

The School District of Lee County

Allen 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	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Allen Park Elementary School

3345 CANELO DR, Fort Myers, FL 33901

<http://alp.leeschools.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Melissa Booth

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (43%) 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI

* 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 Lee County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Allen Park Elementary School

3345 CANELO DR, Fort Myers, FL 33901

<http://alp.leeschools.net/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">84%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee 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.

A high performing school community inspiring high performing lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Today's Learners...Tomorrow's Leaders

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
Booth, Melissa	Principal	The Principal serves as leader of the school in relation to instruction, management, and operations. The Principal and admin designees also attend weekly PLC meetings and report back to the members of the leadership team.
Buen, Jessica	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal supports the Principal in the instruction, management, and operations. The Assistant Principal and admin designees also attend weekly PLC meetings and report back to the members of the leadership team.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Melissa Booth

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

0

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

20

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

70

Total number of students enrolled at the school

894

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

18

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
20

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	148	155	143	189	122	129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	886
Attendance below 90 percent	0	56	42	44	19	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	197
One or more suspensions	0	8	13	16	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Course failure in ELA	0	19	25	46	28	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
Course failure in Math	0	11	11	27	20	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	39	39	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	30	41	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
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	10	12	51	38	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153

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	2	0	0	39	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Students retained two or more times	0	3	0	3	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/27/2022

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	152	153	147	170	125	146	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	893
Attendance below 90 percent	24	42	40	39	24	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200
One or more suspensions	0	4	6	4	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	3	33	16	26	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
Course failure in Math	1	14	8	24	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	29	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	44	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
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	2	18	13	27	35	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	152	153	147	170	125	146	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	893
Attendance below 90 percent	24	42	40	39	24	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200
One or more suspensions	0	4	6	4	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	3	33	16	26	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
Course failure in Math	1	14	8	24	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	29	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	44	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
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	2	18	13	27	35	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	3	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	42%	52%	56%				63%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	54%						61%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%						43%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	43%	45%	50%				62%	62%	63%
Math Learning Gains	49%						60%	65%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38%						25%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	42%	59%	59%				61%	52%	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	56%	58%	-2%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	63%	55%	8%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	60%	54%	6%	56%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

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	57%	61%	-4%	62%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	63%	62%	1%	64%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
05	2022					
	2019	52%	58%	-6%	60%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	58%	50%	8%	53%	5%
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	18	42	38	20	55	50	14				
ELL	13	43	41	21	37	27	15				
ASN	76	83		88	83						
BLK	29	50	46	33	46	40	33				
HSP	31	43	20	32	38	27	26				
MUL	61	62		59	58						
WHT	77	74		73	69		80				
FRL	33	50	39	33	39	37	37				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	15	33	40	17	29	27	25				
ELL	31	43	33	29	59	57	33				
ASN	81			85							
BLK	29	39	44	28	30	22	32				
HSP	44	48	44	40	51	50	44				
MUL	44			50							
WHT	79	59		81	65		84				
FRL	33	42	40	33	35	26	36				
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	19	53	48	28	51	33	29				
ELL	39	50	46	50	45	17	24				
ASN	92	94		96	94						
BLK	39	49	35	39	47	19	34				
HSP	51	55	47	52	56	33	44				
MUL	79			57							
WHT	84	69	50	82	70		83				
FRL	50	55	43	49	52	22	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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	49
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	352
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	31
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	83
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	42
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	33
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	60
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	75
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	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

Allen Park has a higher percentage of students scoring a Level 1 than the district and the state in all three core content areas (ELA, Math, Science). In addition, Allen Park has a higher percentage of ELL students and ESE students scoring a Level 1 when compared to the district and state in all three core content areas (ELA, Math, Science).

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

Allen Park needs to focus on L25 learning gains in both ELA and Math for all students.

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

Contributing factors include an increase in student discipline and an increase in both student and teacher absenteeism. New actions to be taken include increased focus on ELA interventions which include the walk-to-intervention strategy and increased ELA intervention time. Small group instruction and tutoring opportunities will be implemented in both ELA and Math and will focus on Level 2 students identified as being able to make a learning gain.

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

The data components that showed the most improvement include L25 learning gains for ELL students in ELA and the L25 learning gains for Students with Disabilities in Math.

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

Allen Park implemented small group instruction in Math which focused on students most likely to make a learning gain. Teachers implemented small group instruction utilizing the ALDs. Allen Park also implemented a tutoring program in ELA which utilized Phonics for Reading.

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

Targeted interventions in ELA need to be done with fidelity. Small group instruction in Math also needs to take place. Instruction in Math including interventions done with fidelity. Allen Park will also be implementing an after-school tutoring program and Calendar Club in order to accelerate learning.

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.

Currently, our Academic Coaches are providing support to grade level teachers on implementing strategies for learning including small group instruction and interventions. Academic Coaches are also facilitating PLCs and discussing planning and pacing. Content area specialists from the district departments are also supporting grade level teams on a weekly and/or bi-weekly basis with planning, instruction, and data analysis.

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

Implementing schoolwide systems is key to ensuring sustainability of improvement. These systems include PBIS, PLCs, and a system for intervention. Allen Park is currently implementing behavior, attendance, and academic incentives. In addition, Allen Park plans to implement after-school tutoring and a Calendar Club in order to accelerate learning. Allen Park is also working towards becoming a High Reliability School.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Data from 2022 state testing shows that our L25 students who are also ELL scored 30% lower for Math learning gains in 2022 than in 2021 on the state Math assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Knowing that 2022-2023 is proficiency only, Allen Park Elementary will increase Math proficiency for our ELL students from 21% to 23% or higher as measured by the 2023 Math F.A.S.T. testing.

Monitoring:

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

Allen Park Elementary will monitor progress toward this increased outcome using F.A.S.T. state progress monitoring as well as the iReady Math diagnostic assessment, district exemplars and quarterly comprehensives.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Booth (melissarb@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Allen Park elementary will be implementing after school tutoring for students in Math as well as interventions and increased small group instruction during the school day.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Allen Park Elementary used tutoring for Math and implemented the use of ALDs with students identified as being able to make a learning gain in Spring 2022. Due to their success using this strategy with other subgroups, Allen Park will re-implement this strategy again focusing on ELL student in our L25 group.

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.

Identify ELL students who scored Level 1 or Level 2 on the 2022 FSA Math assessment.

Implement strategic small group interventions using the ALDs.

Monitor progress in weekly PLCs.

Participate in job-embedded coaching from Academic Coaches and district curriculum specialists.

Person Responsible

Melissa Booth (melissarb@leeschools.net)

Identify ELL students who scored Level 1 or Level 2 on the 2022 FSA Math assessment.

Implement strategic small group interventions using the ALDs.

Monitor progress in weekly PLCs.

Participate in job-embedded coaching from Academic Coaches and district curriculum specialists.

Person Responsible

Melissa Booth (melissarb@leeschools.net)

#3. 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.

Data from 2022 state testing shows that our L25 students who are also SWD scored 3.5% lower for ELA learning gains in 2022 than in 2021 on the state ELA assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Knowing that 2022-2023 is proficiency only, Allen Park Elementary will increase ELA proficiency for our SWD students from 37.5% to 39.5% or higher as measured by the 2023 ELA F.A.S.T. testing.

Monitoring:

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

Allen Park Elementary will monitor progress toward this increased outcome using F.A.S.T. state progress monitoring as well as the iReady ELA diagnostic assessment, district exemplars and quarterly comprehensives.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Booth (melissarb@leeschools.net)

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

Allen Park Elementary will be implementing after school tutoring for students in ELA as well as interventions and increased small group instruction during the school day.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Allen Park Elementary will implement a system for interventions that includes walk to intervention as well as increased intervention time as they are research based strategies. Allen Park will implement this strategy further differentiating for the needs of these students in the L25 who are also SWD.

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.

Identify SWD students who scored Level 1 or Level 2 on the 2022 FSA ELA assessment.

Implement strategic small group interventions using Phonics for Reading.

Monitor progress in weekly PLCs.

Participate in job-embedded coaching from Academic Coaches and district curriculum specialists.

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

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

Walk-to-Intervention

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

Walk-to-Intervention

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)

Allen Park Elementary will increase ELA proficiency in Grades K-2 as measured by the STAR and STAR Early Literacy assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Allen Park Elementary will increase ELA proficiency from 41% to 43% or higher as measured by 2023 state testing.

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.

Allen Park Elementary will monitor progress using F.A.S.T. state progress monitoring data as well as the iReady ELA diagnostic assessments, district exemplars and quarterly comprehensives. Additionally, we will

use pre- and post-test assessments for students receiving instruction with the district provided intervention programs to measure progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Buen, Jessica, jessicads@leeschools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

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

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

Allen Park is implementing the district approved ELA intervention programs including Phonics for Reading for Grades 3-5, FlyLeaf for Grade 2, and Read Well for Grades K-1. These programs are research based and are aligned with all district evidence-based reading plans for both K-5 and are in alignment with B.E.S.T ELA 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?

Allen Park is implementing the Phonics for Reading, FlyLeaf, and Read Well programs due to data showing deficiency for our students in basic reading skills. These programs address the identified needs at each of the grade levels where they are being used. These programs are research based and have data showing they are effective with students with our demographics.

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
<p>Literacy Leadership: Assistant Principal will lead Academic Coaches and Curriculum Specialist in effective data analysis in order to implement interventions with fidelity. Individuals with a strong background in literacy have been hired in the roles of K-2 Literacy Coach, 3-5 Literacy Coach, and Curriculum Specialist</p>	
<p>Literacy Coaching: Teachers will participate in job-embedded coaching from Academic Coaches and Curriculum Specialist to guide them in implementing the needed interventions. Teachers will receive assistance from Academic Coaches and Curriculum Specialist in order to analyze data.</p>	<p>Buen, Jessica, jessicads@leeschools.net</p>
<p>Assessment: Students will take the pre-test and post-test designed for each intervention program. Data will be analyzed to strategically group and re-group students for interventions.</p>	
<p>Professional Learning: Academic Coaches and Curriculum Specialist will facilitate PLCs in order to ensure that data is being analyzed and used to inform instructional decisions. Academic Coaches and Curriculum Specialist will model best instructional practices in ELA instruction.</p>	

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.

Allen Park has worked hard to establish a system for PBIS which includes the use of common language for schoolwide expectations and beliefs. Allen Park uses the acronym S.H.I.N.E. (Safe, Helpful, In Control, Nice, Engaged). Students, faculty, staff, and families interact daily with our S.H.I.N.E. expectations as they have become the foundation for a positive school culture where students are able to succeed academically, socially, and emotionally. In addition to our S.H.I.N.E. expectations, Allen Park also provides students with the opportunity to engage in lessons related to social emotional learning. The Zones of Regulation are also utilized and present in every classroom. Restorative practices are used by our deans and administration when handling consequences for discipline. Faculty and staff also share the core belief of working as a Professional Learning Community (PLC); working together to analyze data and discuss the "how" of instruction in addition to sharing best practices for continuous improvement. Finally, Allen Park faculty and staff share the belief that ALL students can learn especially when teachers have taken the time to build strong positive relationship and authentic connections with students and families.

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

Stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at Allen Park Elementary include:

Leadership Team - These individuals lay the foundation and set the tone for a positive culture and environment through modeling the importance of building positive relationships, S.H.I.N.E. expectations, social emotional learning, collaboration, restorative practices, and the belief that ALL student can learn.

Faculty & Staff - These individuals are responsible modeling and implementing these core values and beliefs on a daily basis in the classroom with students or within their role on our campus.

Students - These individuals play an important role in demonstrating the core values and beliefs that are taught and demonstrating them both while on campus and outside of school.

Families - Parents, guardians, and families can help promote a positive culture and environments by supporting Allen Park's core values and beliefs at home. Families and can participate in our quarterly parent and family engagement activities which are designed to bring school and home together and to increase parental involvement.

Community - Community members, local business, and volunteers contribute to our positive culture by assisting with school needs. These individuals are often able to assist with donations for PBIS rewards, fundraiser nights, and monetary donations which help to strengthen and improve our already established systems for success.