
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	28
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	28
VI. Title I Requirements	31
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Ray V. Pottorf Elementary School

4600 CHALLENGER BLVD, Fort Myers, FL 33966

<http://rvp.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.

Ray V. Pottorf Elementary is committed to creating a positive school environment where students are engaged, educated, and empowered; by holding themselves accountable for their learning and choices through collaborative relationships ensuring they will become positive contributing members of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be a school of excellence where all students achieve their highest potential.

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
Macchia, Brandy	Principal	Oversee the implementation of action plans and monitor data
Knight, Tonya	Assistant Principal	Meet with teams and assist with implementation
Halvarson, Kathleen	Assistant Principal	Meet with teams to monitor implementation and support through modifying schedules as needed
Hart-King, Jewel	Reading Coach	Assist with supporting teachers and delivering instruction as well as providing PD and monitoring data
Costello, Sarah	Reading Coach	Assist with supporting teachers and delivering instruction as well as providing PD and monitoring data
Smith, Christina	Reading Coach	Assist with supporting teachers and delivering instruction as well as providing PD and monitoring data
Guarno, Phyllis	Math Coach	Assist with supporting teachers and delivering instruction as well as providing PD and monitoring data
Bernadin, Dawn	Instructional Coach	As intervention specialist, she monitors data, develops plans and monitors implementation
Nichols, Jeneane	Instructional Coach	Assist with supporting teachers and delivering instruction as well as providing PD and monitoring data
Cunningham, Jill	Dean	Support teachers with classroom management and school-wide PBS so students are in class learning - supports team with data and targeted classes/ students

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.

At the end of the school year we review data with our stakeholders and begin listening sessions for our priorities/ goals. Then at the beginning of the school year, we review data and develop our goals. This begins with whole staff and grade level teams and then goes to families and the community for input/ suggestions.

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 SIP will be monitored quarterly to review progress in goals. Adjustments will be made as needed to action plans of teams, individual teachers or students. As classroom assessments are completed and MTSS meetings are held throughout the quarter, modifications/ adjustments will be made.

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)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	89%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
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: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
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	17	51	53	61	35	48	0	0	0	265
One or more suspensions	0	4	7	4	7	7	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	0	10	14	41	9	1	0	0	0	75
Course failure in Math	0	6	5	33	8	1	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	28	47	0	0	0	101
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	31	40	0	0	0	88
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	6	7	47	20	38	0	0	0	118

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	4	0	26	0	0	0	0	0	33
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	7	7	0	0	0	0	14

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	17	51	53	61	35	48	0	0	0	265
One or more suspensions	0	4	7	4	7	7	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	0	10	14	41	9	1	0	0	0	75
Course failure in Math	0	6	5	33	8	1	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	28	47	0	0	0	101
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	31	40	0	0	0	88
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	6	7	47	20	38	0	0	0	118

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	4	0	26	0	0	0	0	0	33
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	7	7	0	0	0	0	14

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*	46	48	53	41	52	56	38		
ELA Learning Gains				57			46		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51			42		
Math Achievement*	54	57	59	54	45	50	52		
Math Learning Gains				55			53		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42			54		
Science Achievement*	45	53	54	52	59	59	36		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	62	51	59	69			52		

* 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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	248
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	421
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	25	Yes	2	1
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	46			
HSP	48			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	48			

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	38	Yes	1	
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	49			
HSP	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%
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	53			

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	46			54			45					62
SWD	15			19			13				5	60
ELL	31			53			30				5	62
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37			47			36				5	67
HSP	45			55			40				5	60
MUL	67			67							2	
PAC												
WHT	66			63			69				4	
FRL	43			51			43				5	61

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	41	57	51	54	55	42	52					69
SWD	18	55	56	27	50	29	26					44
ELL	26	50	47	52	64	55	29					69
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	31	45	47	46	56	56	41					70
HSP	40	59	50	52	53	32	49					70
MUL	57			79								
PAC												
WHT	60	76		66	67		71					
FRL	42	59	57	53	55	37	55					65

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	38	46	42	52	53	54	36					52
SWD	15	39	55	24	30	30	26					
ELL	22	46	18	52	63		27					52
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25	38		37	44	45	17					50
HSP	41	44	29	57	58	62	46					53
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	59	58		73	67		55					
FRL	34	42	47	49	51	52	26					49

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	43%	48%	-5%	54%	-11%
04	2023 - Spring	56%	56%	0%	58%	-2%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	35%	42%	-7%	50%	-15%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	45%	55%	-10%	59%	-14%
04	2023 - Spring	65%	61%	4%	61%	4%
05	2023 - Spring	50%	52%	-2%	55%	-5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	41%	50%	-9%	51%	-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.

Science is the component that showed the lowest overall performance. 46% of our 5th graders performed at or above achievement level 3. One of the contributing factors is that we had two new teachers to the 5th grade team. The Science coach had to spend time supporting them which was time not spent in the lab with our 5th grade classes. These teachers also had all new content to learn. We had been showing a positive trend in data but the 22-23 science data indicates a negative decline. ELA was our second lowest component with 49% of students performing at level 3 or above of the FAST ELA.

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

Science is the component that showed the greatest decline from 21-22. We declined from 52% of 5th grade students to 46% performing at level 3 or above. One of the contributing factors is that we had two new teachers to the 5th grade team. The Science coach had to spend time supporting them which was time not spent in the lab with our 5th grade classes. These teachers also had all new content to learn. We had been showing a positive trend in data but the 22-23 science data indicates a negative decline.

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.

Our 3rd Grade ELA component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Ray V Pottorf had 45% of students at a Level 3 or higher while the state had 59% of students at Level 3 or higher. This is a 14 point gap. The factors that contributed to this gap were a large ELL population in 3rd grade, gaps from prior years, lack of student foundational skills and teacher knowledge on how to best meet the foundational skills from prior grades, as well as student attendance.

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 is ELA. We increased 8% from 21-22 to 22-23. We increased from 41% to 49% in achievement level 3 or above. We took multiple actions to improve this area. One of the things was to improve our MTSS process. Our Literacy team reviewed the plans and diagnostic data to ensure that the most effective interventions were being implemented and that they were being implemented with fidelity. In some cases we switched who was delivering the intervention to provide more consistency. We also did reading training with our paraprofessionals. They learned the components of reading and how to effectively deliver/ support interventions. During PLCs, we modified the agenda to include more focused and intentional planning aligned to the Florida BEST benchmarks and utilizing the suggested readings included in them.

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

In reflecting on the EWS data, two areas are of concern – the number of students that scored a level 1 on statewide ELA assessment and the number of students that have been absent 10% or more days.

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

Our highest priorities for the upcoming year include:

- Increase Science scores by supporting Science in 5th grade and being sure it's consistently being delivered K-4
- Decrease the number of students scoring achievement level 1 in ELA
- Decrease the number of students absent 10% or more

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.

This was identified as a crucial need because we spend time re-teaching when we have new staff members added to our team. This slows down planning when trying to discuss what worked previous year and how to refine in subsequent years.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Ray V Pottorf Elementary will have 10% or less of our instructional staff transfer to other schools (does not include retirements and moving out of area) as measured by staff commitment at the end of the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored by staff personnel action forms

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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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) Attend Ron Clark Academy

Person Responsible: Brandy Macchia (brandyam@leeschools.net)

By When: August 2023

Monthly meeting with implementation team

Person Responsible: Brandy Macchia (brandyam@leeschools.net)

By When: August 2023

Scheduled times/ events during monthly Pit Crew meetings

Person Responsible: Brandy Macchia (brandyam@leeschools.net)

By When: September 2023

Pairing of coaches with staff members for support

Person Responsible: Brandy Macchia (brandyam@leeschools.net)

By When: August 2023

#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 is a crucial need because it decreased from last year. It is also our lowest achievement area with 46% of students scoring level 3 or above.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Ray V Pottorf's Science scores will increase from 46% to 52% by May of 2024 as measured by Florida Science assessment.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored through in-house progress monitoring throughout the year. Our final measurement will be end of the year state science assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathleen Halvarson (kathleenjha@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.)

Bi-weekly Professional Learning Communities for all grade levels will be implemented - DuFour.
Hands-on science activities with connection to journals and lab entries - Marjorie Frank

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Professional Learning Communities were not happening as regularly as they were in fifth-grade throughout our school. Therefore, our science coach, Roxann Camel, is going to be meeting with all grade levels bi-weekly to ensure pacing and fidelity of instruction. She will also take the opportunity to build the science content knowledge in teachers which will, in turn, carry over to students.

Furthermore, we are going to have our students respond to their hands-on learning activities in their science journals, to build the bridge between science and ELA.

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.

PLC schedule will be provided to teachers

Person Responsible: Kathleen Halvarson (kathleenjha@leeschools.net)

By When: 8/21/23

Teachers will do the learning activities expected of students prior to teaching and be provided with ELA writing starters

Person Responsible: Kathleen Halvarson (kathleenjha@leeschools.net)

By When: bi-weekly prior to PLC

#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.

ELA was identified because we have a large number of students scoring at achievement level 1. Our percent of students in grades 3-5 scoring at achievement level 3 or above is 49% (below) 50%

Measurable Outcome:

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

52% of Ray V Pottorf Elementary's students in grades 3 - 5 will score at achievement level 3 or above of the state FAST ELA assessment.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored using the state Progress Monitoring. It will also be monitored using school- based formative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brandy Macchia (brandyam@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.)

For grades 3-5, we will be utilizing Phonics for Reading for students who scored below a level 3 on their previous year's FAST. To support students already at a Level 3 or higher to maintain and continue to grow we will use iReady tools and Wonder test prep.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Phonics for Reading is a systematic research based program selected by our district. It provides explicit instruction in phonics, as well as phonemic awareness, fluency, and comprehension. Teachers will track student progress about every 9-11 lessons. This data will be documented and shared at PLCs and with school administration.

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.

Review end of year 22-23 data to determine who needs additional support/ screening

Person Responsible: Jewel Hart-King (jewejlh@leeschools.net)

By When: August 2023

Conduct screeners/ assessments of identified students and develop groups/ schedules

Person Responsible: Jewel Hart-King (jewejlh@leeschools.net)

By When: September 2023

Monitor progress of groups/ individual students monthly

Person Responsible: Jewel Hart-King (jewejlh@leeschools.net)

By When: Monthly - SEptember 2023 - May 2024

#4. 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 students with Disabilities is the group that did not perform at the expected level based on ESSA guidelines. Students with disabilities subgroup federal index is 38.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Ray V Pottorf's students with disabilities federal subgroup index will increase from 38 to 42 by May of 2023 as measured by the federal index.

Monitoring:

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

Data in ELA and Math for school-wide formatives will be monitored by grade level PLCs, coach teams as well as during Leadership meetings. PM1 and PM2 will also be monitored to determine targeted students, modification to interventions and any other changes needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brandy Macchia (brandyam@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.)

ELA: K-1 - ReadWell

2nd - Flyleaf

3rd - 5th - Phonics for Intervention

Math: Figuring Out Fluency In Mathematics By: Jennifer Bay Williams

Mathematical Mindsets By: Jo Boaler

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

ELA - these are district supported interventions. PD and support is provided for teachers to help implement properly

Math - these are intervention strategies that were shared in state Math supervisor training as well as FCTM. They are research based and have shown to be effective in other districts

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.

Reading Intervention Team will conduct assessments to determine reading deficits in students

Person Responsible: Jewel Hart-King (jewejlh@leeschools.net)

By When: 8/21/23

Math Team will provide grade levels with low floor, high ceiling tasks to ensure that all students have access to learning

Person Responsible: Phyllis Guarno (phyllisjg@leeschools.net)

By When: 8/21/23

#5. 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.

In 22-23 school year, Ray V Pottorf's 2nd grade students showed 42% of students were performing at a Level 3 (40PR) or higher as measured by FAST STAR Reading assessment. This is 11 points lower than the Districts overall achievement of Level 3 or higher of 53%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In 23-24 school year, Ray V Pottorf's 2nd grade ELA scores will increase from 42% of students performing at a Level 3 or higher as measured by FAST STAR Reading assessment to 53% of students performing at a Level 3 or higher as measured by PM 3 FAST STAR Reading assessment. (*Students currently in second grade at RVP ended 1st grade at 52% Lv 3 and higher, so our goal is based on increasing this group of students from where they ended in May of 23.)

Monitoring:

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

Ray V Pottorf's 2nd grade ELA scores will be monitored through the State's FAST Progress Monitoring tool in PM1 and PM2. Additionally, student progress will be monitored between PM 1, 2, and 3 through the use of reading intervention programs

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sarah Costello (sarahcs@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.)

Teachers, with the support of coaches and PCTs, will plan effective Tier 1 instruction through use of Instructional Guides and Test Specs during PLCs. Students who need additional supports will receive tiered instruction through the use the district approved intervention program, Fly Leaf.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Fly Leaf is a district approved resource to support students in their development of reading skills. "Flyleaf Publishing decodable books provide beginning and struggling readers with abundant opportunities to transfer their newly acquired phonics knowledge to meaningful, engaging, and complex narratives, informational texts, and poetry. Our research-based instructional materials support teachers in explicitly guiding students to develop the skills and habits of competent readers. Our decodable books can authentically stand up to the rigors of both foundational skills and close reading instruction, making them a unique and invaluable resource for teachers and for students, who deserve the guidance that will enable them to become accurate, fluent, comprehensive, and joyful readers."

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.

All students will be screened for FlyLeaf intervention by August 18

Person Responsible: Jeneane Nichols (jeneanedn@leeschools.net)

By When: FlyLeaf Intervention groups will be implemented daily for one hour starting August 28th Groups will be fluid and monitored quarterly and/or by teacher recommendation.

All students will take the Diagnostic iReady assessment in September. Students will need to complete at least 2 lessons weekly within 45 to 60 mins.

Person Responsible: Jeneane Nichols (jeneanedn@leeschools.net)

By When: Teachers will submit weekly iReady reports to ensure students are meeting weekly goals. Classroom data will be posted weekly on the iReady bulletin board.

#6. 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.

In 22-23 school year, Ray V Pottorf's 3rd grade students showed 41% of students were performing at a Level 3 or higher as measured by FAST RDG assessment. This is 3 points lower than the Districts' overall achievement of Level 3 or higher of 44%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In 23-24 school year, Ray V Pottorf's 3rd grade ELA scores will increase from 41% of students performing at a Level 3 or higher as measured by FAST RDG to 51% of students performing at a Level 3 or higher as measured by PM 3 FAST RDG

Monitoring:

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

Ray V Pottorf's 3rd grade ELA scores will be monitored through the State's FAST Progress Monitoring tool in PM1 and PM2. Additionally, student progress will be monitored between PM 1, 2, and 3 through the use of reading intervention programs and iReady individualized learning paths.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christina Smith (christinaasm@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.)

Teachers, with the support of coaches and PCTs, will plan effective Tier 1 instruction through use of Instructional Guides and Test Specs during PLCs. Teachers will provide interventions to students as needed utilizing Phonics for Reading, resources found within the iReady tool kit as well as students' individualized learning paths to meet students where they are. Classroom teachers will monitor the students' completion of learning paths to ensure students are completing two lessons within the allotted minutes per week.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Phonics for Reading is a district approved resource to support students in their development of reading skills. "PHONICS for Reading relies on easy-to-follow teacher scripts that enable a wide range of educators to provide effective intervention. Each lesson provides a consistent routine that allows students to apply each concept in increasingly challenging situations to build accuracy, automaticity, and fluency."

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.

All students will be screened for Phonics for Reading to determine placement within the program by August 18th.

Person Responsible: Jewel Hart-King (jewejlh@leeschools.net)

By When: Implementation of the program will begin August 28th. Groups will be fluid and monitored quarterly by coach and classroom teacher. Daily lessons will last 20 mins.

All students will take the Diagnostic iReady assessment the week of September.5th. Students will complete at least 2 lessons weekly within 45 to 60 mins.

Person Responsible: Jeneane Nichols (jeneanedn@leeschools.net)

By When: Reports will be submitted and monitored weekly by classroom as well as a Ready coach (Nichols). Classroom data will be displayed on our iReady bulletin board.

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.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

In 2022-23 school year, Kindergarten ended with 50% of students at a Level 3 or higher on FAST Star Early Lit, 1st grade ended with 57% at level 3 or higher on FAST STAR Reading, and 2nd grade ended with 41% on FAST STAR Reading. An area of focus within each of these grade levels is phonics. In each grade level, all students will be screened for each program that is utilized at each grade level. In Grades K and 1 we will be utilizing Read Well and in 2nd grade we will be utilizing Fly Leaf to support students. Students will then be sorted and placed in reading intervention groups where teachers and reading coach(es) will implement each program with fidelity. Data will be collected and analyzed to ensure proper placement of each student and to ensure each student is progressing. Analysis of data will occur at PLC meetings as well as monthly ELA coach meetings with administration.

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

In 2022-23 school year, 3rd grade ended with 38% Level 3 or higher on FAST Reading, 4th grade ended with 66% at a Level 3 or higher, and 5th grade ended with 44% at a level 3 or higher on FAST Reading. To provide support to students who scored a Level 1 or 2, we will screen students to ensure proper placement for Phonics for Reading. Students will be sorted and placed in reading intervention groups where instructional support, teachers, and coaches will implement each program with fidelity. Data will be collected and analyzed to ensure proper placement of each student and to ensure each student is progressing. Analysis of data will occur at PLC meetings as well as monthly ELA coach meetings with administration.

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

At the end of 23-24, our goal for K students is to have 51% of students at a level 3 or higher on FAST STAR Early Lit, 1st grade to end at 53% of students at level 3 or higher on FAST STAR Reading, and second grade to end at 53% of students at a level 3 or higher on FAST STAR Reading.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

At the end of the 23-24 school year, 52% of students in grades 3-5 will achieve a Level 3 or higher on FAST Reading. At the end of 23-24 school year, Ray V Pottorf's 3rd grade ELA scores will increase from 41% of students performing at a Level 3 or higher as measured by FAST RDG to 51% of students performing at a Level 3 or higher as measured by PM 3 FAST RDG.

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Reading coaches and classroom teachers will monitor students progress through each of the intervention programs as well as progress on Tier 1 instruction exemplars. Data will be collected from each intervention program and monitored through a district provided spreadsheet. This data will be reviewed in PLCs as well as monthly Reading meetings with Reading Coaches and Administration. Additionally, data will be collected weekly on iReady lesson completion to ensure students are moving forward on their individualized reading path. Furthermore individual student progress and class progress towards AR goals is monitored weekly over each quarter.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Costello, Sarah, sarahcs@leeschools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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

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

Across all grade levels, we are using the practices/programs that have been outlined by the School District of Lee County's Elementary ELA department. In Kindergarten and 1st grade we are utilizing BEST Literature lessons and writing for TIER 1 instruction and READ Well for intervention. 2nd grade teachers are also utilizing BEST Literature lessons and writing for TIER 1 instruction and FLY Leaf for intervention, reteaching using Wonders. 3rd-5th grade will be utilizing BEST Literature and writing for TIER 1 instruction and Phonics for Reading for intervention, reteaching using Wonders. These programs

align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence based Reading Plan and have been proven to increase student reading skills when used with fidelity.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The rationale for selecting these programs is they have been identified by the School District of Lee County as effective programs to improve students reading performance. These are researched based programs that have been proven to improve students' reading development as identified by the School District of Lee County.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Coaches and teachers will attend district trainings provided for each of the programs. Coaches will lead school-based trainings as needed to support teachers in proper implementation of the reading programs.	Costello, Sarah, sarahcs@leeschools.net
During PLC, coaches support teachers with implementing reading programs as well as plan lessons aligned to the BEST benchmarks so that students reading skills can improve.	Smith, Christina, christinaasm@leeschools.net
During PLC, coaches and teachers will analyze student data to ensure students are improving and to provide additional interventions for those who are not continual improving.	Smith, Christina, christinaasm@leeschools.net

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) will be created with our parents and families at a Parent Night in late August. Title I Meetings and SAC will also be conducted to ensure that parents and families are aware and involved in school based decisions. These meetings will be advertised with fliers and parent link messages, at parent pickup, and will be held in person.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

We will have PFEP meetings, SAC, PTO, Title I meetings in addition to curriculum nights will be provided to our families. We will have a math, reading, and STEAM night where families will participate in grade level content activities. We will also conduct Student-Led Conferences twice a year so families can come in and see their students' academic progress. These events will be advertised with fliers and parent link messages, at parent pickup, and will be held in person.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

We will have extended time PLCs once a week in the mornings so that teachers can collaborate with coaches. An additional PLC will be conducted during their special area times for the content that was not covered in the morning PLC. The master schedule is also created in a way to optimize learning time. Finally, resource teachers, curriculum coaches, and Peer Collaborative Teachers will be pushing in to classrooms based on teacher and student needs.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

NA