

The School District of Lee County

Harns Marsh Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 10 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 27 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 27 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 30 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 34 |

Harns Marsh Elementary School

1800 UNICE AVE N, Lehigh Acres, FL 33971

<http://hme.leeschools.net/>

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The Mission of Harns Marsh Elementary is to develop respectful, responsible, and resourceful citizens in a safe and supportive learning community that fosters high academic expectations through collaboration with all stakeholders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Vision of Harns Marsh Elementary is to do whatever it takes to empower students to reach their fullest potential by creating a safe, loving and engaging learning environment.

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 |
|---------------------|---------------------|--|
| Hernandez, Cynthia | Principal | As the Principal of Harns Marsh Elementary Ms. Hernandez oversees the day to day operations for all aspects of the school. She works closely with the leadership team to delegate task as necessary to contribute to the efficient and effective operations of the school. |
| Peters, Jason | Assistant Principal | Mr. Peters oversees the scheduling, discipline, Title I and custodial aspects of Harns Marsh Elementary. |
| Wallace, Jared | Assistant Principal | Mr. Wallace supports the new teachers in the Apples program, assists grades 3-5 in PLC process. |
| Moreland, Stephanie | Instructional Coach | Ms. Moreland serves as an instructional coach and leadership liaison. She helps to coach new teachers within the classroom, as well as analyze data and implement intervention. |
| Garlick, Heather | Instructional Coach | Ms. Garlick spends 50% of her time instructing students in the classroom and 50% of her time assisting with leadership duties including data analysis, organizing and implementing intervention for grade levels. |
| Morrison, Robert | Teacher, K-12 | Assist with constructing the School Improvement Plan and monitoring of progress toward the schools goals. |

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.

Stakeholder involvement in the School Improvement Plan consisted of gathering information based on student needs and end of school data. Through monthly SAC meetings, community stakeholders were informed of process towards school goals and given the opportunity to provide feedback. Staff members met weekly to discuss data.

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))

SIP data will be monitored by instructional staff, support staff, and administration during our weekly PLC meetings. Data chats between student/teacher and teacher/administration will be used to review data regularly.

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 | 87% |
| 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: C |

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| | 2018-19: C 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 | 18 | 65 | 61 | 60 | 36 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 286 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 8 | 9 | 21 | 6 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 22 | 11 | 76 | 20 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 133 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 5 | 7 | 20 | 13 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 49 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 117 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 43 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 118 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 6 | 8 | 40 | 39 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |

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

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 62 | 36 | 32 | 22 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 197 | |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 11 | 7 | 2 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 1 | 31 | 7 | 31 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 | |
| Course failure in Math | 1 | 12 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 23 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 28 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 | |
| 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 | 11 | 5 | 9 | 41 | 34 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 2 | 1 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 62 | 36 | 32 | 22 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 197 | |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 11 | 7 | 2 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 1 | 31 | 7 | 31 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 | |
| Course failure in Math | 1 | 12 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 23 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 28 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 | |
| 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 | 11 | 5 | 9 | 41 | 34 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 2 | 1 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |

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* | 39 | 48 | 53 | 45 | 52 | 56 | 42 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 56 | | | 41 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 51 | | | 47 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 41 | 57 | 59 | 48 | 45 | 50 | 43 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 54 | | | 40 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 30 | | | 38 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 49 | 53 | 54 | 39 | 59 | 59 | 37 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 62 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 47 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 50 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 48 | 51 | 59 | 56 | | | 47 | | |

* 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 | 42 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 5 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 211 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| Graduation Rate | |

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
|--|------|
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 47 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 379 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 98 |
| 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 | 23 | Yes | 4 | 1 |
| ELL | 37 | Yes | 2 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 34 | Yes | 1 | |
| HSP | 44 | | | |
| MUL | 40 | Yes | 1 | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 46 | | | |

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 | 40 | Yes | 1 | |

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 | 34 | Yes | 3 | |
| ELL | 40 | Yes | 1 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 43 | | | |
| HSP | 48 | | | |
| MUL | 59 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 53 | | | |
| FRL | 46 | | | |

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 | 39 | | | 41 | | | 49 | | | | | 48 |
| SWD | 15 | | | 21 | | | 8 | | | | 5 | 38 |
| ELL | 29 | | | 36 | | | 48 | | | | 5 | 48 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 28 | | | 32 | | | 31 | | | | 5 | 63 |
| HSP | 42 | | | 42 | | | 55 | | | | 5 | 46 |
| MUL | 38 | | | 31 | | | 50 | | | | 3 | |

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 |
|-----------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 38 | | | 50 | | | 47 | | | | 4 | |
| FRL | 36 | | | 39 | | | 47 | | | | 5 | 49 |

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 | 45 | 56 | 51 | 48 | 54 | 30 | 39 | | | | | 56 |
| SWD | 14 | 50 | 50 | 25 | 44 | | 20 | | | | | 36 |
| ELL | 35 | 62 | 50 | 36 | 42 | 25 | 16 | | | | | 56 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 43 | 50 | 50 | 37 | 47 | 33 | 38 | | | | | 43 |
| HSP | 43 | 59 | 54 | 49 | 55 | 30 | 37 | | | | | 57 |
| MUL | 62 | 58 | | 50 | 64 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 52 | 48 | | 57 | 56 | | 50 | | | | | |
| FRL | 41 | 58 | 55 | 44 | 51 | 31 | 32 | | | | | 54 |

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 | 42 | 41 | 47 | 43 | 40 | 38 | 37 | | | | | 47 |
| SWD | 17 | 25 | | 19 | 18 | | 8 | | | | | 44 |
| ELL | 27 | 32 | 50 | 19 | 32 | 42 | 14 | | | | | 47 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 43 | 39 | 27 | 33 | 30 | 36 | 35 | | | | | 41 |
| HSP | 40 | 42 | 75 | 44 | 48 | 56 | 37 | | | | | 48 |
| MUL | 58 | | | 58 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 48 | 46 | | 47 | 29 | | 41 | | | | | |
| FRL | 39 | 41 | 42 | 40 | 38 | 41 | 38 | | | | | 47 |

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 | 44% | 48% | -4% | 54% | -10% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 46% | 56% | -10% | 58% | -12% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 30% | 42% | -12% | 50% | -20% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 44% | 55% | -11% | 59% | -15% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 42% | 61% | -19% | 61% | -19% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 37% | 52% | -15% | 55% | -18% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 45% | 50% | -5% | 51% | -6% |

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.

Current trends indicate that students at Harns Marsh Elementary struggle with grade 3 ELA proficiency, based on the 22-23 EOY. The contributing factors to last year's performance were lack of foundational skills due to disruption of COVID years, Hurricane Ian, new benchmarks, and new curriculum.

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

5th Grade, Math EOY FAST progress monitoring was 38% compared to their previous year of 56%. One of the factors that contributed to this decline is a new FAST progress monitoring, teacher turnover from August - December, Hurricane Ian that impacted the pacing guide.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The two data components that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average were 4th Grade Math (State=61%, Grade 4= 42%) & 3rd Grade ELA (State=50%, Grade 3= 31%).

Contributing factors for the 4th Grade Math gap were lack of intervention time for math as well as students needing support in foundation math skills.

Contributing factors for the 3rd Grade ELA gap were 4 out of 7 teachers were new to the grade level and were new to the curriculum, the benchmarks and interacting with students.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was 3rd Grade Math from 22% to 47%. 3rd grade was one of the only grade levels having Math at the beginning of the day in their schedule.

In addition, in look at the FAST baseline data in comparison to EOY, Grades 3-5 showed tremendous improvement. The new actions that our school took in the area of Math was to incorporate a hands on Math Lab which focused on low performing standards identified by progress monitoring data.

3rd Grade FAST Data: 5% to 14% to 47%

4th Grade FAST Data: 3% to 15% to 42%

5th Grade FAST Data: 7% to 23% to 38%

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

In reflecting on the EWS data, one potential area of concern will be Attendance. We have more than 60 students in Grades 1, 2 & 3 that had 10% or more days.

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

1. Attendance
2. 3rd Grade ELA
3. Incoming 5th Grade Math
4. Incoming 4th Graders Reduction in number of suspensions
5. Closing the Math L25 achievement gap between ELLs and their peers

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

Second-grade ELA is identified as an area of focus through the use of STAR end-of-year assessment data. 60/154 (39%) students were performing at proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The incoming second-grade students had a first-grade STAR ELA proficiency of 33%. By the end of SY 23/24, Second Grade students will achieve a 40% proficiency on the end-of-year STAR ELA Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored by the Early Literacy Coach and Administration during classroom walk-throughs as well as through the use of STAR ELA Progress Monitoring Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jason Peters (jasonlp@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The evidence-based intervention that will be implemented for this area of focus is Wonders, embedded into the 90-minute uninterrupted ELA block, i-Ready adaptive lesson paths/tool kit, Heggerty phonemic awareness/phonics, and Really Great Reading HD Word for on-grade-level instruction. Second grade will use the FlyLeaf curriculum during the 60-minute intervention for students that are not meeting on-grade level standards. During the intervention block, students will receive differentiated instruction based on their level of need.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

During the intervention block and teacher-led center, the teacher will use high-yield instructional strategies such as Numbered-Heads, distributive summarizing, text-dependent questioning, and higher-order thinking to meet the instructional needs of each individual student.

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. Through district/school-based professional development, we will build teacher capacity in the implementation of evidence-based intervention.
2. PCTs and the Primary Literacy Coach will model implementation with best practices and observe utilizing teacher self-assessment (NASOT rubric).

3. Through PLC Learning Rounds, teachers will be able to observe peers implementing evidence-based interventions with best practices and debrief with leadership.

Person Responsible: Jason Peters (jasonlp@leeschools.net)

By When: This Focus Area and goal will be met by Spring of 2024.

#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.

Third-grade ELA is identified as an area of focus through the use of Spring 2023 FAST end-of-year assessment data. 31% of students were performing at proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The incoming third-grade students had a second-grade STAR ELA proficiency of 39%. By the end of SY 23/24, students will achieve a 36% proficiency on the end-of-year FAST ELA Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored by the PCTs, Intermediate Literacy Coach, and Administration during classroom walk-throughs as well as through the use of FAST ELA Progress Monitoring Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jared Wallace (jaredjw@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The evidence-based intervention that will be implemented for this area of focus is Wonders, embedded into the 90-minute uninterrupted ELA block and i-Ready adaptive lesson paths/tool kit for on-grade-level instruction. Third grade will use the Phonics for Instruction curriculum during the 60-minute intervention for students that are not meeting on-grade level standards, and Magnetic Reading will be used for students that are meeting grade level standards. During the intervention block, students will receive differentiated instruction based on their level of need.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

During the intervention block and teacher-led center, the teacher will use high-yield instructional strategies such as Numbered-Heads, distributive summarizing, text-dependent questioning, and higher-order thinking to meet the instructional needs of each individual student.

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. Through district/school-based professional development, we will build teacher capacity in the implementation of evidence-based intervention.
2. PCTs and the Intermediate Literacy Coach will model implementation with best practices and observe utilizing teacher self-assessment (NASOT rubric).

3. Through PLC Learning Rounds, teachers will be able to observe peers implementing evidence-based interventions with best practices and debrief with leadership.

Person Responsible: Jared Wallace (jaredjw@leeschools.net)

By When: This Focus Area and goal will be met by the Spring of 2024.

#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.

Third-Fifth Grade ELA is identified as an area of focus through the use of Spring 2023 FAST end-of-year assessment data. 42% of students were performing at proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The previous year school proficiency for grades three-five was 42%. By the end of SY 23/24, students will achieve a 46% proficiency on the end-of-year FAST ELA Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored by the PCTs, Intermediate Literacy Coach, and Administration during classroom walk-throughs as well as through the use of FAST ELA Progress Monitoring Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cynthia Hernandez (cynthiamhe@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The evidence-based intervention that will be implemented for this area of focus is Wonders, embedded into the 90-minute uninterrupted ELA block and i-Ready adaptive lesson paths/tool kit for on-grade-level instruction.

Grades 3-5 will use the Phonics for Instruction curriculum during the 60-minute intervention for students that are not meeting on-grade-level standards, and Magnetic Reading will be used for students that are meeting grade-level standards. During the intervention block, students will receive differentiated instruction based on their level of need.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

During the intervention block and teacher-led center, the teacher will use high-yield instructional strategies such as Numbered-Heads, distributive summarizing, text-dependent questioning, and higher-order thinking to meet the instructional needs of each individual student.

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. Through district/school-based professional development, we will build teacher capacity in the implementation of evidence-based intervention.
2. PCTs and the Intermediate Literacy Coach will model implementation with best practices and observe utilizing teacher self-assessment (NASOT rubric).

3. Through PLC Learning Rounds, teachers will be able to observe peers implementing evidence-based interventions with best practices and debrief with leadership.

Person Responsible: Jared Wallace (jaredjw@leeschools.net)

By When: This Focus Area and goal will be met by the Spring of 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 focus area is the ESSA Subgroup, Students with Disabilities. This is identified as an area of focus through the use of Spring 2023 FAST end-of-year assessment data. 34% of Students with Disabilities were performing at proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The ESSA Subgroup, Students with Disabilities, will achieve a 39% proficiency on the end-of-year FAST ELA Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored by the PCTs, Intermediate Literacy Coach, ESE Resource Teachers, and Administration during classroom walk-throughs as well as through the use of FAST ELA Progress Monitoring Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jason Peters (jasonlp@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The evidence-based intervention that will be implemented for this area of focus is Wonders, embedded into the 90-minute uninterrupted ELA block and i-Ready adaptive lesson paths/tool kit for on-grade-level instruction.

Grades 3-5 will use the Phonics for Instruction curriculum during the 60-minute intervention for students that are not meeting on-grade-level standards, and Magnetic Reading will be used for students that are meeting grade-level standards. During the intervention block, students will receive differentiated instruction based on their level of need. ESE students will receive push-in support from ESE Resource during small group portion of core instruction and intervention. ESE self contained students will push out, with support, to the general education setting for a set amount of time. Ongoing monitoring will take place to determine the effectiveness of the students working in the different setting. Determine student need based on monitoring of data and provide tutoring opportunities that meet the need of the student.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

During the intervention block and teacher-led center, the teacher will use high-yield instructional strategies such as Numbered-Heads, distributive summarizing, text-dependent questioning, and higher-order thinking to meet the instructional needs of each individual student. ESE Resource teachers and/or Paras will also provide scaffolded instruction during small group and intervention time.

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. Through district/school-based professional development, we will build teacher capacity in the implementation of evidence-based intervention.
2. PCTs and the Intermediate Literacy Coach will model implementation with best practices and observe utilizing teacher self-assessment (NASOT rubric).
3. ESE Resources will support the IEP goals of the students while adhering to the instructional plan of the teacher.
4. Through PLC Learning Rounds, teachers will be able to observe peers implementing evidence-based interventions with best practices and debrief with leadership.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: This Focus Area and goal will be met by the Spring of 2024.

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

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

Our focus area is the ESSA Subgroup, English Language Learners. This is identified as an area of focus through the use of Spring 2023 FAST end-of-year assessment data. 40% of ELL students were performing at proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The ESSA Subgroup, English Language Learners, will achieve a 45% proficiency on the end-of-year FAST ELA Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored by the PCTs, Intermediate Literacy Coach, and Administration during classroom walk-throughs as well as through the use of FAST ELA Progress Monitoring Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jared Wallace (jaredjw@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The evidence-based intervention that will be implemented for this area of focus is Wonders, embedded into the 90-minute uninterrupted ELA block and i-Ready adaptive lesson paths/tool kit for on-grade-level instruction.

Grades 3-5 will use the Phonics for Instruction curriculum during the 60-minute intervention for students that are not meeting on-grade-level standards, and Magnetic Reading will be used for students that are meeting grade-level standards. During the intervention block, students will receive differentiated instruction based on their level of need. Students will receive push-in support from grade-level ESOL Paras based on their English proficiency as measured by the CELLA and WIDA assessments. Paras will be incorporating ESOL strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

During the intervention block and teacher-led center, the teacher will use high-yield instructional strategies such as Numbered-Heads, distributive summarizing, text-dependent questioning, and higher-order thinking to meet the instructional needs of each individual student. ESOL Paras will work with students to make content more comprehensible. They received training on the six principles for Exemplary Teaching of English Language Learners in preschool 22/23.

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. Through district/school-based professional development, we will build teacher capacity in the implementation of evidence-based intervention.
2. PCTs and the Intermediate Literacy Coach will model implementation with best practices and observe utilizing teacher self-assessment (NASOT rubric).
3. ESE Resources will support the IEP goals of the students while adhering to the instructional plan of the teacher.
4. Through PLC Learning Rounds, teachers will be able to observe peers implementing evidence-based interventions with best practices and debrief with leadership.

Person Responsible: Jared Wallace (jaredjw@leeschools.net)

By When: This Focus Area and goal will be met by the Spring of 2024.

#6. 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.

Based on the Spring 2023 Marzano High Reliability Schools survey, Leading Indicator 1.7: The success of the whole school, as well as individuals within the school, is appropriately acknowledged, HME admin will concentrate on maintaining past positive culture-building opportunities and incorporate additional opportunities recommended by the staff based on a preschool HRS survey activity.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In 22/23, there were 43/75 (57%) teachers that took part in the HRS survey on positive culture leading indicator 1.7. By the end of 23/24 we will have 88/132 (67%) staff members participate in quarterly positive culture and environment surveys while maintaining a 70% positive culture rating.

Monitoring:

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

The administrative, Leadership, and Sunshine committee will monitor and analyze quarterly data and make necessary adjustments based on the data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cynthia Hernandez (cynthiamhe@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.)

Staff acknowledgments:

On Tuesdays, students and staff are able to participate in "Positive T-shirt Tuesday," whereby they wear a t-shirt with a positive slogan or affirmation on it. There will be a quarterly "Happy Cart" which will contain food and drink that the teachers have indicated they enjoy. The school participates in seasonal celebrations in addition to Hispanic Heritage and black history month, acknowledging staff and cultural backgrounds.

Individual acknowledgments:

The school utilizes the school news for specific classroom praise and shout-outs to teachers who go above and beyond. There will be a staff-staff peer Kudos board where they can leave positive notes for each other. Several staff are chosen monthly from Kudos boards and receive a gift card donated by private donors.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Staff are motivated by positive affirmation and interactions with peers as well as superiors. This increases team bond, productivity, positive talk.

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. Obtain baseline data of staff's perceived positive culture of the school and their ideal goody preferences.
2. Incorporate Positive T-shirt Tuesdays, Happy Cart, Seasonal Celebrations, Kudos Wall.
3. Provide quarterly positive culture surveys.
4. Analyze the surveys for adjustment.

Person Responsible: Cynthia Hernandez (cynthiamhe@leeschools.net)

By When: Although these action steps will start in August of 2023, the final data goal will be reached by the end of the year 2024.

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

NA

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

In Grade 3, 55% of our students scored below a Level 3 in ELA & in Grade 5, 64% of our students scored below a Level 3

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

NA

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By the Spring of 2024, 53% of our students in 3rd Grade will score a Level 3 or higher in ELA & in Grade 5, 51% will score a Level 3 or higher in ELA.

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.

FAST Progress Monitoring reports will be monitored by Administration Team and classroom teachers beginning Baseline, Q1, Q2 & Q3. Based on data, intervention groups will be flexible and fluid, based on student needs.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Hernandez, Cynthia, cynthiamhe@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?

Evidenced-based practices/programs that will be implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade will include Wonder curriculum, Magnetic Reading, Phonics for Instruction and I-Ready ELA individualized learning path lessons.

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?

These evidenced-based practices/programs are supported by our District.

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 |
|--|---|
| Our Literacy Leadership team meets once a week and student data will drive our meetings. Data and plan of actions will drive our intervention groups in Grades 3-5. | Garlick, Heather, heatherhg@leeschools.net |
| Our Literacy Coaching Cycles will be developed, modeled, and be monitored by our two Peer Collaborative Teachers and our Intermediate Literacy Coach. | Wallace, Jared, jaredjw@leeschools.net |
| Professional Learning will be developed and monitored by our two Peer Collaborative Teachers and School Administration Team. The fourth PLC of each month will be designated for mini PD trainings to support teachers in identifying student needs during intervention periods. | Peters, Jason, jasonlp@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.

School Website: <https://hme.leeschools.net/>

- School Improvement Plans (SIPs) must be created and managed using the Florida CIMS website. This will allow for our completed SIPs to be made available publicly and parents can request a copy from the school's front office in their preferred language after publication approval.
- On Aug 1, 2023, schools must have SIPs reviewed by Academic Services & Title I Depts
- On or before Oct 6, 2023, School Advisory Council (SAC) must present, review, and request feedback on the SIP and budget. The meeting minutes will be uploaded into the school's Title I Crate (web-based site) and FY24 School document folder in the google team drive.
- On Oct 17, 2023, The Lee County School Board will approve publication and dissemination.
- Schools must review Annual School Improvement Assurances, complete & submit School Advisory Council Membership List 2023-2024, complete & submit School Advisory Council 2022-2023 Nomination and Election Process Verification on or before Nov 1, 2023, in the google drive FY24 School Document Folder.

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))

School Website: <https://hme.leeschools.net/>

*Harns Marsh Elementary School recognizes the enormous importance of increasing parental and family engagement in raising student achievement at all levels. To accomplish this and to determine the needs/ barriers of our parents, schools, the PFEP team analyzes the current building capacity activities, compares participation numbers, and addresses the barriers that limit parent participation. These barriers include language barriers, and the inability to leave work for events/meetings.

In addition, since we are a Title I school, we complete the Florida DOE template for the Parent and Family Educational Plan (PFEP). School data is reported to the district to become a part of the District PFEP Evaluation and goal setting process. Schools' baseline data sources. i.e., number of volunteers and volunteer service hours, parent workshop and training evaluations, sign in sheets, attendance and volunteer logs, parent surveys, the PFEP Evaluation, and test results become the guiding force to annual evaluation and improvement of the school's parent involvement program to enhance student achievement for the upcoming school year.

The PFEP will be a principal element of the review process for each school in gathering data at the end of the year as the schools complete their SIP (Comprehensive Needs Analysis) in preparation for revising School Improvement Plans.

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)

Harns Marsh Elementary School plans to strengthen our Academic Program and the quality of learning time by providing the following with the use of Title I funds:

*Hiring of 2 PCTs, 1.5 Math Coaches, 1 Intermediate Literacy Coach, and 1 Parent Involvement Specialist.

*Curriculum and Development Supplemental Contracts for processing for improvement include ongoing data chats at the classroom level, and data review

*PD opportunities to improve teacher quality made available using Title I funds

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))

District general funds provide the foundation for all programs. Title I A funds will be the primary supplemental source for the activities listed in this need. Title I, Part A coordinates with other federal grants, such as Titles 1C, 1D, II, III and IV, IDEA, and Homeless to expand academic enrichment opportunities for subgroups of students and Professional Development for teachers. These services include extended learning opportunities, professional development, supplemental evidence-based resources, and materials.

Title I, Part A coordinates with Title I, Part C to provide expanded academic enrichment opportunities to Migrant students. Services include; tutorials in reading and math, health services, and literacy workshops for parents because of the coordination of these funds.

Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under ESEA also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs to align towards student academic success.

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))

The Lee County School District follows the mental health guidelines set forth by the State of Florida Department of Education. This includes providing universal positive and behavioral support. The district also, with parental permission, assesses and screens students to determine what level of mental health support would best meet their mental health needs. These supports range from school check-ins, school-based mental health counseling as well as a referral pathway to outside mental health services.

The Lee County School District employs evidence-based practices in the foundational instruction of students with a focus on building resiliency, promoting physical and emotional wellness, overall health, social development, overcoming adversity, critical thinking and problem solving, prevention of substance use, and other topics.

The Lee County School District employs school-based mental health professionals, school counselors, school social workers, school psychologists, and licensed mental health professionals to ensure that school-based mental health services are provided to students.

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))

AVID Program – The AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination) program is an in school academic support program that prepares students for college eligibility and success. This year, Harns Marsh Elementary will

be piloting the program with our incoming 5th graders. Our students will learn organizational and study skills, work on critical thinking and asking probing questions, get academic help from peers and tutors.

Extended Learning Opportunities - Harns Marsh Elementary will implement extended learning opportunities (tutorial programs in reading and/or math) to address the academic needs of specific subgroups of Title I students who have been identified as lowest achievers. Schools will use Title I and other funding such as SAI to develop tutorial programs using only research-based strategies and resources. Materials and supplies will be provided to students to assist with achievement of goals and to remove barriers.

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).

The district ensures that every school implements a tiered model of evidence-based behavior supports within a Multi-tiered System of Supports (MTSS). District level personnel are designated to assist schools with their site-based implementation by providing training, modeling, program monitoring, technical assistance, and data collection/analysis. They work with site-based personnel to implement the tiered approach that includes:

Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS)/Positive Behavior System (PBS) - All schools are required to implement the elements of PBIS including a school-based team that facilitates systems that

support positive behavior: school-wide expectations, classroom expectations and rules, positive recognition/rewards, data collection and analysis, and ongoing professional development. Most schools participate in the Florida PBIS Project. Some schools implement the elements within other approaches including the Building Assets Reducing Risks (BARR) program. PBIS/PBS integrates with the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) utilized in Florida school districts for behavior support.

All schools in the School District of Lee County are required to maintain MTSS for all students (tier 1), students needing supplemental support (tier 2), and students needing intensive support (tier 3). Each school has a team that utilizes the multi-tiered system of support (MTSS) process in examining individual student data to identify those that may need additional behavior support beyond the universal PBIS/PBS approach, and to monitor the effectiveness of these interventions. Data analyzed include office discipline referrals, in-school suspension, out-of-school suspension, bus referrals/suspension, as well as positive behavior data. Interventions may include supplemental positive behavior interventions and/or interventions to address inappropriate behavior.

Each school has a designated Intervention Specialist that facilitates team processes and ensures that identified interventions are implemented and monitored for effectiveness. Currently, the district utilizes "Insights to Behavior" to assist with the ongoing teamwork for behavior support in the tiered model using RtI. This includes the use of additional tools such as the Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA), data collection tools, reporting tools, and behavior intervention plan tools. Intervention Specialists assist classroom teachers and school-based personnel in the implementation of behavioral interventions and data collection, as well as serve as the primary contact for families with students receiving interventions.

In the School District of Lee County, the Multi-tiered System of Supports school-based teams may, when needed, refer students to other district/school supports including the school-based mental health team, Section 504 eligibility consideration, and/or evaluation for consideration of eligibility under IDEA. Likewise, when students respond to interventions, the team may recommend maintaining current levels of interventions, reducing interventions, or exiting interventions as appropriate.

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))

The district's Curriculum and Staff Development department will offer training opportunities for paraprofessionals in the core subject areas and technology. In addition, new ESOL paraprofessionals will receive 12 hours of training regarding strategies to assist English Language Learners (ELL) to improve student performance. When appropriate, Instructional Support (Para) will participate in the same training as teachers at Title I schools.

Curriculum and Staff Development will offer teachers a multitude of opportunities to improve effectiveness. They will include (but are not limited to) the following: Florida Standards, Differentiated Instructional Strategies, Analytics (Data Analysis) and Instructional Change, Classroom Walkthrough, Kagan Cooperative Learning, Instruction within the Block, SIOP, and subject area training for adopted texts.

Teacher leaders at schools will support classroom instructional staff daily by coaching, modeling, and/or providing resources to improve instructional activities. Professional development and Peer Collaborative Teachers (PCTs) will further support the initiative by collaborating closely with the teacher leaders. These individuals are chosen through a selective process that ensures highly effective instructional practices are shared with classroom teachers.

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))

The district has Early 5, Pre-K and Special Education programs in place to prepare students socially, emotionally and academically for Kindergarten. Many of our schools have their upcoming Kindergarten students come to school to meet the teachers and take assessments, so that they can better place them for the school year. Another transitional strategy used is to offer Kindergarten camp for a few days to acclimate students to their school and teachers instruct them on basic processes.

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: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| 5 | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners | \$0.00 |
| 6 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |

Budget Approval

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

Yes