The School District of Lee County

Fort Myers Beach Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Fort Myers Beach Elementary School

2751 OAK ST, Fort Myers Beach, FL 33931

http://bch.leeschools.net/

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At Fort Myers Beach Elementary, our mission is to ensure that every learners reaches his/her highest personal potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Fort Myers Beach Elementary, our vision is to work as a collaborative team to improve teaching and learning.

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
Kohler, Traci	Principal	▪ Employ a faculty with the instructional proficiencies needed for the school population served and identify faculty instructional proficiency needs, including standards-based content, research-based pedagogy, data analysis for instructional planning and improvement, and the use of instructional technology. ▪ Implement professional learning that enables faculty to deliver culturally relevant and differentiated instruction, provides resources and times, and engages faculty in effective individual and collaborative professional learning throughout the school year. ▪ Structure and monitor a school learning environment that improves learning for a diverse student population and maintains a safe, respectful, and inclusive student-centered learning environment that is focused on equitable opportunities for learning and building a foundation for a fulfilling life in a democratic society and global economy. ▪ Recognize and use diversity as an asset in the development and implementation of procedures and practices that motivate all students and improve student learning. ▪ Promote school and classroom practices that validate and value similarities and differences among students and provide recurring monitoring and feedback on the quality of the learning environment. ▪ Initiate and support continuous improvement processes focused on the students' opportunities for success and well-being.
Skipper, Sherri	Instructional Coach	▪ Work with teachers to ensure that scientifically-based literacy-researched programs are implemented with fidelity. ▪ Provide direct, classroom-based, professional development for teachers through regular modeling of research-based literacy instruction. ▪ Work with all teachers (including Exceptional Student Education, content area, and elective areas) in the schools they serve, prioritizing coaching and mentoring time with those teachers, activities, and roles that will have the greatest impact on student achievement. ▪ Mentor teachers in providing appropriate intensive intervention instruction for struggling students, including those who are Limited English Proficient. ▪ Model lessons in effective reading instruction, including lessons that provide differentiated instruction. ▪ Facilitate teacher study groups regarding current reading research and effective reading instruction. ▪ Organize and lead professional development programs which are needs-based and focused on the accomplishments of the established reading benchmarks. ▪ Demonstrate interpersonal skills as a member of an academic coaching team and build trust with teachers and school leadership. ▪ Coach teachers in effective literacy instructional strategies through interrelated content. ▪ Coordinate and schedule ongoing professional development of teachers through activities such as coaching grade level meetings, classroom demonstrations, and study groups.

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

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

The School Advisory Council (SAC) is a team of people representing various segments of the community, parents, teachers, students, administrators, support staff, business/ industry people and other interested community members. The purpose of a SAC is to assist in the preparation and evaluation (developing and evaluating) of the results of the school improvement plan and to assist the principal with the annual school budget. Additionally, SAC receives funds "to be used at the discretion of the School Advisory Committee A portion of the money should be used for implementing the school improvement plan." "The improvement plan shall include performance indicators which are measurable." Fort Myers Beach Elementary's SAC will review the school improvement plan and budget by October 6, 2023. Official SAC minutes document input and review and are posted on the school's website.

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))

FMBE's Professional Learning Community comes together to collaborate and improve teaching practices. The goal is to enhance student learning by creating a culture of continuous improvement.

Teachers use PLC time to work together with their colleagues and share best practices, including strategies for using data to inform their instruction. One of the key components of a successful PLC is the use of data and reporting to support student progress. During PLC meetings, teachers regularly review data via Performance Matters and benchmark tracking and set specific goals and targets for student achievement. By collecting and analyzing data, teachers identify areas where students are struggling and adjust their instruction to better meet the needs of their students. Intervention and enrichment activities are designed along with the help of the Multi-Tiered System of Support Specialist. These groups are fluid as students move along the learning continuum.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	28%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	79%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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)	White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A

	2019-20: A
	2018-19: A
	2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	1	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	6
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	2	1	1	3	1	0	0	0	9
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	1	0	0	0	2

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	1	2	1	1	3	1	0	0	0	9
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	1	0	0	0	2

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	81	48	53	86	52	56	85		
ELA Learning Gains				86					
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	100	57	59	97	45	50	88		
Math Learning Gains				95					
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*	91	53	54	100	59	59	73		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		51	59						

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	91
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	362
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	93
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	464
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
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				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	91			

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%
FRL	90			

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				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	94			
FRL	97			

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	81			100			91					
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												

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
2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
PAC												
WHT	82			100							2	
FRL	80			100							2	

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
2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	86	86		97	95		100					
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	90	87		97	100							
FRL	100			93								

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
2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	85			88			73					
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	88			88								
FRL	83			67								

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. <u>The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.</u>

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	73%	48%	25%	54%	19%
04	2023 - Spring	*	56%	*	58%	*
03	2023 - Spring	90%	42%	48%	50%	40%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	100%	55%	45%	59%	41%
04	2023 - Spring	*	61%	*	61%	*
05	2023 - Spring	100%	52%	48%	55%	45%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	91%	50%	41%	51%	40%

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.

Fort Myers Beach Elementary has high proficiency scores at all grade levels in literacy that remained constant from the previous school year. For next school year and beyond, monitoring the proficiency of students identified as English Language Learners will be crucial as our student population grows. (Currently, there are not enough students in this subgroup to calculate in the State's School Grading system.)

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

Fort Myers Beach Elementary has high proficiency scores at all grade levels in literacy that remained constant from the previous school year. For next school year and beyond, monitoring the proficiency of students identified as English Language Learners will be crucial as our student population grows. (Currently, there are not enough students in this subgroup to calculate in the State's School Grading system.)

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.

Although Fort Myers Beach Elementary has high proficiency scores at all grade levels in literacy, literacy scores in grade 5 were lower than other grade levels at FMBE. An instructional staff member needed assistance with lesson planning to meet grade 5 benchmark rigor.

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

Fort Myers Beach Elementary has high proficiency scores at all grade levels in mathematics that improved from the previous school year. Posting and tracking of benchmark data kept student progress at the forefront of our Professional Learning Community meetings. Utilizing district-approved resources and discussing best instructional math practices during PLCs provides guidance for targeted, math small group time. Small learning groups improved student learning outcomes.

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

Student attendance below 90% due to Hurricane Ian disruption.

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

1. Targeted student literacy support using District-approved resources during intervention time at all grade levels.

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Attendance

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

In the study, "Determining the negative effect of teacher attendance on student achievement," researchers support the position that teacher absenteeism has a negative effect on student achievement. There are several important implications from this study. Most importantly, this study determined that teachers are important. When a qualified educator is absent from the classroom, student achievement is negatively affected. Teachers are the educational leaders in the classroom and their roles cannot be compromised.

Woods, Robert C., and Ray V. Montagno. "Determining the negative effect of teacher attendance on student achievement." Education, vol. 118, no. 2, winter 1997, pp. 307+. Gale Academic OneFile, link.gale.com/apps/doc/A20479508/AONE?u=cape27634&sid=googleScholar&xid=f0eb1c27. Accessed 10 July 2023.

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

By June 4, 2024, the yearly teacher attendance average at Fort Myers Beach Elementary will be at 93% or higher as measured by teacher attendance reports.

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

Fort Myers Beach Elementary will monitor weekly teacher attendance. The senior administrative assistant runs weekly reports for the Principal to review. When a trend emerges, the Principal has a conversation with the employee to find out more information. The Human Resources Department is contacted when necessary, including support for the Employee Assistance Program.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Traci Kohler (tracik@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.)

To improve teacher attendance, coercion is not suggested; but higher expectations of teachers, increased awareness of absenteeism effects, and motivating rewards for outstanding teacher attendance encourage lower teacher absenteeism. Considering the financial costs and, more significantly, reduction in student performance because of teacher absenteeism, school administrators should actively address this issue. Smith, G. G. (2001). Increasing teacher attendance. SubJourna/2 (1), 8-17.

Schoolwide Positive Behavior Supports at Fort Myers Beach Elementary include teacher recognition activities that have historical positive social validity at the school such as Twitter recognition and monthly teacher-selected/preferred awards.

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

Schoolwide Positive Behavior Supports
School-wide positive behavior interventions and supports (SWPBIS) is a multitiered support framework for preventing problem behaviors and increasing prosocial behaviors. Overall, statistically significant reductions in school discipline and increased academic achievement were found.

Lee, A, Gage, NA. Updating and expanding systematic reviews and meta-analyses on the effects of

school-wide positive behavior interventions and supports. Psychol Schs. 2020; 57: 783– 804. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22336

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.

PBiS action team meets during Pre-Service week.

Person Responsible: Lori Zamniak (loriez@leeschools.net)

By When: August 10, 2023

PBiS action team presents changes to previous year's plan to include updated teacher recognition.

Person Responsible: Lori Zamniak (loriez@leeschools.net)

By When: August 10, 2023

Run weekly teacher attendance reports.

Person Responsible: Traci Kohler (tracik@leeschools.net)

By When: Mary Borman, senior administrative assistant, runs reports and provides to Dr. Kohler for review each week.

Dr. Kohler reviews attendance reports.

Person Responsible: Traci Kohler (tracik@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Dr. Kohler informs PBiS team of teacher names for recognition. Dr. Kohler discusses concerns with individual teachers.

Person Responsible: Traci Kohler (tracik@leeschools.net)

By When: Monthly or as needed when a problematic trend arises.

Recognize teacher attendance through various methods such a Twitter recognition, treats, school supplies, free jeans day, etc.

Person Responsible: Lori Zamniak (loriez@leeschools.net)

By When: Monthly

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

Although research documents a key contribution of print skills to early literacy, vocabulary and other language skills also provide an important foundation. Focusing on a sample of several hundred low-income children in 16 urban schools that were implementing literacy interventions, 1st-grade predictors of literacy development were traced over time. Beginning-of-1st-grade letter–word identification and word attack skills were the strongest predictors of reading comprehension at the end of 1st grade. However, vocabulary was the best predictor of reading comprehension at the end of 2nd and 3rd grades. The predictive power of early print-related and phonemic-awareness skills diminished over time, yet vocabulary scores remained an important predictor. Results support an early emphasis on developing meaning skills to prepare low-income children for success in literacy.
Lowry Hemphill & Terrence Tivnan (2008) The Importance of Early Vocabulary for Literacy Achievement in High-Poverty Schools, Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR), 13:4, 426-451, DOI: 10.1080/10824660802427710

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

By May 31, 2024, 85% of students in grade 2 will be proficient in Reading as measured by the STAR Reading Assessment.

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

Every teacher utilizes a benchmark tracking system for individual students. During a dedicated intervention time, intervention groups focus on the benchmark(s) students are striving towards proficiency. The primary literacy coach supports those students who need the most intense interventions. During Professional Learning Community meetings, teachers discuss intervention groups and share benchmark data with multiple stakeholders for input including the Multi Tiered System of Support Specialist and Exceptional Student Education Specialist. Intervention groups are fluid as student needs change.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Traci Kohler (tracik@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.)

Magnetic Reading was built on four complementary and overlapping pedagogical pillars: Knowledge-Rich Learning, Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Pedagogy, Scaffolds to Support Learner Variability, and Data to Inform Instruction. Magnetic Reading's comprehensive theory of action is grounded in these pillars.

ReadWell is a K–3 reading intervention for students reading below grade level in the primary grades. Read Well provides explicit, systematic daily instruction in the five areas critical to reading with understanding.

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

Magnetic Reading provides research-based instruction informed by practical classroom experience, an understanding of the cultural and developmental needs of all learners, and the Science of Reading. The design is informed by a validated body of research on the Science of Reading that "has revealed a great

deal about how we learn to read, what goes wrong when students don't learn, and what kind of instruction is most likely to work best for the most students" (Stuart & Fugnitto, 2020).

By the end of Read Well 1/Read Well 2 Fluency Foundations, students have learned 244 of high frequency words. Students learn remaining words in Read Well Plus/Read Well 2. In addition, Read Well 2 Spelling/Writing Conventions teaches the second grade high-frequency words identified by Graham, Harris, etc.Through a flexible approach of whole-class instruction, differentiated small-group instruction, and individual student practice, teachers meet students at their skill levels and adapt instruction accordingly.

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.

Planning:
Lesson plans that support ELA benchmark rigor with a focus on intervention groups: student grouping and resources used.

Person Responsible: Traci Kohler (tracik@leeschools.net)

By When: Dr. Kohler and Sherri Skipper (Primary Literacy Coach) review lesson plans for pacing and benchmark rigor within the district's instructional guide with interventions. Comments provided as needed. Every Monday morning.

Core Instruction:
Classroom observations using test items specs for direct instruction and student work. Comments left weekly for teacher reflection.
Check on benchmark tracking system with intervention group alignment.

Person Responsible: Traci Kohler (tracik@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly classroom observation notes left by Dr. Kohler. Reflection questions included.

Intervention/Extension:
Weekly Professional Learning Community data discussions.

Teachers utilize benchmark trackers for every student.
Intervention groups discussed and student data analyzed during PLCs to ensure correct student placement.
Literacy coach, MTSS Specialist and ESE Specialist monitor correct student placement into specific lessons.
PLCs continue to discuss student growth and make intervention or enrichment adjustments.
Enrichment to include novel studies of books listed in the Florida B.E.S.T. Standards blue book.

Person Responsible: Sherri Skipper (sherriask@leeschools.net)

By When: Every Wednesday during dedicated PLC time from 2:30 - 3:15. PLC agendas with action items completed.

Benchmark Coaching:
Administrative provides feedback around prioritized look-for(s) including:
Teacher provides explicit instruction aligned to the benchmark and intended learning.

Teacher provides task aligned to the benchmark and intended learning.
Teacher asks questions to deepen understanding of the intended learning.
Teacher provides students with opportunities to collaborate.

Person Responsible: Traci Kohler (tracik@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly classroom observation notes left by Dr. Kohler. Reflection questions included.

#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.

Although research documents a key contribution of print skills to early literacy, vocabulary and other language skills also provide an important foundation. Focusing on a sample of several hundred low-income children in 16 urban schools that were implementing literacy interventions, 1st-grade predictors of literacy development were traced over time. Beginning-of-1st-grade letter–word identification and word attack skills were the strongest predictors of reading comprehension at the end of 1st grade. However, vocabulary was the best predictor of reading comprehension at the end of 2nd and 3rd grades. The predictive power of early print-related and phonemic-awareness skills diminished over time, yet vocabulary scores remained an important predictor. Results support an early emphasis on developing meaning skills to prepare low-income children for success in literacy.
Lowry Hemphill & Terrence Tivnan (2008) The Importance of Early Vocabulary for Literacy Achievement in High-Poverty Schools, Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR), 13:4, 426-451, DOI: 10.1080/10824660802427710

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

By May 31, 2024, 85% students in grade 3 will be proficient in Reading as measured by the FAST Progress Monitoring system.

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

Every teacher utilizes a benchmark tracking system for individual students. During a dedicated intervention time, intervention groups focus on the benchmark(s) students are striving towards proficiency. The primary literacy coach supports those students who need the most intense interventions. During Professional Learning Community meetings, teachers discuss intervention groups and share benchmark data with multiple stakeholders for input including the Multi Tiered System of Support Specialist and Exceptional Student Education Specialist. Intervention groups are fluid as student needs change.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Traci Kohler (tracik@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.)

Magnetic Reading was built on four complementary and overlapping pedagogical pillars: Knowledge-Rich Learning, Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Pedagogy, Scaffolds to Support Learner Variability, and Data to Inform Instruction. Magnetic Reading's comprehensive theory of action is grounded in these pillars.

ReadWell is a K–3 reading intervention for students reading below grade level in the primary grades. Read Well provides explicit, systematic daily instruction in the five areas critical to reading with understanding.

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

Magnetic Reading provides research-based instruction informed by practical classroom experience, an understanding of the cultural and developmental needs of all learners, and the Science of Reading. The design is informed by a validated body of research on the Science of Reading that "has revealed a great

deal about how we learn to read, what goes wrong when students don't learn, and what kind of instruction is most likely to work best for the most students" (Stuart & Fugnitto, 2020).

By the end of Read Well 1/Read Well 2 Fluency Foundations, students have learned 244 of high frequency words. Students learn remaining words in Read Well Plus/Read Well 2. In addition, Read Well 2 Spelling/Writing Conventions teaches the second grade high-frequency words identified by Graham, Harris, etc.Through a flexible approach of whole-class instruction, differentiated small-group instruction, and individual student practice, teachers meet students at their skill levels and adapt instruction accordingly.

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.

Planning:
Lesson plans that support ELA benchmark rigor with a focus on intervention groups: student grouping and resources used.

Person Responsible: Traci Kohler (tracik@leeschools.net)

By When: Dr. Kohler and Sherri Skipper (Primary Literacy Coach) review lesson plans for pacing and benchmark rigor within the district's instructional guide with interventions. Comments provided as needed. Every Monday morning.

Core Instruction:
Classroom observations using test items specs for direct instruction and student work. Comments left weekly for teacher reflection.
Check on benchmark tracking system with intervention group alignment.

Person Responsible: Traci Kohler (tracik@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly classroom observation notes left by Dr. Kohler. Reflection questions included.

Intervention/Extension:
Weekly Professional Learning Community data discussions.

Teachers utilize benchmark trackers for every student.
Intervention groups discussed and student data analyzed during PLCs to ensure correct student placement.
Literacy coach, MTSS Specialist and ESE Specialist monitor correct student placement into specific lessons.
PLCs continue to discuss student growth and make intervention or enrichment adjustments.
Enrichment to include novel studies of books listed in the Florida B.E.S.T. Standards blue book.

Person Responsible: Sherri Skipper (sherriask@leeschools.net)

By When: Every Wednesday during dedicated PLC time from 2:30 - 3:15. PLC agendas with action items completed.

Benchmark Coaching:
Administrative provides feedback around prioritized look-for(s) including:
Teacher provides explicit instruction aligned to the benchmark and intended learning.

Teacher provides task aligned to the benchmark and intended learning.
Teacher asks questions to deepen understanding of the intended learning.
Teacher provides students with opportunities to collaborate.

Person Responsible: Traci Kohler (tracik@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly classroom observation notes left by Dr. Kohler. Reflection questions included.

#4. 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.

Although research documents a key contribution of print skills to early literacy, vocabulary and other language skills also provide an important foundation. Focusing on a sample of several hundred low-income children in 16 urban schools that were implementing literacy interventions, 1st-grade predictors of literacy development were traced over time. Beginning-of-1st-grade letter–word identification and word attack skills were the strongest predictors of reading comprehension at the end of 1st grade. However, vocabulary was the best predictor of reading comprehension at the end of 2nd and 3rd grades. The predictive power of early print-related and phonemic-awareness skills diminished over time, yet vocabulary scores remained an important predictor. Results support an early emphasis on developing meaning skills to prepare low-income children for success in literacy.
Lowry Hemphill & Terrence Tivnan (2008) The Importance of Early Vocabulary for Literacy Achievement in High-Poverty Schools, Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR), 13:4, 426-451, DOI: 10.1080/10824660802427710

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

By May 31, 2024, 85% students in grade 3-5 will be proficient in Reading as measured by the FAST Progress Monitoring system.

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

Every teacher utilizes a benchmark tracking system for individual students. During a dedicated intervention time, intervention groups focus on the benchmark(s) students are striving towards proficiency. The primary literacy coach supports those students who need the most intense interventions. During Professional Learning Community meetings, teachers discuss intervention groups and share benchmark data with multiple stakeholders for input including the Multi Tiered System of Support Specialist and Exceptional Student Education Specialist. Intervention groups are fluid as student needs change.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Traci Kohler (tracik@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.)

Magnetic Reading was built on four complementary and overlapping pedagogical pillars: Knowledge-Rich Learning, Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Pedagogy, Scaffolds to Support Learner Variability, and Data to Inform Instruction. Magnetic Reading's comprehensive theory of action is grounded in these pillars.

ReadWell is a K–3 reading intervention for students reading below grade level in the primary grades. Read Well provides explicit, systematic daily instruction in the five areas critical to reading with understanding.

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

Magnetic Reading provides research-based instruction informed by practical classroom experience, an understanding of the cultural and developmental needs of all learners, and the Science of Reading. The design is informed by a validated body of research on the Science of Reading that "has revealed a great

deal about how we learn to read, what goes wrong when students don't learn, and what kind of instruction is most likely to work best for the most students" (Stuart & Fugnitto, 2020).

By the end of Read Well 1/Read Well 2 Fluency Foundations, students have learned 244 of high frequency words. Students learn remaining words in Read Well Plus/Read Well 2. In addition, Read Well 2 Spelling/Writing Conventions teaches the second grade high-frequency words identified by Graham, Harris, etc.Through a flexible approach of whole-class instruction, differentiated small-group instruction, and individual student practice, teachers meet students at their skill levels and adapt instruction accordingly.

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.

Planning:
Lesson plans that support ELA benchmark rigor with a focus on intervention groups: student grouping and resources used.

Person Responsible: Traci Kohler (tracik@leeschools.net)

By When: Dr. Kohler and Sherri Skipper (Primary Literacy Coach) review lesson plans for pacing and benchmark rigor within the district's instructional guide with interventions. Comments provided as needed. Every Monday morning.

Core Instruction:
Classroom observations using test items specs for direct instruction and student work. Comments left weekly for teacher reflection.
Check on benchmark tracking system with intervention group alignment.

Person Responsible: Traci Kohler (tracik@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly classroom observation notes left by Dr. Kohler. Reflection questions included.

Intervention/Extension:
Weekly Professional Learning Community data discussions.

Teachers utilize benchmark trackers for every student.
Intervention groups discussed and student data analyzed during PLCs to ensure correct student placement.
Literacy coach, MTSS Specialist and ESE Specialist monitor correct student placement into specific lessons.
PLCs continue to discuss student growth and make intervention or enrichment adjustments.
Enrichment to include novel studies of books listed in the Florida B.E.S.T. Standards blue book.

Person Responsible: Sherri Skipper (sherriask@leeschools.net)

By When: Every Wednesday during dedicated PLC time from 2:30 - 3:15. PLC agendas with action items completed.

Benchmark Coaching:
Administrative provides feedback around prioritized look-for(s) including:
Teacher provides explicit instruction aligned to the benchmark and intended learning.

Teacher provides task aligned to the benchmark and intended learning.
Teacher asks questions to deepen understanding of the intended learning.
Teacher provides students with opportunities to collaborate.

Person Responsible: Traci Kohler (tracik@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly classroom observation notes left by Dr. Kohler. Reflection questions included.

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).

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

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.

N/A

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

N/A

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?

N/A

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

N/A

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.

N/A

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

N/A

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

N/A

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

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 Attendance	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$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.

No