

The School District of Lee County

# Lexington Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>30</b>

# Lexington Middle School

16351 SUMMERLIN RD, Fort Myers, FL 33908

<http://lxm.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.**

Lexington Middle School Mission Statement: Lexington Middle School will provide each student the opportunity to develop the educational skills, knowledge, attitude, and character to become compassionate, lifelong learners with an intercultural understanding and respect in order to make a positive impact in the community and the world.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

Lexington Middle School Vision Statement: To become a world class middle school.

### 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
Bueno, Kristin	Principal	<p>The principal serves as the instructional and operational leader of Lexington Middle School. The Principal provides a clear vision for learning for all students; ensures a safe, secure, and orderly learning environment; and cultivates relationships with stakeholders.</p> <p>The Principal is responsible for hiring and assigning staff members to positions within the school, supporting professional growth, and building the leadership capacity of staff. The Principal promotes high-quality instructional practices that ensure all students can learn and analyzes multiple sources of data to guide continuous improvement in student achievement, manage school operations, and effectively evaluate and develop staff.</p> <p>Essential job duties and responsibilities include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Maintaining a clear vision for learning for all students</li> <li>*Implementing a strategic plan to accomplish Lexington's mission and vision</li> <li>*Ensuring a safe, secure and orderly environment for all</li> <li>*Promoting high-quality instructional practices school-wide</li> <li>*Using the evaluation system to provide teachers with timely and constructive feedback on instruction</li> <li>*Communicating learning and development goals that reflect high expectations for learning for all students</li> <li>*Developing a culture of collegial and professional relationships among staff that promote critical reflection, shared accountability, and continuous improvement</li> <li>*Managing conflict constructively at all levels</li> <li>*Hiring and effectively assigning staff</li> <li>*Supporting the professional growth of staff members based on identified need</li> <li>*Collecting, analyzing, and using multiple sources of data to guide continuous improvement</li> <li>*Developing positive and collaborative relationships with families</li> <li>*Managing the school budget, requisitions, and all school funds</li> <li>*Overseeing the upkeep of school facilities and physical plant</li> </ul>
Edwards, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	<p>The job duties and responsibilities of the Assistant Principal for Curriculum include creating and adjusting the master schedule for all teachers and students, overseeing schedule changes and the scheduling of new students throughout the year, overseeing the ordering, intake, and distribution of all textbooks and instructional materials, ensuring that the state adopted standards and district curriculum are included in lesson plans and are being implemented in classrooms, participating in Classroom Walkthroughs, Targeted Observations, and Formal Evaluations of employees, and working with PLCs to ensure that data is being collected and analyzed to make instructional decisions.</p> <p>In addition, the Assistant Principal for Curriculum oversees the new teacher program, provides professional development for new teachers, collects data about the need for all teachers and assists in providing professional development, oversees/monitors district and state testing of students in the school, collects and analyzes data to help teachers make instructional decisions, and works with teachers during common planning to ensure all stakeholder needs are met.</p> <p>Additional duties include monitoring the technology usage of students and working with the technology specialist to provide materials for staff and students,</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>working with the ESOL contact to ensure compliance and testing of all ELL students, working with office staff to ensure smooth processes in staff hiring, day-to-day operations, counseling, and student data input.</p>
Kroll, James	Assistant Principal	<p>The job duties and responsibilities of the assistant principal for student services includes overseeing the safety and security procedures for the school, working with security and non-instructional staff to ensure school procedures and policies are in place, creating schedules and duty assignments for when students are outside the classroom, assisting instructional staff with difficult situations inside the classroom, meeting with parents and other stakeholders to ensure a positive and safe environment for all, and overseeing the maintenance of the building and grounds.</p> <p>In addition, the assistant principal for student services works with teams to oversee attendance policies, the school's PBIS system, the discipline of students, and other student needs to ensure a safe and effective learning environment. The assistant principal collects and analyzes data about attendance, safety, and efficiency of procedures and provides/oversees professional development as needed.</p> <p>Other duties include overseeing the bus ramp during drop-off and pick-up, meeting with counselors and the MTSS specialist to address specific student needs, maintaining the school's website and social media feeds, and attending weekly PLCs to ensure that data is being collected and analyzed to make instructional decisions.</p>

**Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development**

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

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

The School Advisory Council which is comprised of staff, community and students revisits the improvement plan at each monthly meeting, reviewing data and providing input related to goal setting and progress. The school's guiding coalition also meets monthly to revisit performance levels and annual goals, creating strategies to meet goals.

**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))

Each time teachers come together, weekly Collaborative Team time, staff meetings, professional development , the meeting commences with a review of the school goals. A sharing of current performance levels and the impact of strategies is shared, thus prompting any appropriate editing of goals. Goal revision or editing throughout the year would occur as a result of the guiding coalition work.



**Demographic Data**

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	63%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	95%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**Early Warning Systems**

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	98	116	324
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	59	63	202
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	53	85	211
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	60	63	137
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	85	107	291
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	111	109	315
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	92	107	267

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	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	0	0	0	0	0	73	53	85	211
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	60	63	137
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	85	107	291
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	111	109	315
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	92	107	267

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	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*	51	48	49	54	48	50	55		
ELA Learning Gains				41			53		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				28			36		
Math Achievement*	59	56	56	51	32	36	57		
Math Learning Gains				47			45		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41			38		
Science Achievement*	48	45	49	48	51	53	51		
Social Studies Achievement*	74	64	68	71	53	58	70		
Middle School Acceleration	78	80	73	83	45	49	62		
Graduation Rate					44	49			
College and Career Acceleration					66	70			
ELP Progress	18	29	40	28	78	76	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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	328
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	492
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
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	22	Yes	4	2
ELL	34	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN	91			
BLK	36	Yes	2	
HSP	47			
MUL	59			
PAC				
WHT	75			

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	45			

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	28	Yes	3	1
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	70			
BLK	38	Yes	1	
HSP	44			
MUL	52			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	41			

**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	51			59			48	74	78			18
SWD	16			25			19	44			5	4
ELL	22			38			15	52	58		6	18
AMI												
ASN	86			86				100			3	
BLK	42			38			8	65			5	29
HSP	39			48			41	67	70		6	16
MUL	58			59							2	

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	66			76			64	81	87		5	
FRL	41			47			34	66	67		6	15

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	54	41	28	51	47	41	48	71	83			28
SWD	22	28	18	23	37	41	23	45				13
ELL	31	32	26	23	33	31	20	48	100			28
AMI												
ASN	75	54		81	68							
BLK	38	26	25	32	35	32	30	51	78			36
HSP	46	39	27	40	44	39	33	65	78			25
MUL	54	52		56	54		45					
PAC												
WHT	65	48	35	66	52	48	65	82	84			
FRL	43	37	26	38	39	38	33	55	67			30

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	55	53	36	57	45	38	51	70	62			47
SWD	21	29	26	31	32	30	33	39	27			29
ELL	22	44	38	21	29	31	16	40				47
AMI												
ASN	82	68		91	68		70		79			
BLK	39	44	42	37	34	31	32	57	57			
HSP	43	46	33	44	41	41	34	54	40			45
MUL	73	68		78	40							
PAC												
WHT	68	60	39	73	50	39	70	85	71			
FRL	40	44	30	40	35	34	34	59	45			50

**Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)**

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	46%	44%	2%	47%	-1%
08	2023 - Spring	50%	44%	6%	47%	3%
06	2023 - Spring	45%	44%	1%	47%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	58%	52%	6%	54%	4%
07	2023 - Spring	42%	37%	5%	48%	-6%
08	2023 - Spring	63%	60%	3%	55%	8%

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

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	87%	39%	48%	50%	37%

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



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

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	67%	59%	8%	66%	1%

### III. Planning for Improvement

#### Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

Science achievement is at 46% proficient. One third of the students were without a certified science instructor for more than a quarter of the school-year due to teacher medical leave. As a result of Hurricane Ian we were out of the school for 5 weeks and those staff and students whose homes were lost had extended absence.

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

Acceleration decreased by 5 points as a result of decreased industry certification opportunities and increased level 3 students enrolled in EOC course.

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

Our 7th grade math performance was 5 points below the state average. This group of students represented less than 1/2 of the 7th grade students enrolled.

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

Our 7th grade math group also was the group showing the greatest growth, increasing by 12% proficient from the prior year. We shifted teachers within the department, with 2 new teachers with this student group. We also used formative assessments on a more frequent cycle, and everyone completed data tracking.

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

We will work to improve average daily attendance rate. Improvement plan to increase home school communication and recognition of increased attendance will be celebrated by the school community.

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

ELA proficiency and growth is number 1, as this will impact all other areas.

7th grade math proficiency is 2nd.

Third is 8th grade science proficiency

**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 Math****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.

One of Lexington's areas' of focus includes 7th grade math proficiency. We chose 7th grade math proficiency because although we raised the proficiency from the 21-22 school year of 31% to 43% proficient for the 22-23 school year, this percent of proficiency is still below the state proficiency average by 5%.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

For the 23-24 school year, Lexington Middle will raise proficiency in 7th grade math from 43% to 48%. We chose 48% because it matches the 23-24 state proficiency and because a growth of 5% is both rigorous, considering our gains from the previous year, yet attainable.

**Monitoring:**

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

In order to monitor proficiency of 7th grade math standards, math teachers will build on the systems that are already in place. The following list includes the specific monitoring practices that will be utilized by all team members:

1. Weekly data analysis during Collaborative Team Time of standards mastery from the 7th grade math common assessment given the prior week.
2. Common spiraling bell work that includes standards still needing improvement based on the data collected during Collaborative Team Time. Bell work will provide daily formative assessment data.
3. Administration of district Exemplars that are standards based every 3-4 weeks with data analysis comparing classes, teachers, school, and district to identify any areas in need of improvement and areas of strength.
4. Administration of FAST Math Progress Monitoring (PM1 and PM2) with data analysis comparing classes, teachers, school, and district to identify any areas in need of improvement and areas of strength.
5. Individual ALEKS paths assigned to students to fill in learning/skills gaps; Teachers will set goals for students for the number of topics to be completed each week based on individual student needs.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jennifer Edwards (jenniferae@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.)

In order to increase our proficiency in 7th grade math, teachers will implement the following evidence-based strategies to increase engagement and improve teaching and learning efficiency.

The first strategy is thoughtful lesson planning to include chunking of material throughout the lesson with time for processing and formative assessment after each "chunk." Chunking lesson plans is one strategy in Marzano's New Art and Science of Teaching that constitutes effective teaching.

The second strategy is the implementation of school-wide engagement strategies in weekly lessons as determined at the beginning of each quarter by department. The 7th grade math team will choose from several Kagan engagement strategies that may include, Sage N' Scribe, Quiz-Quiz-Trade, Showdown, Rally Coach, or Pairs Compare.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies were chosen for several reasons. Chunking lessons, as aligned with Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching, ensures that teachers are delivering content in segments that are manageable for students to process. In addition, the processing and formal assessment piece after each chunk allows the teacher to adjust teaching as needed to ensure students have a relatively firm understanding of the skill or concept they are learning. Kagan engagement strategies ensure that a minimum of 50% of the students in the classroom are actively engaged at processing content at any given moment, with 100% of the students being engaged throughout the strategy. For our math teachers, both of these strategies are feasible and tie into one another. Instead of the strategies being additional work, they are tightening and enhancing the work already in place.

### **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.

In order to employ these evidence-based strategies we will implement five action steps throughout the school year. The first action step is to discuss current data and set goals with the 7th grade math teachers.

**Person Responsible:** Jennifer Edwards (jenniferae@leeschools.net)

**By When:** This will occur by August 10th, 2023.

The second action step is to train teachers on writing lesson plans that include chunking, processing, and formative assessments throughout that are paced to include no more than 10-15 minutes of instruction per chunk. In addition, a lesson plan template will be provided to assist teachers in planning for chunking and processing time. Lesson plans will be monitored, and observing the chunking process will be part of classroom observations.

**Person Responsible:** Jennifer Edwards (jenniferae@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Lesson plan training and template: August 10, 2023 Lesson plan monitoring: Weekly throughout the school year Classroom observations: At least 1 per quarter

The third action step is to provide training on school-wide Kagan engagement strategies at the beginning of each quarter. Training will include learning walks and administrators will conduct walkthroughs.

**Person Responsible:** Jennifer Edwards (jenniferae@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Training will occur at the beginning of each quarter. August 7, 2023 October 25, 2023 February 28, 2023 April 24, 2023 Walkthroughs will occur throughout each quarter.

The fourth action step is to oversee Collaborative Team Time to ensure data collection/discussion is occurring and also that specific areas for remediation and enrichment are being identified based on the data collected. Monitoring includes reviewing Team Time documents to ensure specific strategies for remediation (e.g. bell work, small group, ALEKS path) and enrichment are listed.

**Person Responsible:** Jennifer Edwards (jenniferae@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Weekly throughout the 23-24 school year during collaborative team time.

The fifth action step is to implement quarterly data chats with teachers to review any school, district, and state data and to review strategies that are working and those that need improvement. At this time, we will also identify students not mastering standards and the specific plan for remediation and recheck that will be implemented.

**Person Responsible:** Jennifer Edwards (jenniferae@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Data chats will occur at the end of the first three quarters. Week of October 17th Week of January 9th Week of March 25th

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

For the 22-23 school year, Lexington Middle School's proficiency on the 8th grade Science FCAT assessment was 46%. This is 2% lower than the 21-22 school year and 1% lower than the state average of 48% for the 22-23 school year. We chose this area of focus because we are lower than the state average and did not meet the proficiency goal we set for the 22-23 school year.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

Lexington Middle School will increase student proficiency on the state 8th Grade Science FCAT Assessment from 46% to 50% for the 23-24 school year.

### Monitoring:

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

In order to monitor proficiency of 6th-8th grade science standards, physical science teachers will include specific strategies to review all three grade levels of content throughout the year and monitor student progress on targeted standards/strands identified from the 22-23 8th Grade Science FCAT results.

Monitoring will include the following steps:

1. Weekly data analysis during Collaborative Team Time of standards mastery from targeted 6th and 7th grade standards and newly learned 8th grade standards based on the common assessment given the prior week.
2. Common spiraling bell work that includes standards still needing improvement based on the data collected during Collaborative Team Time. Bell work will provide daily formative assessment data.
3. Administration of district Exemplars that are standards based every 3-4 weeks with data analysis comparing classes, teachers, school, and district to identify any areas in need of improvement and areas of strength.
4. Administration of district Progress Monitoring each quarter with data analysis comparing classes, teachers, school, and district to identify any areas in need of improvement and areas of strength.
5. Standards mastery rechecks twice per quarter for standards not mastered on an original assessment and were remediated.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Edwards (jenniferae@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.)

In order to increase our proficiency on the 8th Grade Science FCAT, teachers will implement the following evidence-based strategies to increase engagement and improve teaching and learning efficiency.

The first strategy is thoughtful lesson planning to include chunking of material throughout the lesson with time for processing and formative assessment after each "chunk." Chunking lesson plans is one strategy in Marzano's New Art and Science of Teaching that constitutes effective teaching.

The second strategy is the implementation of school-wide engagement strategies in weekly lessons as determined at the beginning of each quarter by department. The science team will choose from several Kagan engagement strategies that may include, Round Robin, Quiz-Quiz-Trade, Showdown, Rally Coach, or Pairs Compare.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies were chosen for several reasons. Chunking lessons ensures that teachers are delivering content in segments that are manageable for students to process. In addition, the processing and formal assessment piece after each chunk allows the teacher to adjust teaching as needed to ensure students have a relatively firm understanding of the skill or concept they are learning. During our classroom observations and lesson plan reviews from the 22-23 school year, we found that chunking and processing time was not always present. Second, Kagan engagement strategies ensure that a minimum of 50% of the students in the classroom are actively engaged at processing content at any given moment, with 100% of the students being engaged throughout the strategy. For our science teachers, these strategies will assist in engaging students and assessing the students' understanding of the material being presented.

**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.

In order to employ these evidence-based strategies we will implement five action steps throughout the school year. The first action step is to discuss current data and set goals with the 8th grade science teachers.

**Person Responsible:** Jennifer Edwards (jenniferae@leeschools.net)

**By When:** This will occur on July 21, 2023 and again on August 10, 2023.

The second action step is to train teachers on writing lesson plans that include chunking, processing, and formative assessments throughout that are paced to include no more than 10-15 minutes of instruction per chunk. In addition, a lesson plan template will be provided to assist teachers in planning for chunking and processing time. Lesson plans will be monitored, and observing the chunking process will be part of classroom observations.

**Person Responsible:** Jennifer Edwards (jenniferae@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Lesson plan training and template: August 10, 2023 Lesson plan monitoring: Weekly throughout the school year Classroom observations: At least 1 per quarter

The third action step is to provide training on school-wide Kagan engagement strategies at the beginning of each quarter. Training will include learning walks and administrators will conduct walkthroughs.

**Person Responsible:** Jennifer Edwards (jenniferae@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Training will occur at the beginning of each quarter. August 7, 2023 October 25, 2023 February 28, 2023 April 24, 2023 Walkthroughs will occur throughout each quarter.

The fourth action step is to oversee Collaborative Team Time to ensure data collection/discussion is occurring and also that specific areas for remediation and enrichment are being identified based on the data collected. Monitoring includes reviewing Team Time documents to ensure specific strategies for remediation (e.g. bell work, small group, reteaching) and enrichment are listed.

**Person Responsible:** Jennifer Edwards (jenniferae@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Weekly throughout the 23-24 school year during collaborative team time.

The fifth action step is to implement quarterly data chats with teachers to review any school, district, and state data and to review strategies that are working and those that need improvement. At this time, we will

also identify students not mastering standards and the specific plan for remediation and recheck that will be implemented.

**Person Responsible:** Jennifer Edwards (jenniferae@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Data chats will occur at the end of the first three quarters. Week of October 17th Week of January 9th Week of March 25th



**#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.

For the 22-23 school year, Lexington Middle School's overall proficiency on the FAST Reading assessment was 50%. Although this percentage is 3% above the district and state averages, it is 4% lower than the proficiency in Reading for the 21-22 school year. We chose this area of focus because we saw a decrease in proficiency from the previous year and did not meet the proficiency goal we set for the 22-23 school year.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Lexington Middle School will increase overall school proficiency as measured by the state FAST Reading Assessment from 50% to 55% for the 23-24 school year.

**Monitoring:**

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

In order to monitor proficiency of ELA/Reading standards, ELA teachers will build on the systems that are already in place. The following list includes the specific monitoring practices that will be utilized by all team members:

1. Weekly data analysis during Collaborative Team Time of standards mastery from the common assessment given the prior week.
2. Common spiraling bell work that includes standards still needing improvement based on the data collected during Collaborative Team Time. Bell work will provide daily formative assessment data.
3. Administration of district Exemplars that are standards based every 3-4 weeks with data analysis comparing classes, teachers, school, and district to identify any areas in need of improvement and areas of strength.
4. Administration of ELA/Reading Progress Monitoring (PM1 and PM2) with data analysis comparing classes, teachers, school, and district to identify any areas in need of improvement and areas of strength.
5. Individual iReady/Read 180 paths assigned to students to fill in learning/skills gaps; Teachers will set goals for students for the number of lessons to be completed each week based on individual student needs.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kristin Bueno (kristintb@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.)

In order to increase our proficiency in ELA/Reading, teachers will implement the following evidence-based strategies to increase engagement and improve teaching and learning efficiency.

The first strategy is thoughtful lesson planning to include chunking of material throughout the lesson with time for processing and formative assessment after each "chunk." Chunking lesson plans is one strategy in Marzano's New Art and Science of Teaching that constitutes effective teaching.

The second strategy is the implementation of school-wide engagement strategies in weekly lessons as determined at the beginning of each quarter by department. The ELA team will choose from several Kagan engagement strategies that may include, Sage N' Scribe, Quiz-Quiz-Trade, Showdown, Rally Coach, or Pairs Compare.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies were chosen for several reasons. Chunking lessons, as aligned with Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching, ensures that teachers are delivering content in segments that are manageable for students to process. In addition, the processing and formal assessment piece after each chunk allows the teacher to adjust teaching as needed to ensure students have a relatively firm understanding of the skill or concept they are learning. Kagan engagement strategies ensure that a minimum of 50% of the students in the classroom are actively engaged at processing content at any given moment, with 100% of the students being engaged throughout the strategy. For our math teachers, both of these strategies are feasible and tie into one another. Instead of the strategies being additional work, they are tightening and enhancing the work already in place.

**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.

In order to employ these evidence-based strategies we will implement action steps throughout the school year. The first action step is to discuss current data and set goals with the ELA/Reading teachers.

**Person Responsible:** Ben Anderson (benjaminha@leeschools.net)

**By When:** August 10, 2023

The second action step is to train teachers on writing lesson plans that include chunking, processing, and formative assessments throughout that are paced to include no more than 10-15 minutes of instruction per chunk. In addition, a lesson plan template will be provided to assist teachers in planning for chunking and processing time. Lesson plans will be monitored, and observing the chunking process will be part of classroom observations.

**Person Responsible:** Jennifer Edwards (jenniferae@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Lesson plan training and template: August 10, 2023 Lesson plan monitoring: Weekly throughout the school year Classroom observations: At least 1 per quarter

The third action step is to provide training on school-wide Kagan engagement strategies at the beginning of each quarter. Training will include learning walks and administrators will conduct walkthroughs.

**Person Responsible:** Jennifer Edwards (jenniferae@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Training will occur at the beginning of each quarter. August 7, 2023 October 25, 2023 February 28, 2023 April 24, 2023 Walkthroughs will occur throughout each quarter.

The fourth action step is to implement quarterly data chats with students and with teachers to review any individual, school, district, and state data and to review strategies that are working and those that need improvement. At this time, we will also identify students not mastering standards and the specific plan for remediation and recheck that will be implemented.

**Person Responsible:** Kristin Bueno (kristintb@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Data chats will occur quarterly, by the end of the first three quarters. Week of October 17th Week of January 9th Week of March 25th

#### #4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

##### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

This ESSA subgroup has performed below 41% proficiency in ELA/Reading and is a target group for our work in increasing student proficiency.

##### Measurable Outcome:

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

Lexington Middle School will increase the overall proficiency of Black/African American students in Language Arts as measured by the state FAST Reading Assessment from 38% to 41% for the 23-24 school year.

##### Monitoring:

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

In order to monitor proficiency of ELA/Reading standards of this group, ELA teachers will build on the systems that are already in place. The following list includes the specific monitoring practices that will be utilized by all team members:

1. Weekly data analysis during Collaborative Team Time of standards mastery from the common assessment given the prior week.
2. Common spiraling bell work that includes standards still needing improvement based on the data collected during Collaborative Team Time. Bell work will provide daily formative assessment data.
3. Administration of district Exemplars that are standards based every 3-4 weeks with data analysis comparing classes, teachers, school, and district to identify any areas in need of improvement and areas of strength.
4. Administration of ELA/Reading Progress Monitoring (PM1 and PM2) with data analysis comparing classes, teachers, school, and district to identify any areas in need of improvement and areas of strength.
5. Individual iReady/Read 180 paths assigned to students to fill in learning/skills gaps; Teachers will set goals for students for the number of lessons to be completed each week based on individual student needs.

##### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristin Bueno (kristintb@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.)

In order to increase our proficiency in ELA/Reading, teachers will implement the following evidence-based strategies to increase engagement and improve teaching and learning efficiency.

The first strategy is thoughtful lesson planning to include chunking of material throughout the lesson with time for processing and formative assessment after each "chunk." Chunking lesson plans is one strategy in Marzano's New Art and Science of Teaching that constitutes effective teaching.

The second strategy is the implementation of school-wide engagement strategies in weekly lessons as determined at the beginning of each quarter by department. The ELA team will choose from several Kagan engagement strategies that may include, Sage N' Scribe, Quiz-Quiz-Trade, Showdown, Rally Coach, or Pairs Compare.

##### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies were chosen for several reasons. Chunking lessons, as aligned with Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching, ensures that teachers are delivering content in segments that are manageable for students to process. In addition, the processing and formal assessment piece after each chunk allows the teacher to adjust teaching as needed to ensure students have a relatively firm understanding of the skill or concept they are learning. Kagan engagement strategies ensure that a minimum of 50% of the students in the classroom are actively engaged at processing content at any given moment, with 100% of the students being engaged throughout the strategy. For our math teachers, both of these strategies are feasible and tie into one another. Instead of the strategies being additional work, they are tightening and enhancing the work already in place.

### **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.

In order to employ these evidence-based strategies we will implement action steps throughout the school year. The first action step is to discuss current data and set goals with the ELA/Reading teachers.

**Person Responsible:** Kristin Bueno (kristintb@leeschools.net)

**By When:** August 10, 2024

The second action step is to train teachers on writing lesson plans that include chunking, processing, and formative assessments throughout that are paced to include no more than 10-15 minutes of instruction per chunk. In addition, a lesson plan template will be provided to assist teachers in planning for chunking and processing time. Lesson plans will be monitored, and observing the chunking process will be part of classroom observations.

**Person Responsible:** Jennifer Edwards (jenniferae@leeschools.net)

**By When:** August 10, 2023

The third action step is to provide training on school-wide Kagan engagement strategies at the beginning of each quarter. Training will include learning walks and administrators will conduct walkthroughs.

**Person Responsible:** Jennifer Edwards (jenniferae@leeschools.net)

**By When:** October 25, 2023 February 28, 2023 April 24, 2023 Walkthroughs will occur throughout each quarter.

The fourth action step is to conduct quarterly data chats with students and with teachers to review any individual, school, district, and state data and to review strategies that are working and those that need improvement. At this time, we will also identify students not mastering standards and the specific plan for remediation and recheck that will be implemented.

**Person Responsible:** Kristin Bueno (kristintb@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Data chats will occur quarterly, by the end of the first three quarters. Week of October 17th  
Week of January 9th Week of March 25th

**#5. 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.

An understanding of core values and working together with a shared sense of ownership in setting and achieving goals supports positive culture. It also recognizes and encourages employees to use their strengths and value the strengths of others in a shared mission.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The school will retain eighty percent or more of the teachers for the 23-24 school-year.

**Monitoring:**

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

Quarterly staff surveys, monthly initiatives such as the happy cart, sunshine committee events, learning walks, mentoring, celebrations and collaborative team time will be utilized to support a sense of belonging, value, and achievement.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kristin Bueno (kristintb@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.)

High Reliability Schools quarterly surveys will be utilized to monitor level one, a safe and collaborative culture.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

As a level-1 certified high reliability school, we continue to support practices that support the foundation and well-being of the school, a safe and collaborative culture. The survey provides timely feedback to assist us in guiding or practices and support engagement and a safe feeling by all employees.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

### CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The School District of Lee County follows all state and federal guidelines when allocating school funding. The schools are budgeted in multi-faceted methods based on the student's needs. Initially, the schools are tiered based on the following criteria: student proficiency, learning gains, struggling schools, % of new teachers, % of ELL students, and percentage of ESE students for academic support and funding purposes. Content tiers are also established to provide instructional support resources based on individual student group needs. Within each school's Title I, SAI, and UniSIG plans, as appropriate, there is a requirement to address ESSA student groups through high-quality instruction and monitoring systems. School funding needs are addressed weekly throughout the school year in collaboration with principal supervisors and the budget department. Principal supervisors monitor student data and underperforming subgroups through monthly visits and data chats.

### Budget to Support Areas of Focus

#### Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

**The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.**

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	\$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>

#### Budget Approval

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

Yes