
Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 9 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 25 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 26 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 27 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 29 |

Pine Island Elementary School

5360 RIDGEWOOD DR, Bokeelia, FL 33922

<http://pie.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.

Pine Island Elementary's mission statement is to inspire a love of learning and a drive for success that will instill in each student the desire to reach their fullest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pine Island's vision statement is to develop well rounded creative thinkers who have a love for learning and who are successful positive community members.

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 |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Millins, Thomas | Principal | |
| Williamson, Amy | School Counselor | |
| Nelson, Mendy | Reading Coach | |
| Notarianni, Regina | Curriculum Resource Teacher | |
| Frahm, Cathy | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Dooley, Summer | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Kunkel, Amber | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Stevens, Kaylie | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Barnhill, Jamie | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Nelson, Jeffrey | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Catto, Emily | Teacher, ESE | |
| Beemer, Zachary | Teacher, K-12 | |

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.

All stakeholders meet monthly to discuss the development of the SIP goals and the progress towards meeting them. They review the processes used to attain the goals and objectives while constantly revisiting and revising practices when needed. This is done in a variety of ways such as verbal conversation, emails, surveys, presentations, and forms.

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))

During our monthly meetings with the SIP Leadership team, SIP goals will be reviewed and data pertinent to those goals will be evaluated. Progress towards the goals will be scrutinized using that data and information will be taken back to team members by the SIP leadership team. Strategies to support further improvement will be discussed at these meetings to increase student achievement. EAGLE time (differentiation of instruction) will be discussed and a plan for meeting the needs of all students, especially those performing below grade level will be created and constantly revisited ensuring that the strategies and interventions are being effective.

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 | 33% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 100% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | No |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | ATSI |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Hispanic Students (HSP) 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: I 2018-19: B 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 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 4 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 5 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Course failure in Math | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 4 | 10 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 2 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 10 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |

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 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |

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 | 0 | 11 | 10 | 6 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in ELA | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in Math | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 1 | 2 | 12 | 14 | 12 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 |
| | 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 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |

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 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

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

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

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 11 | 10 | 6 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in ELA | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in Math | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 1 | 2 | 12 | 14 | 12 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |

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 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | 62 | 48 | 53 | 64 | 52 | 56 | 59 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 65 | | | 43 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 60 | | | | | |
| Math Achievement* | 81 | 57 | 59 | 83 | 45 | 50 | 59 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 83 | | | 0 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 60 | | | | | |
| Science Achievement* | 70 | 53 | 54 | 63 | 59 | 59 | 44 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 62 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 47 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 50 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 65 | 51 | 59 | 53 | | | 69 | | |

* 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 | 70 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 352 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 66 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 531 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 96 |
| 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 | 42 | | | |
| ELL | 53 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | | | | |
| HSP | 55 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 78 | | | |
| FRL | 63 | | | |

| 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 | 2 | |
| ELL | 59 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | | | | |
| HSP | 62 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 78 | | | |
| FRL | 64 | | | |

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 | 62 | | | 81 | | | 70 | | | | | 65 |
| SWD | 29 | | | 55 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| ELL | 27 | | | 67 | | | | | | | 3 | 65 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 35 | | | 65 | | | | | | | 3 | 65 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 72 | | | 88 | | | 71 | | | | 4 | |
| FRL | 50 | | | 72 | | | 62 | | | | 5 | 67 |

| 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 | 64 | 65 | 60 | 83 | 83 | 60 | 63 | | | | | 53 |
| SWD | 27 | | | 40 | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 42 | | | 83 | | | | | | | | 53 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 47 | 60 | | 69 | 83 | | | | | | | 53 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 72 | 68 | | 90 | 82 | | 80 | | | | | |
| FRL | 58 | 63 | | 76 | 73 | | 50 | | | | | |

| 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 | 59 | 43 | | 59 | 0 | | 44 | | | | | 69 |
| SWD | 20 | | | 14 | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | 69 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 48 | 40 | | 50 | | | | | | | | 69 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 67 | 46 | | 64 | 0 | | 63 | | | | | |
| FRL | 53 | 36 | | 57 | 0 | | 23 | | | | | |

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 | 56% | 48% | 8% | 54% | 2% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 55% | 56% | -1% | 58% | -3% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 61% | 42% | 19% | 50% | 11% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 81% | 55% | 26% | 59% | 22% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 79% | 61% | 18% | 61% | 18% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 85% | 52% | 33% | 55% | 30% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 71% | 50% | 21% | 51% | 20% |

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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was our second grade students in ELA. 60% of our second grade students were proficient in ELA according to the STAR assessment given during PM 3. Contributing factors to this low performance include students participating in blended learning during Kindergarten and first grade, high rates of absences due to COVID-19, and gaps of instruction due to Hurricane Ian. This group of students has trended for the past 3 years to struggle with proficiency in ELA.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was fourth grade ELA. Those students went from 73% proficiency in third grade to 56% proficiency in fourth grade in ELA. Factors that contribute to this decline are high class size, large populations of ESOL, ESE, and MTSS students, and a new teacher to Pine Island Elementary in fourth grade.

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.

Upon reviewing state data versus school data, we were higher than the state in all areas other than fifth grade ELA. The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state was fifth grade math. We were 12 scale score points higher on average in that assessment. However the assessment that our students did not achieve as high as the state was fifth grade ELA. A factor that contributed to this one point gap could be a break in instruction due to Hurricane Ian.

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 in Grades 3-5 math. We demonstrated a 10.6% proficiency above the state average. That was a 3% increase for Pine Island Elementary from the previous year. New actions that led to this result were strategic planning and implementing interventions with our resource teacher and additional ESE teacher and an additional ESOL paraprofessional.

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

Reflecting on the EWS data, two potential areas of concern would be the students in second and fourth grade who display more than one early warning indicator. Attendance and course failures will be a major focus when looking at the early warning system.

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

1. Teacher and data tracking
2. Interventions (ELA & Math)
3. Identifying each student's individual academic needs
4. Effective use of teacher/ staff resources

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 Early Warning System

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.

Utilizing the Early Warning System identification process, we have identified our ESE students who have more than one EWS indicator. We will set a goal to increase the positive culture and environment for those students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By increasing the positive culture and environment of Pine Island Elementary, students in grades Kindergarten- 5th grade who are in the exceptional student education program with more than one early warning indicator noted in the SIP plan will decrease from 20 out of 45 (44%) to 15 out of 45 (33%) students as measured by the early warning indicators noted in the SIP plan by May 2024.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored by district mandated progress monitoring three times a year, district exemplars, teacher and student data sheets, student attendance, student surveys, monitoring of IEP goals, curriculum based assessments and discipline reports.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Thomas Millins (thomascm@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 we will use will be PBIS and zones of regulation, . We will also use curriculum maps, instructional guides research based interventions & feedback. To specifically target our students with an IEP we will collect data on a weekly basis. The data that will be collected will be weekly skill checks, fluency checks, student surveys, discipline reports, exemplar data, and DIBELS. We will also be tracking these students weekly on their IEP goals. The data will be graphed and reported in the student data folders. In addition STAR reading & FAST will be used to progress monitor quarterly and the instructional planning report will assist in grouping students and guiding instruction.

Small group instruction during EAGLE time and with our ESE teacher, ESOL para and resource teacher will be implemented daily along with individual or small group testing. Students will be instructed using multiple modalities. Students will also participate in small group counseling focusing on social skills with our school counselor.

Similar to last year, we will be utilizing an additional ESE teacher and an additional ESOL para to directly support these students.

Each of these students will be assigned a peer mentor to check in with the students at least once a week.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The curriculum maps and instructional guides provide teachers with a roadmap of the standards that need to be mastered along with a scope and sequence. In addition, it supports the teachers with additional resources for standards based instruction. PBIS is a research based program that focuses on promoting positive behavior and rewarding it through a Live School Store. Having two additional staff members to

support these students specifically will enhance the level and depth of instruction these students will receive. Having our counselor work with these students will provide support and social skills. Our school believes in problem solving and monitoring student progress to determine student's level of understanding and need for support. We implement interventions based on student's needs and provide feedback to support individualized learning.

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. Students who are performing 6 months or more below grade level will have an MTSS plan with interventions
2. A parent conference will be held with students who are earning lower than a C, classroom interventions will be shared with the parent and at home strategies will be shared.
3. A paraprofessional will be assigned to 2nd grade and will assist in the classroom during the ELA block, the differentiation block and Math Block.
4. The ESE teacher will closely monitor students with IEPs and will collaborate with teachers regarding student progress.
5. PLC meetings will be held weekly and specific data will be discussed to monitor achievement data and trends.
6. Administration will hold data chats with all teachers to discuss specific students who are not mastering standards and brainstorm strategies to assist them.
7. MTSS meetings will be held quarterly to progress monitor students.
8. Teachers will be given common planning time and semesterly planning time to review the curriculum maps and instructional guides and plan their instruction.
9. Really Great Reading, Read Well, and i-ready phonics will be implemented to assist in building strong phonics skills.
10. Continued implementation of quality practices to include data binders, student reflection on data and student led conferences.
11. Administration will perform classroom walkthroughs and coaching focusing on differentiation and targeted instruction
12. Professional development on the implementation of curriculum guides and instructional strategies, high yield strategies and most effective teaching practices
13. Social skills instruction will be provided on a weekly basis.
14. Continue with a school wide PBIS plan and Live School Store

Person Responsible: Thomas Millins (thomascm@leeschools.net)

By When: This goal will be achieved by May 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.

The area of focus for this goal is second grade student's proficiency in ELA. Research has shown that reinforcing the effectiveness of instruction in alphabetics, fluency, and vocabulary, providing instruction in broad oral language skills, integrating all aspects of reading, instruction, and ensuring that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension will provide students with a solid foundation on which to build higher level literacy skills.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students in second grade will increase their ELA proficiency from 79% to 80% by the Spring of 2024 as measured by the STAR assessment.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored by district mandated progress monitoring three times a year, district exemplars, teacher and student data sheets, and curriculum based assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Thomas Millins (thomascm@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 strategies that we will use will be curriculum maps, instructional guides and interventions & feedback. To specifically target our second grade students we will collect data on a weekly basis. The data that will be collected will be weekly skill checks, fluency checks, exemplar data, and DIBELS. The data will be graphed and reported in the student data folders. In addition STAR reading will be used to progress monitor quarterly and the instructional planning report will assist in grouping students and guiding instruction.

Small group instruction during EAGLE time and with our ESE teacher, ESOL para, instructional para and resource teacher will be implemented daily along with individual or small group testing. Students will be instructed using multiple modalities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The curriculum maps and instructional guides provide teachers with a roadmap of the standards that need to be mastered along with a scope and sequence. In addition, it supports the teachers with additional resources for standards based instruction. Our school believes in problem solving and monitoring student progress to determine student's level of understanding and need for support. We implement interventions based on student's needs and provide feedback to support individualized learning.

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. Students who are performing 6 months or more below grade level will have an MTSS plan with interventions
2. A parent conference will be held with students who are earning lower than a C, classroom interventions will be shared with the parent and at home strategies will be shared.
3. A paraprofessional will be assigned to 2nd grade and will assist in the classroom during the ELA block, the differentiation block and Math Block.
4. The ESE teacher will closely monitor students with IEPs and will collaborate with teachers regarding student progress. She will also participate in instruction during the EAGLE time block.
5. PLC meetings will be held weekly and specific data will be discussed to monitor achievement data and trends.
6. Administration will hold data chats with 2nd grade teachers to discuss specific students who are not mastering standards and brainstorm strategies to assist them.
7. MTSS meetings will be held quarterly to progress monitor students.
8. Teachers will be given common planning time and semesterly planning time to review the curriculum maps and instructional guides and plan their instruction.
9. Really Great Reading will be implemented to assist in building strong phonics skills.
10. Continued implementation of quality practices to include data binders, student reflection on data and student led conferences.
11. Administration will perform classroom walkthroughs and coaching focusing on differentiation and targeted instruction
12. Professional development on the implementation of curriculum guides and instructional strategies, high yield strategies and most effective teaching practices

Person Responsible: Thomas Millins (thomascm@leeschools.net)

By When: This goal will be achieved by May 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.

The area of focus for this goal is third grade student's proficiency in ELA. Research has shown that reinforcing the effectiveness of instruction in alphabetics, fluency, and vocabulary, providing instruction in broad oral language skills, integrating all aspects of reading, instruction, and ensuring that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension will provide students with a solid foundation on which to build higher level literacy skills.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students in third grade will increase their ELA proficiency from 60% to 64% by the Spring of 2024 as measured by the FAST assessment.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored by district mandated progress monitoring three times a year, district exemplars, teacher and student data sheets, and curriculum based assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Thomas Millins (thomascm@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 strategies that we will use will be curriculum maps, instructional guides and interventions & feedback. To specifically target our third grade students we will collect data on a weekly basis. The data that will be collected will be weekly skill checks, fluency checks, exemplar data, and DIBELS. The data will be graphed and reported in the student data folders. In addition STAR reading will be used to progress monitor quarterly and the instructional planning report will assist in grouping students and guiding instruction.

Small group instruction during EAGLE time and with our ESE teacher, ESOL para, instructional para and resource teacher will be implemented daily along with individual or small group testing. Students will be instructed using multiple modalities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The curriculum maps and instructional guides provide teachers with a roadmap of the standards that need to be mastered along with a scope and sequence. In addition, it supports the teachers with additional resources for standards based instruction. Our school believes in problem solving and monitoring student progress to determine student's level of understanding and need for support. We implement interventions based on student's needs and provide feedback to support individualized learning.

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. Students who are performing 6 months or more below grade level will have an MTSS plan with interventions
2. A parent conference will be held with students who are earning lower than a C, classroom interventions will be shared with the parent and at home strategies will be shared.
3. A paraprofessional will be assigned to 3rd grade and will assist in the classroom during the ELA block, the differentiation block and Math Block.
4. The ESE teacher will closely monitor students with IEPs and will collaborate with teachers regarding student progress. She will also participate in the EAGLE time block.
5. PLC meetings will be held weekly and specific data will be discussed to monitor achievement data and trends.
6. Administration will hold data chats with 3rd grade teachers to discuss specific students who are not mastering standards and brainstorm strategies to assist them.
7. MTSS meetings will be held quarterly to progress monitor students.
8. Teachers will be given common planning time and semesterly planning time to review the curriculum maps and instructional guides and plan their instruction.
9. Phonics Intervention will be implemented to assist in building strong phonics skills.
10. Continued implementation of quality practices to include data binders, student reflection on data and student led conferences.
11. Administration will perform classroom walkthroughs and coaching focusing on differentiation and targeted instruction
12. Professional development on the implementation of curriculum guides and instructional strategies, high yield strategies and most effective teaching practices

Person Responsible: Thomas Millins (thomascm@leeschools.net)

By When: This goal will be achieved by May 2024.

#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.

The area of focus for this goal is for third- fifth grade student's proficiency in ELA. Research has shown that reinforcing the effectiveness of instruction in alphabetics, fluency, and vocabulary, providing instruction in broad oral language skills, integrating all aspects of reading, instruction, and ensuring that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension will provide students with a solid foundation on which to build higher level literacy skills.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students in grades 3-5 will increase their ELA proficiency from 60% to 61% by the Spring of 2024 as measured by the FAST assessment.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored by district mandated progress monitoring three times a year, district exemplars, teacher and student data sheets, IEP goal monitoring and curriculum based assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Thomas Millins (thomascm@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 strategies that we will use will be curriculum maps, instructional guides and interventions & feedback. To specifically target our third through fifth grade students we will collect data on a weekly basis. The data that will be collected will be weekly skill checks, fluency checks, exemplar data, and DIBELS. The data will be graphed and reported in the student data folders. In addition STAR reading will be used to progress monitor quarterly and the instructional planning report will assist in grouping students and guiding instruction.

Small group instruction during EAGLE time and with our ESE teacher, ESOL para, instructional para and resource teacher will be implemented daily along with individual or small group testing. Students will be instructed using multiple modalities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The curriculum maps and instructional guides provide teachers with a roadmap of the standards that need to be mastered along with a scope and sequence. In addition, it supports the teachers with additional resources for standards based instruction. Our school believes in problem solving and monitoring student progress to determine student's level of understanding and need for support. We implement interventions based on student's needs and provide feedback to support individualized learning.

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. Students who are performing 6 months or more below grade level will have an MTSS plan with interventions
2. A parent conference will be held with students who are earning lower than a C, classroom interventions will be shared with the parent and at home strategies will be shared.
3. A paraprofessional will be assigned to 3rd- 5th grade and will assist in the classroom during the ELA block, the differentiation block and Math Block.
4. The ESE teacher will closely monitor students with IEPs and will collaborate with teachers regarding student progress. She will also be utilized during EAGLE time.
5. PLC meetings will be held weekly and specific data will be discussed to monitor achievement data and trends.
6. Administration will hold data chats with 3rd- 5th grade teachers to discuss specific students who are not mastering standards and brainstorm strategies to assist them.
7. MTSS meetings will be held quarterly to progress monitor students.
8. Teachers will be given common planning time and semesterly planning time to review the curriculum maps and instructional guides and plan their instruction.
9. Really Great Reading will be implemented to assist in building strong phonics skills.
10. Continued implementation of quality practices to include data binders, student reflection on data and student led conferences.
11. Administration will perform classroom walkthroughs and coaching focusing on differentiation and targeted instruction
12. Professional development on the implementation of curriculum guides and instructional strategies, high yield strategies and most effective teaching practices

Person Responsible: Thomas Millins (thomascm@leeschools.net)

By When: This goal will be achieved by May 2024.

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Primary literacy skills provide the foundation for all higher level reading and comprehension skills. It is imperative that students are proficient in the these standards. Based on the 2023-2024 reading progress monitoring, 60% of students in grades 3-5 are proficient in reading. Our ESSA subgroup, students with disabilities were also progress monitored during the 2021-2022 school year and only 34% of those students were proficient. Our ESSA subgroup, students with disabilities were also progress monitored during the 2022-2023 school year and 60% of those students were proficient. Our students increased their proficiency 26 points in one year. We were able to close the achievement gap between all students and this subgroup this year and are setting a goal to continue this.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, 61% of all students with disabilities grades 3-5 will be proficient in reading as measured by the Spring 2024 FAST Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through progress monitoring throughout the school year. The progress monitoring tools that we will be using will be FAST & i-Ready diagnostic assessments, i-Ready growth monitoring assessments, ELA exemplars, quarterly comprehensive assessments, teacher made assessments, assessments that target individual IEP goals, and informal assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Thomas Millins (thomascm@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.)

We will use grade level PLC meetings and monthly school wide PLCs to evaluate student data specifically targeting our students with disabilities. Progress Monitoring data will be used at these meetings to determine mastery. To specifically target our ESSA subgroup of students with disabilities we will collect data on a weekly basis according to the individual student's IEP goals. The data collected will be weekly assessments, formative assessments, progress towards IEP goals and exemplars. The data will be graphed and reported on the quarterly IEP progress reports. In addition i-Ready reading will be used to progress monitor 3 times throughout the year along with FAST. The instructional planning report will assist in grouping students and guiding instruction. ESOL students who also have an IEP will utilize the Imagine Learning program to enhance their English Language Learning.

Small group instruction during EAGLE time and with our ESE teacher, ESOL paraprofessional, instructional paraprofessional and resource teacher will be implemented daily along with individual or small group testing. Students will be instructed using multiple modalities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Professional Learning Community at Work (PLC) model offers a systems approach to school improvement. Teachers are organized into grade level, course specific, or interdisciplinary collaborative teams in which educators work interdependently to achieve common goals for which members are mutually accountable. A process is put in place to ensure teams clarify the essential learnings for each

course, grade level, and unit of instruction; establish consistent pacing; create frequent common assessments to monitor student learning, and agree on the criteria they will use to judge the quality of student work. Each team then uses the evidence of student learning to identify individual students who need additional time and support, to discover problematic areas of the curriculum that require the attention of the team, and to help each member become aware of his or her instructional strengths and weaknesses.

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. Adhere to the scheduled Grade level and full faculty PLC schedule
2. Teachers will complete a PLC plan at each meeting to help guide the next steps to helping those students who are not making adequate progress
3. Teachers are given the opportunity to request additional resources that would help aid in the task of helping all students make a gain with a special focus on students with disabilities.
4. Administration will be present at these meeting to facilitate the 4 essential questions in addition to any other pertinent information
5. Teachers will meet quarterly with the grade levels above and below them to ensure that they are on track for learning above and below grade levels.
6. Quarterly data chats with grade level teachers and schoolwide stakeholders to name students who need additional support.
7. Intervention time during which students move among teachers to target specific learning needs based on standards.
8. Implementation of High Yield strategies and higher order thinking skills when appropriate to the lesson.
9. Plan for professional development using curriculum guides and instructional guides from the district.
10. Review CASTLE features and dashboard for collecting and evaluating of data
11. Continued implementation of quality practices to include data binders, student reflection on data and student led conferences.
12. Administration will perform classroom walkthroughs and coaching focusing on differentiation and targeted instruction
13. Professional development on high yield strategies and most effective teaching practices

Person Responsible: Thomas Millins (thomasm@leeschools.net)

By When: This goal will be achieved by May 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

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

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

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

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.

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?

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?

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

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: Early Warning System | \$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 |
| 5 | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$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