Immokalee Community School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Immokalee Community School

123 N 4TH ST, Immokalee, FL 34142

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Zuleika Quintero

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: D (36%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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

N/A

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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Mission: Redlands Christian Migrant Association Charter Schools are committed to excellence in education. Students will be educated to reach their potential as bilingual individuals with life choices and opportunities for success.

Provide the school's vision statement

RCMA Charter Schools prepare our students to be bilingual, bi-literate and bi cultural life-long learners; sources of energy, hope, and leadership for themselves, families, communities, and their nation. We work with parents to provide students with an education rooted in shared values and ethical foundations necessary for responsible citizenship, a life lived with integrity, and a commitment to the higher purpose of serving and advocating for others.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Brown, Juana	Other	The responsibilities of our schools executive director include the following. She helps to provide leadership opportunities, supports the school's vision while ensuring the curriculum aligns with it, assure that students are learning effectively in the classroom by meeting their personal and education goals and needs. Our charter school director, also helps to achieve financial and fundraising goals and maintaining and improving the school's overall rating, and assuring that we are in compliance with our district and state requirements.
Quintero, Zulaika	Principal	The duties and responsibilities of the principal are to oversee all school operations policies and procedures, budgets, and ensure the school remains a safe site for students. The principal hires, monitors, and evaluates all staff, as well as monitors student achievement, and encourage parent involvement.
Facundo, Amy	Instructional Coach	Our instructional coach has an important role of great value, as she helps our teachers by ensuring that they reach their highest level of success. She helps to promote the use of data to inform and drive teaching practices. She also supports by helping to reflect on their instruction, by collaborating, modeling, and giving them honest feedback. This helps to promote a supportive and connected environment.
Preciado, Manuel	Other	Our after school manager provides a safe, nurturing, and well-supervised after school program ans summer program; he's the liaison with parents, collaborators, school leadership, volunteers, and visitors and displays the site and the program positively. He is responsible for planning and development of the creative learning environment, establishment of interest centers, and preparation of needed materials and supplies. In addition he is responsible for the collection of program data, providing reports for contract compliance, and assisting with administrative support. He is also responsible for recruitment and retention of after school staff, and supervision of after school staff.
Seijo, Audrey	Instructional Coach	Support teachers in using data to improve instruction on all levels. Develop coaching plans to ensure teachers and student improvement though professional development and targeted topics and designs. She works with teachers in order to establish professional learning communities that provide support and guidance for interventions for all grade levels.
Garcia, Rosmery	Attendance/ Social Work	Provides support services to students, staff, and parents. Support services include referrals, assessment, diagnostics, and report writing. This work takes place at the school site, in other public buildings, and in private residences. Considerable discretion,

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		independent judgment and learned social work skills must be used with establishing, maintaining, and using a network of accessible community services to assist families with fulfilling their goals and becoming advocates for their children.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Zuleika Quintero

Number of teachers with a 2019 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 2019 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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

18

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (61%)

	2015-16: D (36%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
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](#).	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by 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	40	40	35	35	34	33	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	248
Attendance below 90 percent	11	11	5	0	4	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	7	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
	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	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 11/2/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

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	40	35	35	34	34	33	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	244
Attendance below 90 percent	3	2	2	6	2	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	3	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	8	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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

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

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	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	46%	60%	57%	42%	61%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	59%	58%	54%	62%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	51%	53%	46%	54%	48%
Math Achievement	77%	68%	63%	72%	69%	62%
Math Learning Gains	70%	64%	62%	56%	65%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	55%	51%	54%	55%	47%
Science Achievement	8%	59%	53%	52%	60%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
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
03	2019	40%	61%	-21%	58%	-18%
	2018	42%	59%	-17%	57%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison	-2%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	48%	58%	-10%	58%	-10%
	2018	46%	60%	-14%	56%	-10%

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	44%	60%	-16%	56%	-12%
	2018	26%	59%	-33%	55%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
06	2019	52%	56%	-4%	54%	-2%
	2018	52%	56%	-4%	52%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		26%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	80%	68%	12%	62%	18%
	2018	89%	67%	22%	62%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	70%	65%	5%	64%	6%
	2018	54%	67%	-13%	62%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				
05	2019	67%	67%	0%	60%	7%
	2018	68%	68%	0%	61%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
06	2019	94%	61%	33%	55%	39%
	2018	82%	62%	20%	52%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		26%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	8%	56%	-48%	53%	-45%
	2018	52%	58%	-6%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-44%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	17	24	25	57	65						
ELL	37	52	55	76	70	61	12				
HSP	46	58	58	77	70	65	8				
FRL	42	52	52	75	68	65	9				

2018 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	5	36		42	29						
ELL	28	47	47	68	44		20				
HSP	42	54	46	72	56	54	52				
FRL	43	55	44	73	57	52	50				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	448
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	54
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
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

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

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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends

Student performance on Science Achievement is the lowest component for the 2018-2019
school year. The data reflects a 44 percent decrease from our 2018-2019 Science Achievement. This is not a trend across all tested grades because this is the only grade that is administered the Science component.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline

Students who previously tested in 2017-2018, showed a 13 percent gain compared to the students who tested in 2018-2019 school year. School data shows, that the greatest decline from the prior year was student performance on Science Achievement. The data reflects a 44 percent decrease from our 2018-2019 Science Achievement scores.

2016-2017 = 39%
2017-2018 = 52%
2018-2019 = 8%

As we reflect on this data, we struggle to understand what exactly contributed to this 44% decrease. We had the same teacher who taught science, we had a cohort that typically made small gains throughout their testing years and there was no change in their testing environments. We are continuously trying to find out what triggered such a low performance in Science this school year to assure improvement for the years to come.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends

The greatest gap when compared to the state average was in Science Achievement.

Immokalee Community School = 8%
State Average = 53%

This is a difference of 45 percent on the Science Achievement comparison between our school and the state.
As we reflect on this data, we struggle to understand what exactly contributed to this high decrease in our Science Achievement. We had the same teacher who taught Science, we had a cohort that typically made small gains throughout their testing years and there was no change in their testing environments. We are continuously trying to

find out what triggered such a low performance in Science to assure improvement for the years to come.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Overall School Data:
There was a significant improvement in our 2018-2019 Math Learning Gains component. Our school grew by 14%, from a 56% to a 70% learning gains in this area.

Grade Level Data:
*6th grade math had 94% of students scored proficient or higher. This represents a cohort increase of 26%.
*5th grade math had 67% of students scored proficient of higher. This represents a cohort increase of 13%.

The school implemented a new online math program that differentiated support for students in grades 3rd-6th. This new program was implemented with fidelity across the board and teachers had professional development with the focus being on weekly progress monitoring. School administration played a motivational/accountability role in the success of the program by celebrating student achievements throughout the school year.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

1. Attendance- As we enter school under COVID restrictions, attendance has been an area of a large concern due to students being out with COVID related symptoms. This has put a strain on our students' academic growth, on our teachers' ability to move forward with content and engagement; It's also put a strain on parent's with concerns on COVID safety.

2. Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA Assessment Results - we have twelve students who scored a level 1 on the 2018-2019 ELA FSA. This is a great concern when looking at our attendance and the impact COVID has impeded on student performance.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year

1. Science Achievement - increase from 8% to 33%
2. ELA School Achievement - increase from 46% to 54%
3. ELA School Learning Gains - increase from 57% to 60%
4. ELA for Lowest 25% - increase from 58% to 60%
5. ELA SWD Learning Gains increase from 24% to 30%

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our Science scores have declined from previous years. Our percentage for meeting high standards in Science had increased in previous years: 2015-16 29%, 2016-17 39%, and 2017-18 52%. However, in 2018-19 our Science achievement percentage decreased to an 8%. This has been of great concern and an area of focus for Immokalee Community School.
Measureable Outcome:	As we reflect on our school improvement plan, the 2020-21 objective is to attain a 33% or higher in our 5th grade science achievement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Zulaika Quintero (zulaika@rcma.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	As of this year, all of our Kinder - 5th grade classroom teachers have been trained in BeGLAD strategies and we are currently working on training our 6th grade teachers. BeGLAD (Guided Language Acquisition Design) is an instructional approach that incorporates a variety of strategies to support bilingual students in simultaneously learning content and acquiring language. BeGLAD is grounded in research related to second language acquisition and sheltered instruction. Utilizing these evidence-based strategies in all classrooms will support our vertical alignment in Science and other content area. This will also allow for cross-content and dual-language support.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Some of the key BeGLAD strategies that are used for Science are the Graphic Organizer, Cognitive Content Dictionary (CCD) and Interactive Journals. These are the pivotal strategies used in making information comprehensible, and can be used across all content-areas. These focused strategies help to teach concepts and vocabulary comprehensibly, utilizing neurological imprinting and motivation. With these strategies, teachers create charts that include academic vocabulary and concepts. These charts are used in place of realia and as a visual support for the traditional lecture. The teacher uses these to front load a unit.

Action Steps to Implement

Classroom teacher will analyze biweekly curriculum based-assessment data and quarterly benchmark data to assess student progress on learning growth goals. Classroom teachers will conference with students to review their growth as well as how together they will address challenge areas indicated in the assessments and identify realistic goals students will work towards. The data will also be used by teachers to plan student grouping and differentiation, adjust pacing, and plan learning activities. Teachers will communicate with the after-school director to ensure the program tutors identify students who need more intensive remediation and targeted areas of support. We will have grade level PLC's with teams meeting to review data in real time and plan support and interventions. We'll have weekly teacher feedback meeting centered on students data and student work sample to determine level of student mastery and growth, a long with additional prescriptive measures.

Person Responsible	Zulaika Quintero (zulaika@rcma.org)

Grade level teacher teams, along with ESE and ELL teachers will meet quarterly to review students data. Reflection will lead to collaborative decision-making on curriculum, standards pacing, and instructional decisions for students at all levels. Meetings will help the full team

identify necessary corrective actions to address learning gaps. Grade level teams will meet biweekly with the school principal and instructional coaches to review student data. Teachers will bring both data and student work as evidence of progress for the class as a whole and share dis-aggregated data for targeted sub-groups and L25% in these data meetings. Addittionally, grade level teams will meet with data coordinator and school principal to review benchmark quarterly assessment data three times a year mirroring this process.

Person Responsible   Audrey Seijo (audrey.seijo@rcma.org)

The principal will engage in classroom walkthroughs to observe instruction on a weekly basis. This will ensure instruction is supporting students and leading to understanding and application of skills. Leadership team members will accompany principal in some of these walkthroughs to provide a snapshot of instruction and learning and lead to collaborate reflections and team support. Peer observations will be scheduled so teachers can visit one another for ideas and collaborative meeting feedback.

Person Responsible   Zulaika Quintero (zulaika@rcma.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	While there have been some very significant improvements in Math in certain grades, English Language Arts scores averages, continue to increase from a 41.5% to a 51% over the last two years. Comparing grade level scores in Math and ELA results, show a disparity with no grade level scoring above a 52% in ELA. Subgroup data shows a slight increase in ELA learning gains of 3%, and a slight increase in the bottom 25%tile of 12%.
Measureable Outcome:	ICS' school goal is improvement in both achievement and learning gains for all students. Our goals include: 1. ELA School Achievement - increase from 46% to 50% 2. ELA School Learning Gains - increase from 57% to 60% 3. ELA for Lowest 25% - increase from 58% to 60% 4. ELA SWD Learning Gains increase from 24% to 30% ICS' Dual Language program will be implemented from kindergarten to 6th grade this academic school year. Students in 3rd-6th grade will be challenged to be proficient in both Spanish and English, while their bilingual/ bi-literate achievement and growth will only be reflected in one language on the assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Zulaika Quintero (zulaika@rcma.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	ICS is constantly evaluating our ELA data to identify trends and patterns that can help inform program improvement. Program improvement includes several targeted activities to be implemented with fidelity across all grade levels. The school is evaluating reading/language arts curriculum, learning resources - including technology - and instruction to ensure each component supports student grade level success. Professional development and coaching, particularly on use of data to inform "what is taught, when it's taught, and how it will be taught." ICS' DLL program will be implemented in kindergarten through 6th grade. We are mindful of research on impact of bi-literacy and bilingualism in both Spanish and English on student achievement and see this as part of our school action plan.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1) Systematic review of assessment data; focusing on power standards; goal setting and monitoring of student and classroom goals using curriculum based and benchmark assessments 2) PD and coaching support for teachers and teacher aides on BeGLAD strategies 3) Differentiated instruction with daily small group and individualized support for all students with additional layer of support for our SWD and lowest 25% students. 4) Use of after school program and Saturday school to provide additional layer of targeted support for students in the lowest 25% 5) Collaborative team meetings to allow teachers to support one another in planning, data analysis, and sharing of instructional practices 6) Parent workshops to provide parents with practical ideas to support

literacy at homes. These workshops will be interactive and model strategies even non-reading parents can use at home to build vocabulary, oral language, and fluency.

Action Steps to Implement

Classroom teacher will analyze biweekly curriculum based-assessment data and quarterly benchmark data to assess student progress on learning growth goals. Classroom teachers will conference with students to review their growth as well as how together they will address challenge areas indicated in the assessments and identify realistic goals students will work towards. The data will also be used by teachers to plan student grouping and differentiation, adjust pacing, and plan learning activities. Teachers will communicate with the after-school director to ensure the program tutors identify students who need more intensive remediation and targeted areas of support. We will have grade level PLC's with teams meeting to review data in real time and plan support and interventions. We'll have weekly teacher feedback meeting centered on students data and student work sample to determine level of student mastery and growth, a long with additional prescriptive measures.

Person Responsible   Zulaika Quintero (zulaika@rcma.org)

Grade level teacher teams, along with ESE and ELL teachers will meet quarterly to review students data. Reflection will lead to collaborative decision-making on curriculum, standards pacing, and instructional decisions for students at all levels. Meetings will help the full team identify necessary corrective actions to address learning gaps. Grade level teams will meet biweekly with the school principal and instructional coaches to review student data. Teachers will bring both data and student work as evidence of progress for the class as a whole and share disaggregated data for targeted sub-groups and L25% in these data meetings. Additionally, grade level teams will meet with data coordinator and school principal to review benchmark quarterly assessment data three times a year mirroring this process.

Person Responsible   Audrey Seijo (audrey.seijo@rcma.org)

The principal will engage in classroom walkthroughs to observe instruction on a weekly basis. This will ensure instruction is supporting students and leading to understanding and application of skills. Leadership team members will accompany principal in some of these walkthroughs to provide a snapshot of instruction and learning and lead to collaborate reflections and team support. Peer observations will be scheduled so teachers can visit one another for ideas and collaborative meeting feedback.

Person Responsible   Zulaika Quintero (zulaika@rcma.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

1. Attendance- As we enter school under COVID restrictions, attendance has been an area of a large concern due to students being out with COVID related symptoms. This has put a strain on our students' academic growth, on our teachers' ability to move forward with content and engagement; It has also put a strain on parent's with concerns on COVID safety.

As a leadership team, we are working together to assure we support students who we are concerned for regarding attendance.
*Providing technology platforms to support students who are out due to COVID related symptoms.
*Providing various modes of communication between teacher, student and families.
*Providing communication between front office, nurse and other staff members.
*Keeping track of students who have missed school and might need extra support.
*Providing an evening for school work to be picked-up, so students are better equipped for online learning.

2. Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA Assessment Results - we have twelve students who scored a level 1 on the 2018-2019 ELA FSA. This is a great concern when looking at our attendance and the impact COVID has impeded on student performance.

As a leadership team, we are working together to assure we support students who scored a level 1 on the 2018-2019 ELA FSA.
*These scholars have been identified and placed on Multi-Tiered Support System (MTSS).
*These scholars will be invited to our Saturday School program that will begin in January 2021.
*Collaboration among leadership team and teachers to discuss and better support the needs of these scholars using DATA to identify evidence-based interventions and evaluate the effectiveness of those chosen interventions with the flexibility of re-evaluating those outcomes.

Part IV: 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 to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

ICS has been diligent in solidifying parent partnerships to help build the school culture. The first step has been to have a school principal, teachers, social worker, teacher aides, and other staff with roots in the Immokalee community who have an understanding of the unique needs of our families. The second vehicle for relationship building is the valuing of language and culture. As a dual language program our mission is to build and support the use of Spanish - the home language of most students - as well as the celebration of culture.

The school prides itself on being culturally responsive and supporting parents with workshops that help equip parents with knowledge and skills to fuel their individual growth as well as that of their students. These workshops center on health and wellness, with the school partnering with the Aetna Foundation to bring parents self-care support, including fitness classes, weekly distribution of a bag of fresh produce, and mental health resources for families living with chronic stress. Along with these, there are yearly workshops to provide parents with easily implemented home math and literacy activities to use with their students.

Assuring community partnerships, other stakeholders, has been key to providing parents with support and some
wraparound services, including mental health and dental treatment for their students. The school has a longstanding partnership with community organizations that share in the mission of bringing opportunities to parents. Stakeholders such as the Healthcare Network of Southwest Florida's Dr Javier Rosado, NCEF, and other partners help realize our mission of building opportunities for families.

Another valuable vehicle for parent involvement is our School Advisory Committee (SAC). Monthly attendance at meetings number 60 plus parents who enthusiastically advice the school and share decision-making on important school issues including how resources will be used. They also undertake support and communication with fellow school parents.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00

	Total:	$0.00