

The School District of Lee County

The Alva School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	27
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

The Alva School

17500 CHURCH AVE, Alva, FL 33920

<http://alv.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.

The Alva School will provide educational opportunities for academic excellence for all K-8 students in a safe, respectful, and productive learning environment. Students and staff will exhibit S.H.A.P.E qualities which includes service, hope, achievement, pride and effort.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Alva School is a place of excellence where all students are inspired to think and learn.

The school will design programs and learning opportunities that promote academic achievement and the personal and social growth of every student. As a richly diverse community of learners that values all its members, The Alva School will assume a central role in the community by linking parents, local agencies, and businesses to the school.

The Alva School will provide a safe and productive learning environment in which students can communicate effectively, think critically, solve problems, and are technologically literate through a variety of curricular and extracurricular activities. Through a challenging course of study with high standards, students will become responsible learners who can work collaboratively, and be accountable for their own academic and developmental progress. Students and staff will follow S.H.A.P.E to be outstanding individuals. This includes Service, Hope, Achievement, Pride and Effort.

The Alva School students will become life-long learners who will be educated to make valuable contributions to society. Through the teamwork of the school, home, and community, every student will be well prepared for the demands of the future.

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
Shaker, Nathan	Principal	Lead SIP Creator; delegates responsibilities as needed or required. Presents SIP to SAC.
Abrams, Shari	Assistant Principal	Completes parts of the SIP; Updates quarterly; presents SIP to SAC.
Sites, Jennifer	Teacher, ESE	SIP Contributor; Intervention Coordinator
Cangialosi, Erica	Instructional Coach	SIP Contributor; Intervention Coordinator
Clark, Emily	Instructional Coach	SIP Contributor; Intervention Coordinator
Stinson, Kim	Assistant Principal	Completes parts of the SIP; Updates quarterly; presents SIP to SAC.

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.

School-based Stakeholders - Representation by TALC & SPALC leaders, as well as instructional coaches and ESE personnel. Principal and Assistant Principal are primary SIP Leaders.

Parents & Students - Representation through our School Advisory Council (SAC). The SIP, and any alterations or updates, are presented for input at each quarterly SAC meeting.

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))

With the implementation of FAST, the SIP will be reviewed and updated after the implementation of PM1 & PM2, for achievement-based goals. All other goals will be reviewed and updated quarterly.

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)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	32%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	96%

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: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
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	19	12	23	20	30	62	53	59	278	
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	1	2	11	9	18	44	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	6	8	8	5	5	0	6	3	41	
Course failure in Math	0	1	2	5	2	4	0	6	6	26	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	17	21	49	61	55	210	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	3	14	68	47	49	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		

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	1	2	9	5	14	35	40	39	145

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	2	0	0	8	3	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	2	0	7

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	30	21	13	26	27	31	66	58	63	335	
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	1	3	12	10	19	48	
Course failure in ELA	0	6	8	8	2	5	0	6	1	36	
Course failure in Math	0	1	2	7	1	4	0	7	4	26	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	15	21	51	62	56	212	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	3	13	71	49	52	191	
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	1	2	9	3	14	37	43	40	149

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	0	6

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	30	21	13	26	27	31	66	58	63	335	
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	1	3	12	10	19	48	
Course failure in ELA	0	6	8	8	2	5	0	6	1	36	
Course failure in Math	0	1	2	7	1	4	0	7	4	26	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	15	21	51	62	56	212	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	3	13	71	49	52	191	
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	1	2	9	3	14	37	43	40	149

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	0	6

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*	49	45	53	51	48	55	47		
ELA Learning Gains				51			46		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			35		
Math Achievement*	59	48	55	56	37	42	57		
Math Learning Gains				50			50		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54			45		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	55	47	52	51	47	54	49		
Social Studies Achievement*	58	60	68	68	51	59	51		
Middle School Acceleration	65	77	70	77	42	51	67		
Graduation Rate		51	74		43	50			
College and Career Acceleration		33	53		66	70			
ELP Progress	43	47	55	52	69	70	60		

* 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	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	398
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	552
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
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	21	Yes	4	2
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	51			
HSP	51			
MUL	42			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	51			

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	30	Yes	3	1
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	47			
HSP	52			
MUL	53			
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	50			

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	49			59			55	58	65			43
SWD	10			20			18	20			5	
ELL	31			49			46				4	43
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	46			57			50				3	
HSP	46			55			49	56	60		7	46
MUL	48			36							2	
PAC												
WHT	51			62			58	59	65		6	
FRL	43			52			50	54	59		7	42

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	51	51	42	56	50	54	51	68	77			52
SWD	17	31	26	26	35	37	21	45				
ELL	39	65	63	52	54	65	21					52
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	47	52	36	45	54	46						
HSP	48	54	48	51	50	51	41	62	62			50
MUL	48	39		52	72							
PAC												
WHT	52	50	40	58	50	54	56	70	80			
FRL	43	51	41	47	47	50	41	60	65			59

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	47	46	35	57	50	45	49	51	67			60
SWD	9	31	33	25	30	26	26	26				
ELL	23	42	45	39	39							60

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												
BLK	38	38		32	48		27					
HSP	41	48	44	52	42	42	43	46	68			57
MUL	50	40		41	45							
PAC												
WHT	50	46	31	61	52	47	52	53	67			
FRL	41	43	34	50	48	39	38	44	55			45

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
05	2023 - Spring	55%	48%	7%	54%	1%
07	2023 - Spring	40%	44%	-4%	47%	-7%
08	2023 - Spring	46%	44%	2%	47%	-1%
04	2023 - Spring	57%	56%	1%	58%	-1%
06	2023 - Spring	48%	44%	4%	47%	1%
03	2023 - Spring	68%	42%	26%	50%	18%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	58%	52%	6%	54%	4%
07	2023 - Spring	31%	37%	-6%	48%	-17%
03	2023 - Spring	85%	55%	30%	59%	26%
04	2023 - Spring	68%	61%	7%	61%	7%
08	2023 - Spring	57%	60%	-3%	55%	2%
05	2023 - Spring	69%	52%	17%	55%	14%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	44%	43%	1%	44%	0%
05	2023 - Spring	70%	50%	20%	51%	19%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	72%	39%	33%	50%	22%

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	55%	59%	-4%	66%	-11%

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.

Our grades four and seven performed below the state and/or district in ELA. In Math, our Algebra scores were below state and district - the lowest in our district - and 8th graders taking Pre-algebra performed 6 points below the district average. Based on PM3 FAST data, grade 4 and 7 ELA and Algebra demonstrate the greatest need for improvement. The main contributing factor in both grades was novice teachers in both grade levels. The momentum and progress noted from PM1 to PM2 was not maintained from PM2 to PM3. We need to increase interventions/enrichments and strategic plan implementation in response to PM2 data.

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

Our school's Social Studies Achievement scores saw the biggest drop from 2022 to 2023, declining from 68% to 58%, a ten percent decrease in our 7th-grade students achieving proficiency in Civics. This level of achievement mirrored the results we saw in 7th grade ELA achievement, likely due to the strong

correlation between fluent reading skills and Civics proficiency. When comparing our middle-level performance to that of all other middle schools in our district, 15 out of the 20 schools dropped by at least one percentage point when compared to the prior year, averaging a 6% loss. A widespread decline has encouraged our 7th-grade Civics teachers, ELA teachers, and administration to reflect and continue to dig into curricular alignment, best practices, and formative/informative assessments with preschool planning, professional development, and support planned into the 2023-2024 school year.

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.

When compared to stated averages, our 7th-grade students experienced the greatest gaps in proficiency in both English Language Arts and Math. The Alva school was at 32% proficient in math, compared to 48% for the state, a difference of 16%. The difference compared to the district's 33%, was only 1% which can be attributed to the way our district instructs and assesses our 7th grade math students. Even more concerning to us was that only 42% of our 7th-grade students scored proficient in ELA, compared to 48% in the state, and 47% in the district, underperforming both the state and district by -6/-5% points. We attribute this gap to novice ELA teachers and a lack of sustainable systems to coach, model, and implement effective classroom management and writing strategies.

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

During our PM2 windows, 5th-grade math proficiency and growth from PM1 looked to be an area of concern. On PM3 5th grade showed significant gains from PM2, and overall proficiency in comparison to prior years utilizing different assessment tools. Our third student's team shined in both reading and math, with single to double-digit leads over state and district averages. This gain was reported consistently over all assessment windows. The Alva contributes significant gains in the elementary grades to well-established teams of teachers working more collaboratively. Our third-grade team had a pair of experienced teachers team teaching, allowing for differentiation and skill remediation in smaller groups with both teachers sharing both small group and whole group planning and instruction. The way that the 5th-grade team was structured this year allowed for better alignment of support and scaffolding, with level 1s and 2s being grouped into a smaller class with additional support assigned. Our fifth-grade team bravely committed to providing each other feedback and sharing instructional strategies to ensure the success of the team. Finally, our fifth-grade team relied less on computer-based programs to offer math practice and utilized activities and paper-based resources with continual feedback.

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

Looking historically and at the end-of-the-year EWS data, we are concerned with the number of students experiencing 10% or more absences. Over the last two years, we have witnessed almost 30% of our student population struggle to attend school regularly. Our middle-level grades attribute to 62% of our chronically absent population. The numbers ticked down slightly in every grade level (K-8) from 2022 to 2023, but despite the PBIS strategies and attendance interventions implemented, we have not witnessed a substantial reduction in nonattendance here at The Alva School.

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

The Alva School's Priorities for School Improvement:

- Student/Teacher Attendance
- 4/7th Grade ELA Achievement
- SWD Proficiency
- 7th Grade Math Achievement
- 8th grade Science Achievement

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 Attendance**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.

Teacher attendance models the significance of daily presence and engagement. By practicing responsible teacher attendance, preparation and catch-up when absent, we can model an important life skill to our students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

1. Days per month of 100% teacher attendance (this rate we would seek to increase)
2. Days per month of "Zero" peer-teacher coverage (this rate we would seek to decrease)

Monitoring:

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

Visually, in the main office

1. Weekly, visual tally will be maintained - each month the total will be shared.
2. Weekly visual tally will be maintained - each month the total will be shared.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nathan Shaker (nathans@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.)

Visually and centrally tracking data to create a community sense of accountability is a proven effective strategy for bringing about change. Combined with celebration and public monitoring, teachers as professionals can be persuaded to consider alternatives to repeated, unexpected or excessive absences.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. Using a positive reinforcement to promote increased teacher attendance will encourage pre-planning and consideration of peers in leave requests. When we have a 100% day, the following day will be rewarded - jeans, breakfast cart, lunch, etc.
2. The most effective coverage we have at Alva is through paraprofessionals that already work closely with a grade level or subject area. Avoiding period-by-period coverage prevents teacher exhaustion and inconsistent instruction throughout the day. By first assigning paras, then peer-coverage, we seek to reduce stress and increase consistency.

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.

1. Create a space for the public representation
2. Train secretary to pull and record daily record of teacher attendance.

3. Include data in weekly communication
4. Celebrate data in quarterly Data Round-ups.

Person Responsible: Nathan Shaker (nathans@leeschools.net)

By When: System set up by Day 1 of school. Weekly and Quarterly targets; daily maintenance.

#2. 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.

Science performance is paramount to future success, and can be a major indicator of student perceptions of STEM fields. At Alva, our 5th grade Science scores have historically been in the top 5 of all schools in Lee County, however, with the addition of 125 students in 6th grade, we have not been able to maintain this trend, or rise up the non-proficient students that come to Alva in 6th grade.

Measurable Outcome:

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

This year, 70% of 5th graders and 42% of 8th graders here proficient, averaging to a 55% proficiency rate. In the 2023-2024 school year, 5th grade will maintain 70% proficiency, and 8th grade will increase to 50% proficiency, increasing the average to 58% proficiency school-wide.

Monitoring:

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

District-based exemplars and formative assessments have traditionally been good indicators of final performance. In 8th grade, we see a high correlation between developing ELA proficiency and Science proficiency. The primary monitoring for 5th grade will be District assessments; the primary monitoring device for 8th grade will be District Assessments, but we will target those students that are Level 2 and 3 readers for Science proficiency. Any Level 1 reader that increases substantially at PM1 or PM2 will be added to the targeted cohort.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shari Abrams (sharila@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.)

Historical data shows that Level 2-3 students are the most at risk of NOT passing the Science assessments. Early identification and intervention will increase their percentage of Level 2 and 3 readers that achieve and maintain proficiency in Science.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The strategy is temporarily effective, and considers that the SIP will have a quarterly update. In Q1, identifying high-yield students, coordinating them into a documented cohort and centering the teachers attention on them will lay the foundation for intervention in the 2nd quarter.

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.

Reports run and cohorts created of current 5th and 8th grade students that are Level 2 and 3 readers, as well as an Level 1 that has increased to a Level 2 or Level 3 in PM 1/2023.

Person Responsible: Shari Abrams (sharila@leeschools.net)

By When: One week after PM 1 scores are released.

Cohort file is shared with 8th grade Science PLC for analysis and comparison to District Formative Assessments and classroom performance.

Person Responsible: Shari Abrams (sharila@leeschools.net)

By When: End of Quarter 1

Science PLC determines needed interventions based on student performance in Science and PM1/2023. Those interventions will be updated at the start of Quarter 2.

Person Responsible: Shari Abrams (sharila@leeschools.net)

By When: SIP Review and Update, Quarter 2 Meeting.

#3. 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.

Aggregated, Grade-level data shows a need for focused support in 4th and 7th grade. In 4th grade, Alva did not maintain the level of achievement that the District achieved, or a proficiency score equivalent to there elementary peers. Likewise in 7th grade, performance is considerably lower than peer groups. This had a sharp impact in two areas - Civics followed with a 10 point decline, and the number of Level 1s in 8th grade is greatly increased from previous years.

Our only ATSI group is SWD - in 7th grade, only 32% of SWD students were proficient. The concern was not similar in 4th - 50% were proficient. The SWD concern was consistent across Middle School grades, averaging around 30% proficiency. This is the 3rd consecutive year of SWD being below 41%, so the urgency rises.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, The Alva School's 4th-grade students will meet or exceed the district average, 7th-grade students will achieve 50% proficiency (8% increase), and 6th and 8th-grade students will seek 55% proficiency as determined by the final PM3 Florida Assessment for Thinking. In addition, all Middle School grades will meet the federal guideline of 41% by the final FAST assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The Alva School will not only employ and monitor the predesignated first and second progress monitoring dates for ELA FAST, but will consider students' need to monitor English Language Arts proficiency utilizing district-available formative assessments including I-Ready. The initial list of non-proficient ELA students will be developed and shared, with a special cohort of higher level 1 and Level 2 students identified utilizing end-of-year (PM3 2023) data, with those students' ELA data (classroom and formative assessments) being tracked monthly via PLC meetings with support from a reading coach until the PM1 window data is available. At that time, the team will reassess current interventions and supports, and adjust as needed before the PM2 window. Any level 1 student who increases significantly from PM1 to PM2 will be added to the targeted cohort for quarter 2 and additional monitoring will be extended.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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 Alva School will be targeting, developing, implementing, and coaching beginning with a Strength Training & Agility on 12 HRS Introduction of Instructional Elements (Delving into Twelve) targeted instructional strategies: Celebrating Success, Tracking Student Progress, Using Informal Assessment of the Whole Class, Recording & Representing Content, Identifying Similarities & Differences, Engaging Students in Cognitively Complex Tasks, Highlighting Critical information, Organizing Student to Interact, Maintaining a Lively Pace, Acknowledging Adherence to Rule & Procedures, Displaying Objectivity & Control, and Demonstrating Value and Respect for Reluctant Learners. At this time, teachers will determine three strategies they will focus their year on developing. We believe the implementation of these strategies, and more importantly the team collaboration planned for will increase the effectiveness of ELA instruction at The Alva School.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

With a uniquely veteran staff, possessing deep experience and well developed skills, we realized our greatest resource to achievement in ELA can be found inside our classroom walls. With our prior year's data showing that the lowest performing ELA students correlated with our most novice teacher's classrooms, we knew we needed to create systems that would increase collaboration between novice and experienced teachers, focused on instructional strategies. Not only are the identified strategies proven to be highly reliable, but the structures planned will allow for self-reflection by ALL staff, invite peer modeling, and focused/increased opportunities for feedback.

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.

Initial PD of targeted HRS 12 Instructional Strategies: brief overview, identification of 3 pro and 3 rookie skills, Commit to 3, and Feedback Form

Person Responsible: Shari Abrams (sharila@leeschools.net)

By When: Before Preschool School-based PD Day, August 7th

Quarterly PD Plan on 12 HRS Strategies

Person Responsible: Nathan Shaker (nathans@leeschools.net)

By When: 7/19/2023

Form for inputting Pro 3 and Rookie 3, and feed into door/name sign, and sort for planning purposes (feedback/modeling)

Person Responsible: Allen Razon (allenbr@leeschools.net)

By When: 8/7/2023

Develop feedback form for teacher leader/admin/observers to use

Person Responsible: Shari Abrams (sharila@leeschools.net)

By When: 8/7/2023

#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.

Year after year, achievement in math is the culmination of quality instruction aligned to standards. When reviewing our end-of-year data, our teacher teams far outperformed both district and state averages and almost all grade levels by an average of 6 percentage points. This trend dipped as students transitioned from third to fourth grade, and became negative in 7th grade math and Algebra. With the way our district structures instruction and assessment of 7th-grade math, our most concerning difference was not our 32% efficiency compared to the state's 48%, but our 32% efficiency compared to the district's 33%, falling below the district average.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, The Alva School will increase the number of proficient math students in 7th grade to 40% (2023=32%) and 80% (2023=71%) in Algebra as assessed by PM3 Fast and EOC assessments.

Monitoring:

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

The Alva School will not only employ and monitor the predesignated first and second progress monitoring dates for Math FAST, but will consider students' need to monitor Math proficiency utilizing district-available formative assessments. Students' Math data (classroom and formative assessments) will be tracked monthly via PLC meetings. Once PM! data is released, the team will reassess current interventions and supports, and adjust as needed before the PM2 window.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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 Alva School will be targeting, developing, implementing, and coaching beginning with a Strength Training & Agility on 12 HRS Introduction of Instructional Elements (Delving into Twelve) targeted instructional strategies: Celebrating Success, Tracking Student Progress, Using Informal Assessment of the Whole Class, Recording & Representing Content, Identifying Similarities & Differences, Engaging Students in Cognitively Complex Tasks, Highlighting Critical information, Organizing Student to Interact, Maintaining a Lively Pace, Acknowledging Adherence to Rule & Procedures, Displaying Objectivity & Control, and Demonstrating Value and Respect for Reluctant Learners. At this time, teachers will determine three strategies they will focus their year on developing. We believe the implementation of these strategies, and more importantly the team collaboration planned for will increase the effectiveness of ELA instruction at The Alva School.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

With a uniquely veteran staff, possessing deep experience and well developed skills, we realized our greatest resource to achievement in Math can be found inside our classroom walls. With our prior year's data showing that the lowest performing Math students correlated with both our most novice teacher's classrooms and our most seasoned, we knew we needed to create systems that would increase collaboration between novice and experienced teachers in and outside of content areas, focused on instructional strategies. Not only are the identified strategies proven to be highly reliable, but the structures

planned will allow for self-reflection by ALL staff, invite peer modeling, and focus/increase opportunities for feedback.

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.

Initial PD of targeted HRS 12 Instructional Strategies: brief overview, identification of 3 pro and 3 rookie skills, Commit to 3, and Feedback Form

Person Responsible: Shari Abrams (sharila@leeschools.net)

By When: First PD Day 8/7/23

Quarterly PD Plan on 12 HRS Strategies

Person Responsible: Nathan Shaker (nathans@leeschools.net)

By When: 7/19/23

Form for inputting Pro 3 and Rookie 3, and feed into door/name sign, and sort for planning purposes (feedback/modeling)

Person Responsible: Allen Razon (allenbr@leeschools.net)

By When: 8/7/23

Develop feedback form for teacher leader/admin/observers to use

Person Responsible: Shari Abrams (sharila@leeschools.net)

By When: 8/7/23

#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.

After reviewing our 2022 and 2023 SWD subgroup data, it is evident that our school must do a better job of not just "accommodating" or "supporting", but accelerating learning for ALL students to have significant gains in the percentage of students meeting proficiency in English Language Arts. In 2022 we achieved 31

Measurable Outcome:

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

In the 2023-2024 school year, 41% of The Alva School's SWD will score proficient by the final Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST- PM3).

**Based on progress monitoring, implementation can be monitored by tracking sign-in/sign-out data to the Learning Lab, which is already collected.

Monitoring:

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

The Alva School will not only employ and monitor the predesignated first and second progress monitoring dates for the FAST but will consider students' need to monitor English Language Arts proficiency utilizing district-available formative assessments including I-Ready. The initial list of non-proficient ELA SWD will be developed and shared, with a special cohort of higher level 1 and Level 2 students identified utilizing end-of-year (PM3 2023) data, with those students' ELA data (classroom and formative assessments) being tracked monthly by both the ESE and ELA data PLC meetings until the PM1 window data is available. At that time, the team will reassess current interventions and supports, and adjust as needed before the PM2 window. Any level 1 student who increases significantly from PM1 to PM2 will be added to the targeted cohort for quarter 2.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly Schmidt (kimberlyds@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 Alva School will increase the delivery of quality ELA instruction inside of the general education classroom by certified teachers by changing from a special education delivery model that relied heavily on the delivery of instruction inside of the learning lab or through a supervised paraprofessional, to a focus on the delivery of instruction utilizing a truer coteaching model, with a focus on delivery to the predetermined cohort of higher Level 1 and Level 2 students inside of the ELA classroom.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

After review and reflection of current data, our SWD, especially in the middle-level grades too often were sent to the Learning Lab for behavioral concerns rather than a need for 1-1 or small group instruction. By better strategizing who will be servicing our highest achieving but still underperforming ELA students, we are trusting our greatest assets to collaborate and use their gifts to scaffold their grade level standards to meet the individual needs of their students while maintaining a grade level appropriate level of rigor and expectation. The strategy is temporarily effective and considers that the SIP will have a quarterly update, considering groupings and the effectiveness of the strategy. In Q1, identifying high-yield students, coordinating them into a documented cohort, and centering the teacher's attention on them will lay the foundation for intervention in the 2nd quarter.

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.

Identification of ELA Level 2 and highest 10% of Level 1 students with disabilities, and creating a list of those students to be shared with grade level ELA teachers, resource teachers, and support staff.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Sites (jenniferasi@leeschools.net)

By When: This list will be shared with staff no later than 8/4/2023 electronically

Students will be scheduled into the ELA classroom, with a no-lab for instruction designation and plan for support inside of the general education classroom.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Sites (jenniferasi@leeschools.net)

By When: 8/4/2023

At least monthly monitoring of formative ELA assessments

Person Responsible: Erica Cangialosi (ericajc@leeschools.net)

By When: 8/31/2023 and 9/29/2023

Update to cohort and adjustment to interventions/strategy consider PM1 data

Person Responsible: Kimberly Schmidt (kimberlyds@leeschools.net)

By When: One week following the release of PM1 Data

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).

TBD