

The School District of Lee County

Paul Laurence Dunbar Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	23

Paul Laurence Dunbar Middle School

4750 WINKLER AVENUE EXT, Fort Myers, FL 33966

<http://dun.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 School District of Lee County is committed to providing a world-class education with excellence and equity to empower each student to reach his or her highest potential with the most effective staff to foster the knowledge, skills, and ethics required for responsible citizenship and productive careers.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Together We SOAR!

Spirit - Optimism - Achievement - Respect

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
Prentice, Karen	Principal	To provide leadership, direction and accountability for the school's academic improvements
Fitzpatrick, Denise	Assistant Principal	To create and maintain a master schedule that creates the most opportunities for the most students possible.
Woods, Winston	Assistant Principal	To support and maintain a culture that is focused on learning through clear discipline plans and processes and smooth operational processes.
Colvin, Andrew	Teacher, K-12	To provide teacher input and peer coaching

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.

Stakeholders are initially sought out during our preschool Coffee with the Principal and 6th grade orientation days. Online surveys and face to face meetings give parents a way to speak up if they would like to provide support and input. The administrative team reaches back out once the SAC meetings are scheduled and works to create a representative and inclusive SAC.

An online parent feedback survey will go out mid year to collect input from parents who are unable to participate in the SAC or in PTO.

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))

Our SIP is part of the driving part of our data analysis and review after each quarter. Each subject department will work with the administrative team to unpack their own data and create subject specific goals at the course, classroom and student levels. The classroom and course data will be shared schoolwide in the school's data room. Student data will be reviewed in course specific PLC work. The student and classroom data will be part of the weekly work of PLCs, and will inform the monthly meetings with the administrative team. These monthly leadership meetings will look at each subject area's current data and where the data align to our SIP. The monthly meeting for leadership will also analyze our school's discipline and attendance data to identify areas of opportunity.

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	76%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
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)* Asian Students (ASN) 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: C 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	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	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	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	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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	69	74	89	232
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	39	41	116
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	88	101	277
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	92	92	264
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	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	67	79	82	228

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	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	9

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	69	74	89	232
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	39	41	116
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	88	101	277
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	92	92	264
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	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	67	79	82	228

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	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	9

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	48	49	49	48	50	53		
ELA Learning Gains				46			50		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				26			26		
Math Achievement*	56	56	56	50	32	36	53		
Math Learning Gains				50			46		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42			43		
Science Achievement*	47	45	49	42	51	53	52		
Social Studies Achievement*	60	64	68	62	53	58	58		
Middle School Acceleration	91	80	73	85	45	49	80		
Graduation Rate					44	49			
College and Career Acceleration					66	70			
ELP Progress	38	29	40	47	78	76	38		

* 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	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	341
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	499
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	32	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN	91			
BLK	46			
HSP	50			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	77			
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	25	Yes	3	1
ELL	32	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK	42			
HSP	40	Yes	1	
MUL	40	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	40	Yes	1	

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			56			47	60	91			38
SWD	17			22			19	31			4	
ELL	28			39			16	40			5	38
AMI												
ASN	83			93			78	100	100		5	
BLK	35			38			25	43	89		5	
HSP	43			51			40	52	83		6	33
MUL	52			64			50	71	100		5	
PAC												
WHT	69			74			66	82	94		5	
FRL	41			47			38	52	88		6	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	49	46	26	50	50	42	42	62	85			47
SWD	17	26	17	19	36	33	13	24				40
ELL	25	29	23	29	40	31	18	49				47
AMI												
ASN	89	71		96	88		100	89	96			
BLK	36	41	23	33	40	41	21	53	86			
HSP	38	38	27	39	41	33	26	51	64			45
MUL	50	31		48	32							
PAC												
WHT	70	57	39	74	67	63	71	78	91			
FRL	33	38	28	35	41	38	23	48	75			45

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	53	50	26	53	46	43	52	58	80			38
SWD	18	30	22	17	25	23	19	20				21
ELL	23	40	38	24	41	60	25	37	50			38
AMI												
ASN	94	74		91	75		92	94	100			
BLK	38	38	17	34	31	34	29	39	58			40
HSP	41	44	38	45	44	48	46	45	79			38
MUL	37	53		68	59							
PAC												
WHT	75	64	22	77	60	52	86	85	89			
FRL	39	39	22	39	37	38	37	45	63			28

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	42%	44%	-2%	47%	-5%
08	2023 - Spring	45%	44%	1%	47%	-2%
06	2023 - Spring	49%	44%	5%	47%	2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	37%	52%	-15%	54%	-17%
07	2023 - Spring	23%	37%	-14%	48%	-25%
08	2023 - Spring	64%	60%	4%	55%	9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	44%	43%	1%	44%	0%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	94%	39%	55%	50%	44%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	43%	55%	48%	50%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	50%	*	63%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	56%	59%	-3%	66%	-10%

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 subject area with the most room to grow is ELA/reading, in achievement. While our 2022-23 data show that our population showed a 1% increase in the number of proficient students, our percent proficient is still only 50%. When examined more closely, our students last year lost ground. The percentage of incoming 6th graders who tested proficient at the end of the year went down by 3.3 points, 7th grade lost 3.9 points, and 8th grade lost nearly 6 points.

Last year was a challenging area in staffing and in school discipline. Two weeks into our school year, a new teacher resigned. His replacement was released to work in here in November a week before she went on maternity leave. A second ELA teacher left the profession in February. For discipline, the administrative team was down manpower most of the year. Systems began to crumble and now must be rebuilt.

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

No data component showed decline from the prior 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.

Science and social studies proficiency are both 6 points below the state average. Both of these areas have been a focus of PLDMS for the last two years, and both have made progress year over year. These subjects lost ground during COVID and are still making up that gap.

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

Math, in regular middle school courses and in acceleration courses of Algebra and Geometry, made the most improvements, with a 12 point gain overall and contributing to a 94 acceleration points. The teachers in the math department used best practices in isolation of the rest of the school. With only one exception, all of the teachers willingly and actively participated in unpacking standards, identifying learning targets, using frequent common short assessments, and sharing data. These teachers worked as a unit to focus on student learning at high levels.

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

Our black and African American ESSA subgroups have not rebounded to pre-COVID levels in any subject.

Our ELL ESSA subgroup continues to hover as one of the bottom two groups.

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

- 1) Building a positive and collaborative culture
- 2) Rebuilding and improving structures for PLC work in all subject areas

- 3) Rebuilding and improving structures for student discipline and restorative practice
- 4) Rebuilding and improving structures for intervention and extension, including a focus on our ELL systems and ESE supports.

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 I was appointed principal, I reached out to my new staff and asked for one to one meetings with anyone interested. A rough qualitative analysis of the responses from common questions indicated the following:

- 1) More than half of our teachers and staff did not feel safe in the building
- 2) More than half of our teachers and staff felt that discipline had disappeared
- 3) More than half of our teachers said that they wished rules were consistent for students and staff

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on a brief feedback survey of teachers, parents and students,
20% or fewer will indicate they feel the school is not a safe place to work/learn
60% or more will indicate that the systems and process for classroom and school rules make the school day smoother than this current year has been.

Monitoring:

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

A survey of teachers, parents and students will be used for feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen Prentice (karensb@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.)

Organizational PLC team for PBIS will meet once a month or more to work on a problem of practice
Organizational PLC team for safety will meet once a month or more to work on any issues
Administrative PLC team will meet weekly to identify, address, evaluate and plan for problems of practice

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Working in clear, structured teams with clearly stated norms will leverage the strength of PLC work to help move the culture of the school in a positive direction.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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.

Our ELA and math achievement in ELL students is under the threshold. We will create a structure of support for all of our students in the ELL population, including hiring an expert teacher to lead the charge.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our ELL students will improve an ELA and math achievement, moving from 32 to 38 points in the 2023-2024 year.

Monitoring:

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

Our ELL and reading PLC will create common assessments and review the data every 4 weeks. This will be monitored by the administrator.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen Prentice (karensb@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.)

Using PLCs to target and track student assessment is a best practice for targeted support of student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy will leverage the expertise of our teachers and is supported in the PLC culture of our school.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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.

Our SWD population has performed below the 41 percent thresh hold for three years.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We plan to support and target the growth of our SWD population to go from 25 proficient in ELA to 30.

Monitoring:

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

This work will be assessed in standards based PLCs through targeted instructional planning, common assessments and data analysis on a 4 week rotation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Winston Woods (winstonw@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.)

Using PLCs to target and track student assessment is a best practice for targeted support of student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The focus on PLCs leverages the expertise of our teachers and the collaborative structure of our school culture to ensure a strong academic focus.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Hispanic**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.

Our Hispanic population achievement has fallen below the 41% threshold for a year. These students need to part of a focused intervention/extension opportunity.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The achievement level of our Hispanic population will go from 40 to 45 as an overall measure of their proficiency in ELA.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored through targeted standards based PLC work with common assessments and data review in 4 week cycles.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Denise Fitzpatrick (denisecf@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 intervention will be common assessments and common planning on targeted standards through the PLC process.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PLCs leverage the expertise of our faculty and the collaborative structures of our school culture to better support students.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Multi-Racial

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.

Our students in the multiracial subgroup have underperformed the 41% threshold for a year. These students need to be a focus and be part of a schoolwide structure of intervention targets.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

This work will be assessed in standards based PLCs through targeted instructional planning, common assessments and data analysis on a 4 week rotation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Denise Fitzpatrick (denisecf@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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PLCs leverage the expertise of our faculty and the collaborative structures of our school culture to better support students.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged

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.

Our economically disadvantaged students have underperformed the 41% threshold for achievement for the last year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to have the percentage of our SES students who score proficient in ELA moving from 40% to 45%.

Monitoring:

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

This work will be assessed in standards based PLCs through targeted instructional planning, common assessments and data analysis on a 4 week rotation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen Prentice (karensb@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.)

PLCs leverage the expertise of our faculty and the collaborative structures of our school culture to better support students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PLCs leverage the expertise of our faculty and the collaborative structures of our school culture to better support students.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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 school funding. The schools are budgeted in multi-faceted methods based on the student's needs. Initially, the schools are tiered based on the following criteria: student proficiency, learning gains, struggling schools, % of new teachers, % of ELL students, and % of ESE students for academic support and 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. Principal supervisors monitor student data and underperforming subgroups through monthly visits and data chats.

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: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Hispanic	\$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Multi-Racial	\$0.00
6	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Economically Disadvantaged	\$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