Cypress Lake Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Cypress Lake Middle School

8901 CYPRESS LAKE DR, Fort Myers, FL 33919

http://cym.leeschools.net/

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lee County School Board on 10/17/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At Cypress Lake Middle School, we facilitate a safe environment where students have access to tools and opportunities to promote social and academic growth leading to success in the 21st Century.

Cypress Lake Middle School's Mantra: Passion for Success: Academics, Arts, and Life!

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be a world-class school.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Miller, Matt	Principal	• Oversee the hiring process • Assign teaching duties to classroom teachers • Assign duties to instructional support personnel • Oversee the work of collaborative teacher teams as part of the Professional Learning Community (PLC) process • Conduct classroom walk-throughs to monitor teaching and learning processes • Oversee employee evaluation system • Provide or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development • Facilitate implementation of the MTSS problem-solving process • Manage school budgets • Liaison between school and school district personnel as well as with the community
Cook, Michael	Assistant Principal	• Administrator over students last names M-Z • Create master schedule and ensure proper course placement for students • Conduct classroom walk-throughs to monitor teaching and learning processes • Provide or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development • Oversee the new teacher mentoring program (APPLES) • Oversee school PBIS program • Oversee matters of curriculum and instructional materials
George, Suja	Assistant Principal	• Administrator over students last names A-L • Oversee facilities • Oversee student transportation • Conduct classroom walk-throughs to monitor teaching and learning processes • Provide or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development • Oversee school restorative practices process
Mills, Katie	Instructional Coach	Reading Coach
Patel, Suzi	Behavior Specialist	Behavior Specialist
Enright, Liana	School Counselor	School Counselor
Huggins, Elizabeth	School Counselor	School Counselor
Stirns, Cindy	Teacher, K-12	The roles of each member teacher are as follows: • Provide leadership within their department

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		• Liaison between their department and administration • Provide high-quality instruction to assigned students • Monitor student learning progress via progress monitoring, district exemplars, and classroom assessments both formative and summative • Participate in professional development • Deliver professional development • Serve as a mentor for teachers within the department and/or new teachers outside the department • Attend MTSS Team meetings to collaborate on & monitor students who are struggling • Implement interventions designed by MTSS Team for students receiving supplemental and intensive supports. • Deliver instructional interventions with fidelity
Massaro, Shelby	Teacher, K-12	The roles of each member teacher are as follows: • Provide leadership within their department • Liaison between their department and administration • Provide high-quality instruction to assigned students • Monitor student learning progress via progress monitoring, district exemplars, and classroom assessments both formative and summative • Participate in professional development • Deliver professional development • Serve as a mentor for teachers within the department and/or new teachers outside the department • Attend MTSS Team meetings to collaborate on & monitor students who are struggling • Implement interventions designed by MTSS Team for students receiving supplemental and intensive supports. • Deliver instructional interventions with fidelity
Voyer, Dawn	Teacher, K-12	The roles of each member teacher are as follows: • Provide leadership within their department • Liaison between their department and administration • Provide high-quality instruction to assigned students • Monitor student learning progress via progress monitoring, district exemplars, and classroom assessments both formative and summative • Participate in professional development • Deliver professional development • Serve as a mentor for teachers within the department and/or new teachers outside the department • Attend MTSS Team meetings to collaborate on & monitor students who are struggling • Implement interventions designed by MTSS Team for students receiving supplemental and intensive supports. • Deliver instructional interventions with fidelity

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Logano, Carissa	Teacher, K-12	The roles of each member teacher are as follows: • Provide leadership within their department • Liaison between their department and administration • Provide high-quality instruction to assigned students • Monitor student learning progress via progress monitoring, district exemplars, and classroom assessments both formative and summative • Participate in professional development • Deliver professional development • Serve as a mentor for teachers within the department and/or new teachers outside the department • Attend MTSS Team meetings to collaborate on & monitor students who are struggling • Implement interventions designed by MTSS Team for students receiving supplemental and intensive supports. • Deliver instructional interventions with fidelity
Hufford, Sue	Teacher, K-12	Intervention Support Specialist

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school leadership team, including teachers, are involved in the initial development of the SIP. The School Advisory Council (SAC) will be given the opportunity to review the SIP and make appropriate recommendations for changes. They will then be asked to approve the final version.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The school leadership team will regularly review the processes and action steps outlined in the SIP in order to ensure they are resulting in an increase in student achievement; the school principal will take the lead on this. As part of a regular (at least quarterly) review of the SIP, necessary adjustments will be made and communicated to stakeholders.

Demographic Data Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	54%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	85%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	58	65	162
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	33	41	85
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	52	86	177
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	61	0	184
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	52	78	160

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	7

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	58	65	162
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	33	41	85
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	52	86	177
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	61	0	104
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	52	78	160

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	7

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	57	48	49	61	48	50	62		
ELA Learning Gains				51			58		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				34			38		
Math Achievement*	67	56	56	62	32	36	65		
Math Learning Gains				59			54		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52			43		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	51	45	49	55	51	53	62		
Social Studies Achievement*	76	64	68	68	53	58	74		
Middle School Acceleration	83	80	73	79	45	49	67		
Graduation Rate					44	49			
College and Career Acceleration					66	70			
ELP Progress	29	29	40	54	78	76	55		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	363
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	575
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	22	Yes	4	2
ELL	41			
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	46			
HSP	51			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	77			
FRL	52			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	29	Yes	3	1
ELL	39	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	50			
MUL	69			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	49			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	57			67			51	76	83			29
SWD	17			26			14	38			5	14
ELL	24			45			24	53	73		6	29
AMI												
ASN	77			85							2	
BLK	38			50			19	75			4	
HSP	42			55			39	61	80		6	27
MUL	56			72			69	55	82		5	
PAC												
WHT	71			78			63	90	84		5	
FRL	45			57			39	64	79		6	27

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	61	51	34	62	59	52	55	68	79			54
SWD	20	35	32	26	50	43	22	16				20
ELL	33	44	28	38	49	39	28	35				54
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	44	36	24	36	51	50	28	59				
HSP	48	46	34	49	56	49	42	51	72			56
MUL	63	59		68	70			85				
PAC												
WHT	75	58	40	77	62	52	71	80	83			
FRL	48	45	34	47	51	44	42	56	68			56

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	62	58	38	65	54	43	62	74	67			55
SWD	18	31	25	23	34	25	12	42				36
ELL	28	53	54	34	40	37	19	52	45			55

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN	80	85		83	80		80		83			
BLK	42	46	30	35	34	34	29	62				
HSP	50	53	39	54	45	40	45	60	57			54
MUL	73	64		69	61		73					
PAC												
WHT	72	62	40	76	63	54	76	85	73			
FRL	49	51	35	52	46	36	50	62	48			57

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	57%	44%	13%	47%	10%
08	2023 - Spring	51%	44%	7%	47%	4%
06	2023 - Spring	52%	44%	8%	47%	5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	73%	52%	21%	54%	19%
07	2023 - Spring	24%	37%	-13%	48%	-24%
08	2023 - Spring	70%	60%	10%	55%	15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	48%	43%	5%	44%	4%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	91%	39%	52%	50%	41%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	43%	*	48%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	71%	59%	12%	66%	5%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Grade 8 Science scores were the lowest performance across the 5 areas with a 51% proficiency rate in FY23. This was a decline from 55% in FY22. Oftentimes, there is a correlation between a cohort's performance in English Language Arts (ELA) and Science. The 8th grade cohort during FY22 had a 62% proficiency rate in ELA while the FY23 8th grade cohort had a 52% proficiency rate. This contributed to the drop in science scores. Additionally, an incredibly successful teacher with a long history of success retired at the end of FY22 and was replaced with a newer teacher who had less experience teaching the subject area.

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

The greatest decline from FY22 to FY23 was in ELA proficiency (61% to 56%). The statewide average in ELA dropped from 50% to 47% during the same timeframe. This suggests the new assessment (F.A.S.T.) based upon new benchmarks was more difficult to pass than the previous set of assessments.

For FY23, while CLMS is still 9 points ahead of the state average of 47% proficiency, the drop to 56% is still concerning. Our students and staff have now had a year to adjust to the new benchmarks, newly adopted curriculum, and the change in testing methodology to an adaptive test.

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 data component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Grade 7 math. The state average in FY23 was 48% and at CLMS it was 24%. This is due to the differences in math progression around the state. Many school districts place their entire 7th grade into 7th grade math while in Lee County, our most advanced 7th grade students take 8th grade math or Algebra 1 instead. This creates a faulty comparison of 7th grade math proficiency vs. the state average. At CLMS, only 84 total students took 7th grade math during FY23. Of those 84, 3% were proficient in math during FY22. This same group went from 3% proficient in FY22 to 24% proficient in FY23 which is a good 1-year gain.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the CLMS overall math proficiency rate which rose 9 points from 62% in FY22 to 71% in FY23. The math department overhauled its approach to how collaborative teacher teams engaged in the Professional Learning Community (PLC) process. They focused more intently on a narrower set of benchmarks which were the most important to their courses. They created, delivered, and analyzed common assessments and explicitly taught guaranteed vocabulary terms based upon the selected benchmarks. They also built in a cognitive and meta cognitive skill focus for the year.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

An area of concern was the number of students who missed 10% or more of total school days in FY23.

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

1. Improved Grade 8 Science proficiency
2. Improved overall ELA proficiency
3. Improved Grade 7 Math proficiency
4. Expansion of The New Art and Science of Teaching as a common instructional framework used by all teachers
5. Refined work of collaborative teacher teams engaging in the PLC process

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

When teacher retention is an issue, schools struggle to maintain continuity of teaching and learning year-to-year. Additionally, professional development initiatives fail to gain traction in this environment. This can lead to unstable student achievement results and lack of growth over the years.

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

By the end of FY24, 90% of the teaching staff at CLMS will continue into FY25, barring already scheduled retirements.

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

The school principal will monitor via a quarterly 1:1 meeting with each teacher. While these meetings will include a variety of topics, the principal will provide support if any teachers are struggling. This sort of partnership between teachers and school leadership is crucial in order to positively influence teacher retention.

Additionally, CLMS will move toward the New Art and Science of Teaching (NASOT) as a common instructional framework and language. Teacher coaching and support are more efficient and effective when centered around a common language.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Matt Miller (matthewrmi@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention: Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The New Art and Science of Teaching as a common instructional framework and language was development by Dr. Robert J. Marzano of Marzano Resources following decades of research on effective educational practices. This fits as the centerpiece of the CLMS journey toward certification in Level 2 (Effective Teaching in Every Classroom) of Marzano Resources High Reliability Schools (HRS) framework. NASOT includes 43 elements of design which are organized into 10 design areas each falling under three main categories.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When discussing teacher retention issues with the school leadership team in the past, the lack of a common instructional framework was identified as a reason why some new teachers struggled. The New Art and Science of Teaching (NASOT) provides schools with a common way to approach instruction which allows more efficient instructional coaching and improvement. This will lead to teachers feeling more supported by leadership and one another on their own educational journey, and, in turn, will lead to higher teacher retention.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention (Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Initially train all teachers on the New Art and Science of Teaching, including providing them with their own copy of the Handbook for NASOT.

Person Responsible: Matt Miller (matthewrmi@leeschools.net)

By When: August 10th, 2023.

Provide ongoing professional development to all teachers.

Person Responsible: Matt Miller (matthewrmi@leeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing through May 31st, 2024

Develop and implement a system for observations, coaching, and additional support for all teachers. This will include the entire CLMS leadership team of administrators and teachers.

Person Responsible: Matt Miller (matthewrmi@leeschools.net)

By When: This will be ongoing for FY24, but the initial development of the system must be done by September 1st, 2023.

The school leadership team will develop and implement an observation and coaching system to ensure benchmark alignment exists in classrooms related to teacher actions, student actions/tasks, teacher questioning, and student collaborative structures.

Person Responsible: Matt Miller (matthewrmi@leeschools.net)

By When: This will be ongoing for FY24, but the initial development of the system must be done by September 1st, 2023.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Overall (grades 6-8) ELA/reading proficiency at CLMS dropped from 61% in FY22 to 56% in FY23. The greatest decline from FY22 to FY23 was in ELA proficiency (61% to 56%). The current population of student enrolled for FY23 have a 55% prior year proficiency rate. As ELA/reading benchmark mastery are fundamental to learning and growth in any subject area, this is a crucial need based upon the data reviewed.

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

In FY24, CLMS will increase overall ELA/reading proficiency in grades 6-8 from 56% (spring 2023) to 58% (spring 2024) as measured by the 2024 FAST reading assessments.

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

Teachers and members of the administrative team will regularly review an array of data points such as district-created progress monitoring data, benchmark-based exemplar data, and classroom assessments including both formative and summative targeting mastery of priority benchmarks. This data will not only be used to track progress toward meeting the school improvement plan goal, but also will serve as the foundation for the three grade-level ELA/reading collaborative teacher teams engaging in the Professional Learning Community (PLC) process.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Matt Miller (matthewrmi@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Cypress Lake Middle School is a Professional Learning Community (PLC). As such, we place an emphasis on collaborative teacher teams engaging in the PLC process in order to provide effective teaching in every classroom and construct and deliver a guaranteed and viable curriculum.

Each collaborative team will:
• Create a list of norms that guide team interactions and work
• Create SMART goals tied to student mastery of benchmarks
• Identify priority benchmarks (a subset of the entire benchmark list for a course)
• Identify and teach guaranteed vocabulary terms that support mastery of the priority benchmarks
• Identify and instruct around 1 cognitive and 1 metacognitive skill chosen as the team's focus
• Create common assessments designed to measure mastery of these priority benchmarks
• Review common assessment data and create intervention/extension plans as needed
• Revisit and refine team practices in a cycle of continuous improvement

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Collaborative teacher teams engaging in the PLC process is a highly effective strategy backed by years of research by Dr. Robert J. Marzano of Marzano Resources as well as Dr. Rick Dufour of Solution Tree. The Lee County School District is also investing professional development time and resources into these same endeavors.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Train all teachers and administrators on the Professional Learning Community process from Solution Tree. This process applies to all teachers and is a necessary component of a planning system for this goal.

Person Responsible: Matt Miller (matthewrmi@leeschools.net)

By When: August 10, 2023

Require all collaborative teacher teams to create and share a "Team Collaboration Outcomes" document that includes all components described in the Evidence-Based Intervention section above. It will also serve as a running document throughout FY24 that will have all collaborative team meeting agendas and minutes linked in a separate section as well as a link to all common assessment data review documents. This process will positively affect all students so it is a Tier 1 / Core Instruction action.

Person Responsible: Matt Miller (matthewrmi@leeschools.net)

By When: September 15, 2023

Create and utilize a comprehensive data tracking system for this area of focus. Teacher teams will interact with this tracker on a regular basis and will refer students into a structured elective pullout benchmark/standards-based intervention system if progress is not meeting expected measures. This intervention system will begin in Q2 and will continue as needed throughout FY24. Students will enter and exit the intervention system as data warrants.

Person Responsible: Matt Miller (matthewrmi@leeschools.net)

By When: September 15, 2023 and ongoing

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Grade 8 Science proficiency at CLMS dropped from 55% in FY22 to 51% in FY23 which was the second greatest drop in proficiency across tested subject areas. Students need to enter high school prepared for success in high school science courses such as Biology and Chemistry. As such, this area is a crucial need.

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

In FY24, CLMS will increase proficiency in Grade 8 Science from 51% (spring 2023) to 58% (spring 2024) as measured by the spring 2024 Grade 8 NGSSS Science assessment.

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

Teachers and members of the administrative team will regularly review an array of data points such as district-created progress monitoring data, district-created standards-based exemplar data, and classroom assessments including both formative and summative targeting mastery of priority standards. This data will not only be used to track progress toward meeting the school improvement plan goal, but also will serve as the foundation for the Grade 8 science collaborative teacher team as part of the Professional Learning Community (PLC) process.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Suja George (sujag@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Cypress Lake Middle School is a Professional Learning Community (PLC). As such, we place an emphasis on collaborative teacher teams engaging in the PLC process in order to provide effective teaching in every classroom and construct and deliver a guaranteed and viable curriculum.

Each collaborative team will:
• Create a list of norms that guide team interactions and work
• Create SMART goals tied to student mastery of standars
• Identify priority standards (a subset of the entire standard list for a course)
• Identify and teach guaranteed vocabulary terms that support mastery of the priority standards
• Identify and instruct around 1 cognitive and 1 metacognitive skill chosen as the team's focus
• Create common assessments designed to measure mastery of these priority standards
• Review common assessment data and create intervention/extension plans as needed
• Revisit and refine team practices in a cycle of continuous improvement

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Collaborative teacher teams engaging in the PLC process is a highly effective strategy backed by years of research by Dr. Robert J. Marzano of Marzano Resources as well as Dr. Rick Dufour of Solution Tree. The Lee County School District is also investing professional development time and resources into these same endeavors.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Train all teachers and administrators on the Professional Learning Community process from Solution Tree. This process applies to all teachers and is a necessary component of a planning system for this goal.

Person Responsible: Matt Miller (matthewrmi@leeschools.net)

By When: August 10, 2023

Require all collaborative teacher teams to create and share a "Team Collaboration Outcomes" document that includes all components described in the Evidence-Based Intervention section above. It will also serve as a running document throughout FY24 that will have all collaborative team meeting agendas and minutes linked in a separate section as well as a link to all common assessment data review documents. This process will positively affect all students so it is a Tier 1 / Core Instruction action.

Person Responsible: Suja George (sujag@leeschools.net)

By When: September 15, 2023

Create and utilize a comprehensive data tracking system for this area of focus. Teacher teams will interact with this tracker on a regular basis and will refer students into a structured elective pullout benchmark/standards-based intervention system if progress is not meeting expected measures. This intervention system will begin in Q2 and will continue as needed throughout FY24. Students will enter and exit the intervention system as data warrants.

Person Responsible: Matt Miller (matthewrmi@leeschools.net)

By When: September 15, 2023 and ongoing

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Proficiency on the Grade 7 FAST math at CLMS was 24% in FY23. It is important to note that advanced grade 7 students took a grade 8 pre-algebra class and, as a result, Grade 8 FAST math so their results were not reported in the "grade 7 math" category. The students who were 24% proficient in FY23 came into FY23 with only a 2% FY22 proficiency rate.

Even with this positive growth in mind, students at CLMS can do better in FY24 in this area. It is important to get as many students as possible to proficiency before moving on to further math courses.

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

In FY24, CLMS will increase proficiency on the grade 7 FAST math assessment from 24% (spring 2023) to 30% (spring 2024).

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

Teachers and members of the administrative team will regularly review an array of data points such as district-created progress monitoring data, benchmark-based exemplar data, and classroom assessments including both formative and summative targeting mastery of priority benchmarks. This data will not only be used to track progress toward meeting the school improvement plan goal, but also will serve as the foundation for the grade 7 math collaborative teacher team engaging in the Professional Learning Community (PLC) process.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Matt Miller (matthewrmi@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Cypress Lake Middle School is a Professional Learning Community (PLC). As such, we place an emphasis on collaborative teacher teams engaging in the PLC process in order to provide effective teaching in every classroom and construct and deliver a guaranteed and viable curriculum.

Each collaborative team will:
• Create a list of norms that guide team interactions and work
• Create SMART goals tied to student mastery of benchmarks
• Identify priority benchmarks (a subset of the entire benchmark list for a course)
• Identify and teach guaranteed vocabulary terms that support mastery of the priority benchmarks
• Identify and instruct around 1 cognitive and 1 metacognitive skill chosen as the team's focus
• Create common assessments designed to measure mastery of these priority benchmarks
• Review common assessment data and create intervention/extension plans as needed
• Revisit and refine team practices in a cycle of continuous improvement

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Collaborative teacher teams engaging in the PLC process is a highly effective strategy backed by years of research by Dr. Robert J. Marzano of Marzano Resources as well as Dr. Rick Dufour of Solution Tree.

The Lee County School District is also investing professional development time and resources into these same endeavors.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Train all teachers and administrators on the Professional Learning Community process from Solution Tree. This process applies to all teachers and is a necessary component of a planning system for this goal.

Person Responsible: Matt Miller (matthewrmi@leeschools.net)

By When: August 10, 2023

Require all collaborative teacher teams to create and share a "Team Collaboration Outcomes" document that includes all components described in the Evidence-Based Intervention section above. It will also serve as a running document throughout FY24 that will have all collaborative team meeting agendas and minutes linked in a separate section as well as a link to all common assessment data review documents. This process will positively affect all students so it is a Tier 1 / Core Instruction action.

Person Responsible: Matt Miller (matthewrmi@leeschools.net)

By When: September 15, 2023

Create and utilize a comprehensive data tracking system for this area of focus. Teacher teams will interact with this tracker on a regular basis and will refer students into a structured elective pullout benchmark/standards-based intervention system if progress is not meeting expected measures. This intervention system will begin in Q2 and will continue as needed throughout FY24. Students will enter and exit the intervention system as data warrants.

Person Responsible: Matt Miller (matthewrmi@leeschools.net)

By When: September 15, 2023 and ongoing

#5. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The ESSA subgroup of Students with Disabilities (SWD) had a federal percent of points index of 29% in FY22 (data for FY23 is not published). This was the third consecutive year below 41% and the first year below 32%. Although CLMS only has 2 of the 10 ESSA subgroups below the federal benchmark of 41%, we need to have 0 below this mark.

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

In FY24, CLMS will increase performance for the SWD ESSA subgroup from 29% in FY22 (FY23 not reported) to 41% in FY24 as measured by the Federal Percent of Points Index.

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

Teachers across the various subject areas used in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI), teachers in the ESE department, and members of the administrative team will regularly review an array of data points such as district-created progress monitoring data, benchmark-based exemplar data, and classroom assessments including both formative and summative targeting mastery of priority benchmarks. This data will not only be used to track progress toward meeting the school improvement plan goal, but also will serve as the foundation for the ESE collaborative teacher team engaging in the Professional Learning Community (PLC) process.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Suzi Patel (suzanneap@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Cypress Lake Middle School is a Professional Learning Community (PLC). As such, we place an emphasis on collaborative teacher teams engaging in the PLC process in order to provide effective teaching in every classroom and construct and deliver a guaranteed and viable curriculum.

Each collaborative team will:
• Create a list of norms that guide team interactions and work
• Create SMART goals tied to student mastery of benchmarks
• Identify priority benchmarks (a subset of the entire benchmark list for a course)
• Identify and teach guaranteed vocabulary terms that support mastery of the priority benchmarks
• Identify and instruct around 1 cognitive and 1 metacognitive skill chosen as the team's focus
• Create common assessments designed to measure mastery of these priority benchmarks
• Review common assessment data and create intervention/extension plans as needed
• Revisit and refine team practices in a cycle of continuous improvement

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Collaborative teacher teams engaging in the PLC process is a highly effective strategy backed by years of research by Dr. Robert J. Marzano of Marzano Resources as well as Dr. Rick Dufour of Solution Tree. The Lee County School District is also investing professional development time and resources into these same endeavors.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Train all teachers and administrators on the Professional Learning Community process from Solution Tree. This process applies to all teachers and is a necessary component of a planning system for this goal.

Person Responsible: Matt Miller (matthewrmi@leeschools.net)

By When: August 10, 2023

Require all collaborative teacher teams to create and share a "Team Collaboration Outcomes" document that includes all components described in the Evidence-Based Intervention section above. It will also serve as a running document throughout FY24 that will have all collaborative team meeting agendas and minutes linked in a separate section as well as a link to all common assessment data review documents. This process will positively affect all students so it is a Tier 1 / Core Instruction action.

Person Responsible: Matt Miller (matthewrmi@leeschools.net)

By When: September 15, 2023

Create and utilize a comprehensive data tracking system for this area of focus. Teacher teams will interact with this tracker on a regular basis and will refer students into a structured elective pullout benchmark/ standards-based intervention system if progress is not meeting expected measures. This intervention system will begin in Q2 and will continue as needed throughout FY24. Students will enter and exit the intervention system as data warrants.

Person Responsible: Matt Miller (matthewrmi@leeschools.net)

By When: September 15, 2023 and ongoing

#6. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The ESSA subgroup of English Language Learners (ELL) had a federal percent of points index of 39% in FY22 (data for FY23 is not published). This is the first year below 41%. Although CLMS only has 2 of the 10 ESSA subgroups below the federal benchmark of 41%, we need to have 0 below this mark.

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

In FY24, CLMS will increase performance for the ELL ESSA subgroup from 39% in FY22 (FY23 not reported) to 41% in FY24 as measured by the Federal Percent of Points Index.

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

Teachers across the various subject areas used in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) and members of the administrative team will regularly review an array of data points such as district-created progress monitoring data, benchmark-based exemplar data, and classroom assessments including both formative and summative targeting mastery of priority benchmarks. This data will not only be used to track progress toward meeting the school improvement plan goal, but also will serve as the foundation for the ESE collaborative teacher team engaging in the Professional Learning Community (PLC) process.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Matt Miller (matthewrmi@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Cypress Lake Middle School is a Professional Learning Community (PLC). As such, we place an emphasis on collaborative teacher teams engaging in the PLC process in order to provide effective teaching in every classroom and construct and deliver a guaranteed and viable curriculum.

Each collaborative team will:
• Create a list of norms that guide team interactions and work
• Create SMART goals tied to student mastery of benchmarks
• Identify priority benchmarks (a subset of the entire benchmark list for a course)
• Identify and teach guaranteed vocabulary terms that support mastery of the priority benchmarks
• Identify and instruct around 1 cognitive and 1 metacognitive skill chosen as the team's focus
• Create common assessments designed to measure mastery of these priority benchmarks
• Review common assessment data and create intervention/extension plans as needed
• Revisit and refine team practices in a cycle of continuous improvement

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Collaborative teacher teams engaging in the PLC process is a highly effective strategy backed by years of research by Dr. Robert J. Marzano of Marzano Resources as well as Dr. Rick Dufour of Solution Tree. The Lee County School District is also investing professional development time and resources into these same endeavors.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Train all teachers and administrators on the Professional Learning Community process from Solution Tree. This process applies to all teachers and is a necessary component of a planning system for this goal.

Person Responsible: Matt Miller (matthewrmi@leeschools.net)

By When: August 10, 2023

Require all collaborative teacher teams to create and share a "Team Collaboration Outcomes" document that includes all components described in the Evidence-Based Intervention section above. It will also serve as a running document throughout FY24 that will have all collaborative team meeting agendas and minutes linked in a separate section as well as a link to all common assessment data review documents. This process will positively affect all students so it is a Tier 1 / Core Instruction action.

Person Responsible: Matt Miller (matthewrmi@leeschools.net)

By When: September 15, 2023

Create and utilize a comprehensive data tracking system for this area of focus. Teacher teams will interact with this tracker on a regular basis and will refer students into a structured elective pullout benchmark/standards-based intervention system if progress is not meeting expected measures. This intervention system will begin in Q2 and will continue as needed throughout FY24. Students will enter and exit the intervention system as data warrants.

Person Responsible: Matt Miller (matthewrmi@leeschools.net)

By When: September 15, 2023 and ongoing

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The School District of Lee County follows all state and federal guidelines when allocating funding to schools. The schools are budgeted in multi-faceted methods based on the student needs. Initially the schools are tiered based on the following criteria: student proficiency, learning gains, struggling schools, % of new teachers, % of ELL students, % of ESE students for academic support and for funding purposes. Content tiers are also established to provide instructional support resources based on individual student group needs. Within each school's Title I, SAI, and UniSIG plans as appropriate there is a requirement to address ESSA student groups through high quality instruction and monitoring systems. School funding needs are addressed weekly throughout the school year in collaboration with principal supervisors and the budget department. Ongoing monitoring of student data and underperforming subgroups is provided through monthly visits and data chats by principal supervisors.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
6	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes