also ensuring that teachers understand the system and how to implement interventions effectively. The MTSS system we are establishing and improving every year will be sustained, as it is now an essential part of the school culture.

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.	The overall proficiency levels of students in the statewide standardized English Language Arts assessment is a concern. The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment is at 48%. In addition, the percentage of students in Kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screenings and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized grade 3 English Language Arts assessment was 43%. Focusing differentiated interventions will assist to help increase proficiency. Using multiple assessment pieces from state progress monitoring, district benchmark scores, iReady, and weekly tests on the BEST Standards, careful monitoring of student progress throughout the year can be used to make adjustments to grouping as needed, and meet the needs of each individual student. Professional Learning Community meetings will be held weekly to closely monitor student achievement data. The primary platform that will be used to monitor student progress is the district's Data Warehouse platform. This strategy will allow teachers to track student data in regards to their iReady scale scores, district and state progress monitoring scores, and weekly formative assessments. By recording all of the student data in one platform, students performance will be graphed and discussed during PLC meetings. Likewise, if a student is not showing improvement in a reading intervention group, using the MTSS process to identify additional ways to provide support, or adjusting groupings to meet student needs will be brainstormed and implemented. Throughout the year, teachers will continue to work with students to record and track their own progress of the standards. This will give students the opportunity to take greater ownership of their learning and know where they are currently performing.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The intended outcome of providing and monitoring differentiated reading interventions is to increase the number of students that are proficient in reading from 48% to 51%. The Measurable Outcome that the school plans to achieve is to increase the percentage of third, fourth, and fifth grade scoring Level 3 on the 2023 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment by 3 percentage points. This would be seen both in improvement in an increase in points awarded in the overall school grade, as well as an increase in grade level data. In addition, the measurable outcome for students in grades K-2 is to increase the percentage of proficiency on the iReady Diagnostic assessment by 3 percentage points and increase the percentage of students who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized grade 3 English Language Arts assessment from 43% to 46% or lower.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Professional Learning Community meetings will be held monthly to closely monitor student achievement data. The primary platform that will be used to monitor student progress is the district's Data Warehouse platform. This strategy will allow teachers to track student data in regards to their iReady scale scores and district benchmark scores. By recording all of the student data in one platform, students performance will be graphed and discussed during PLC meetings. Likewise, if a student is not showing improvement in a reading intervention group, using the MTSS process to identify additional ways to provide support, or adjusting groupings to meet student needs will be brainstormed and implemented. Throughout the year, teachers will continue to work with students to record and track their own progress of the standards. This will give students the opportunity to take greater ownership of their learning and know where they are currently performing.
Person responsible for	Melissa Stamper (stampeme@collierschools.com)

monitoring outcome:	
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Professional Learning Community meetings will be held regularly to closely monitor student achievement data. The primary platforms that will be used to monitor student progress is the district's Data Warehouse platform and Focus.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	This strategy will allow teachers to track student data in regards to their iReady scale scores, district benchmark scores, and standards mastery scores in one location. By recording all of the student data in one platform, students performance will be graphed and discussed during PLC meetings. Likewise, if a student is not showing improvement in a reading intervention group, using the MTSS process to identify additional ways to provide support, or adjusting groupings to meet student needs will be brainstormed and implemented. Throughout the year, teachers will continue to work with students to record and track their own progress of the standards. This will give students the opportunity to take greater ownership of their learning and teachers and students will both know where they are currently performing and the goals that they are working toward reaching.

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.

Utilizing the MTSS process to identify additional students, resources, and staff based on data.

Person Responsible	Melissa Stamper (stampeme@collierschools.com)

Changing the process and the data collections tools for progress monitoring in order to support student achievement.

Person Responsible	Charlene Paula (paulach@collierschools.com)

Goal setting and data chats implementation on a weekly basis.

Person Responsible	Meghan Leiti (leitime@collierschools.com)

Including all relevant staff members in Tier 2 and Tier 3 PLCs to solicit input from all staff members involved with the students.

Person Responsible	Meghan Leiti (leitime@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.	The school performed lower than the district average in mathematics proficiency, earning a 63%. Upon analyzing grade level data, trends emerged in Third and Fifth grade. Third grade data increase in proficiency in mathematics for students from 47% to 51% which is significantly below the district average of 65%. Fifth grade data decreased in proficiency in mathematics for students from 66% to 57%. Targeting both deep understanding of the new B.E.S.T. Standards, utilization of aligned formative assessments before core instruction in and determining effective math support for students will help the school achieve its goal in improving mathematics proficiency. Weekly formative assessments will be administered in grades K-5 in order to collect data and drive instruction.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The intended outcome is to increase the overall proficiency in Mathematics by a minimum of 3% with 66% of students being proficient in mathematics for the 2022-2023 school year. Additionally, the continuous standards-based discussion and progress monitoring through formative assessments will lead to improvement in mathematics core instruction and stronger identification of needs-based interventions to increase the number of students earning a level 4 or 5 on the mathematics state assessment.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Data will be analyzed during Planning with the Instructional coach and the Leadership Team.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Meghan Leiti (leitime@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	After weekly formative assessments and state progress monitoring in math benchmarks, data dialogue meetings will take place with each grade level team to determine patterns outlining areas of strength and continuous improvement. Team data chats will be held with students to review performance and to set new goals going forward specific to math sub skills and domains.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the	This process will assist in both better tracking of student progress and more responsive targeted instruction to increase student proficiency in mathematics.

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

Administering standards based data collection tools for progress monitoring in order to support student achievement.

Person Responsible Meagan Wherry (wherrm@collierschools.com)

Goal setting and data chats implementation on a biweekly basis.

Person Responsible Melissa Stamper (stampeme@collierschools.com)

Increasing the frequency of math planning and formative assessments in order to consistently address math data and the instructional implications.

Person Responsible Meagan Wherry (wherrm@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.	The FY22 data for our Mike Davis students indicated a 33% proficiency rate in Science for the 2021-2022 school year. This was our lowest scoring area. We will continue to focus on acceleration strategies by providing students with robust background knowledge building activities, instruction in content area vocabulary, and instructional strategies within content area, grade level text. We will utilize progress monitoring tools that include practice NGSSSS-style questions, district benchmark assessments, unit assessments, and Progress Learning reports to make instructional decisions that will move our students forward.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By May 2023, the 5th-grade students at Mike Davis Elementary will increase their overall Science proficiency score from 33% to 40% as measured by the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards Science assessment (NGSSSS).
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	We will utilize progress monitoring tools that include practice NGSSSS-style questions, district benchmark assessments, unit assessments, and USA Test Prep reports to make instructional decisions that will move our students forward. Additionally, instruction and planning will be monitored through Administrators' classroom observations and collaborative planning with the part-time Science Coach sessions with District support.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Meghan Leiti (leitime@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Utilize district provided curriculum supports including the 5E Instructional Model (Engage, Explore, Explain, Elaborate, Evaluate) Provide students with background knowledge-building activities Explicit instruction in content area vocabulary Application of instructional strategies within content area, grade level text Use of Exit Tickets and formative assessments Resource teachers and tutors provide push-in support for SWD and EL students in science Provide hands-on lab experiences that aligned with the nature of science methodologies Increase exposure to NGSSSS style questions
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the	During planning for instruction and implementation of lessons, we will be working with teachers to ensure they are exposing students to on-grade level text, experiences, and tasks aligned to the NGSSSS, which will increase the rigor and their understanding of scientific concepts. The 5E Instructional Model is a research-based strategy from the National Science Teaching Association that is used as a basis for lesson delivery. Exit tickets and formative assessment will provide data for teachers to inform instruction and provide individual feedback to students.

resources/ criteria used for 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.

Develop a collaborative planning schedule with district science support for departmentalized science teachers in grades 3-5.

Person Responsible   Meghan Leiti (leitime@collierschools.com)

Creation of master schedules to support instructional strategies and supports.

Person Responsible   Meghan Leiti (leitime@collierschools.com)

Ongoing professional learning to assist in planning for student engagement, rigor, and evidence of student mastery.

Person Responsible   Meghan Leiti (leitime@collierschools.com)

Student performance data from classroom observations, assessments, quarterly benchmark assessments and Progress Learning will be monitored regularly for progress towards goals.

Person Responsible   Melissa Stamper (stampeme@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

We will focus on acceleration strategies by providing students with effective differentiated phonics instruction based on student data. Students who are not meeting reading expectations will be provided with targeted small group instruction.

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

We will focus on acceleration strategies by providing students with targeted instruction using on-grade level text to build fluency and comprehension. Students who are not meeting reading expectations will be provided with targeted small group instruction.

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

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

By May 2023, Mike Davis students in grades K-2 will increase proficiency levels from 43% to 46% based on iReady data.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

By May 2023, Mike Davis students in grades 3-5 will increase proficiency levels from 48% to 51% based on PM3 data.

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.

Using multiple assessment pieces from state progress monitoring, district benchmark scores, iReady, and weekly tests on the BEST Standards, careful monitoring of student progress throughout the year can be used to make adjustments to grouping as needed, and meet the needs of each individual student.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Stamper, Melissa, stampeme@collierschools.com

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §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?

Evidence based resources that will be used to provide targeted interventions include the following:
HMH Word Studio, HMH Rigby Leveled Readers, HMH Read and Respond Journal, Reading Horizons, Heggerty, iReady Tools for Instruction, LLI

These resources are clearly aligned to the district's comprehensive reading plan, and they are fully aligned to BEST standards.

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?

The evidence based practices being used are aligned directly to students' deficits through the MTSS process. This allows us to provide targeted interventions and meet the needs of all students.

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
MTSS meetings occur every 6 weeks to analyze student performance data in order to make informed instructional decisions.	Stamper, Melissa, stampeme@collierschools.com
Teachers are provided with professional development in implementing effective interventions through coaching, professional development sessions provided monthly, and a book study around achieving goals.	Leiti, Meghan, leitime@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.

The school builds positive relationships with parents, families, and community members in multiple ways. Throughout the year, parents have the opportunity to participate in many school wide events including the Annual Title 1 Meeting held in August, Literacy Night, Math Night, Meet the Teacher, and Student-Led Conferences. Throughout these events families partner with the school to take an active part in learning about their child's school's education, and spending time building positive family relationships through school based events.

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

Stakeholders which contribute to promoting a positive culture and environment at the school include members of the leadership team, teachers, students, parents, and staff.

Parents have multiple opportunities to participate throughout the year at the school in their child's education. Teachers and administration build strong relationships with parents and families through positive communication. Each family is personally contacted by his or her teacher during the first weeks of school, through Curriculum Night, before or after school conferences, and Webex video conferencing or a phone call home.

Additional strategies to promote a positive culture and maximize parent communication has included increasing staff use of Parent Link, Twitter and Facebook through the Leadership Social Media Team. Through the Twitter and Facebook platforms family members are given access into a window of their child's classroom. Here they are able to see snapshots of lessons and learning going on in the classrooms, highlighting student accomplishments and video-clips of active learning.