

The School District of Lee County

The Sanibel School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	32
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	32

The Sanibel School

3840 SANIBEL CAPTIVA RD, Sanibel, FL 33957

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of The Sanibel School is to provide a world class education, so that students reach their potential through hands-on exploration! We believe what happens here will soon change the world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Unite, Inspire, Empower!

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
Lusk, Jennifer	Principal	
Gurgal, Jill	Assistant Principal	
Bergamo, Dr. Gregory	Teacher, ESE	
Lear, Robin	Teacher, ESE	
Jack, Theresa	Other	
Healy, Patricia	Instructional Coach	
Scarnato, Barbara	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.

The SIP will be reviewed with the SAC committee during the first meeting of the school year. Input will be obtained from teachers and staff during team meetings in pre-school week. Speaking engagements such as Kiwanis, Rotary, and the Realtor's Association were scheduled to share information with community members. Parents were invited to a meet and greet during the summer to meet the new administration and hear goals for the upcoming school year. They were also offered the opportunity to provide input.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored through leadership team meetings and during weekly PLC meetings.

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)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	17%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	35%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) 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: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	5	3	1	5	2	2	3	2	6	29	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	0	0	3	5	23	27	23	82

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	91	45	53	84	48	55	89		
ELA Learning Gains				62			82		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				72			74		
Math Achievement*	81	48	55	89	37	42	90		
Math Learning Gains				72			79		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				71			81		
Science Achievement*	82	47	52	80	47	54	86		
Social Studies Achievement*	96	60	68	91	51	59	97		
Middle School Acceleration	50	77	70	50	42	51	78		
Graduation Rate		51	74		43	50			
College and Career Acceleration		33	53		66	70			
ELP Progress		47	55		69	70			

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	83
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	500
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	75
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	671
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	87			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	85			
FRL	80			

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	52			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	88			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	74			
FRL	78			

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	91			81			82	96	50			
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	100			73							2	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	90			82			80	95	60		6	
FRL	88			72							2	

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	84	62	72	89	72	71	80	91	50			
SWD	44	54		56	54							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	83			92								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	85	62	67	89	71	70	82	89	50			
FRL	74	78		85	78		73					

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	89	82	74	90	79	81	86	97	78			
SWD	56			58								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	80			90								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	90	85	78	91	78	83	88	97	84			
FRL	92	91		88	85							

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	87%	48%	39%	54%	33%
07	2023 - Spring	89%	44%	45%	47%	42%
08	2023 - Spring	76%	44%	32%	47%	29%
04	2023 - Spring	100%	56%	44%	58%	42%
06	2023 - Spring	97%	44%	53%	47%	50%
03	2023 - Spring	100%	42%	58%	50%	50%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	80%	52%	28%	54%	26%
07	2023 - Spring	89%	37%	52%	48%	41%
03	2023 - Spring	95%	55%	40%	59%	36%
04	2023 - Spring	100%	61%	39%	61%	39%
08	2023 - Spring	81%	60%	21%	55%	26%
05	2023 - Spring	70%	52%	18%	55%	15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	88%	43%	45%	44%	44%
05	2023 - Spring	74%	50%	24%	51%	23%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	60%	39%	21%	50%	10%

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

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	97%	59%	38%	66%	31%

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.

Middle School Acceleration showed the lowest performance and decline at 44%, which was a 6% decline from the 21-22 school year. Only 15 out of 18 possible students were enrolled into Algebra. Of these 15 students enrolled, only 9 passed the EOC. This resulted in the lower percentage. This trend can also be observed back to 21-22.

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

Overall math achievement showed the greatest decline from 89% to 82%. Specifically, 5th grade math decreased from 91% to 69% proficient. Hurricane Ian contributed to the decline in math achievement. Many students and staff were displaced due to the hurricane. The challenges of being displaced at home and at school contributed to this decline. In addition, math materials and manipulatives were not available. During the 23-24 school year, a math intervention teacher will be hired to support the math readiness and transition from elementary school to middle school.

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

Although Math Achievement was well above the district, many schools showed improvement while overall ours declined by 7%. Middle School Acceleration declined by 6% to 44% and was below the state average. Hurricane Ian contributed to the decline in achievement. Many students and staff were displaced due to the hurricane. In addition, math materials and manipulatives were not available. During the 22-23 school year, some 8th grade students were not scheduled into algebra leaving only 15 out of 18 students possible.

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

Overall, ELA Achievement showed the greatest improvement of 6% from 84% to 90%. The intervention specialist and primary specialist provided small group intervention. School-wide incentives, such as an AR party, were in place and are very motivating for students.

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

There are significantly more students with 2 or more indicators in the EWS compared to last year. Due to the impacts of Hurricane Ian, many more students were displaced and were absent. Because of this, one of our goals is to increase student enrollment and monitor students' absences to see how we as a school

could support their families. The principal has been in frequent communication with families regarding coming back to The Sanibel School and we will continue to support them.

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

Our highest priorities include Middle School Acceleration, Math Achievement, and increasing student enrollment.

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.

Because our middle school acceleration is at 44% which is below the state average, 7th grade math will be an area of focus in order to better prepare them for the Algebra EOC in the future. Currently, 89% of 7th grade students are proficient in math which increased from 81%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

According to 7th grade math FAST assessment, students at The Sanibel School will improve from 89% proficient to 90% proficient by the end of the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Students will be identified for tutoring based on exemplar and progress monitoring data. Intervention teacher will make weekly contact with families regarding missing/late assignments. She will track attendance for tutoring and review this with the leadership team. Students will be monitored using the district progress monitoring system and exemplars.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jill Gurgal (jillmg@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 yield instructional strategies are being utilized within the classroom. Our teacher incorporates visual representations within her lessons and differentiates according to students' needs. She often builds upon fact fluency foundational skills required in problem solving skills. Scaffolding is routinely done and exit tickets reinforce previously taught concepts. Intervention groups will be determined using exemplars and progress monitoring. Tutoring will be available before school on an as-needed basis. An additional math certified intervention teacher has been hired to provide targeted interventions. Weekly parent communication regarding missing/late assignments will be sent out. Small group instruction will be provided to ESE students as SWD were at 44% proficiency which is close to the ESSA target.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

FLDOE standards, statutory guidelines, district benchmarks, and instructional guides were adhered to when selecting the above strategies.

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.

Weekly PLC meetings each Wednesday - Within these meetings, we will review exemplar data, lesson planning with instructional guides, before-school tutoring attendance, and Connect with Lee.

Person Responsible: Jill Gurgal (jillmg@leeschools.net)

By When: Admin scheduled weekly PLC meetings with teachers each Wednesday..

Additional certified math teacher was hired to provide targeted interventions.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Lusk (jenniferllu@leeschools.net)

By When: July/August, pending HR

Before-School tutoring is scheduled with the math intervention teacher. She will not be assigned a daily morning duty in order to have availability to provide support and tutoring.

Person Responsible: Jill Gurgal (jillmg@leeschools.net)

By When: Master Schedule and Duty Schedule completed in July

#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.

In order to continue to build students' foundational skills, 2nd grade ELA proficiency was chosen as an area of focus.

Measurable Outcome:

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

2nd grade students at The Sanibel School will improve from 74% proficient to 80% proficient as measured by state progress monitoring by the end of the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Students will be identified based on progress monitoring and exemplar data with the help of the Primary Specialist. Students will be monitored using the district progress monitoring system and exemplars.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robin Lear (robinlle@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 Yield Instructional Strategies are utilized within all classrooms. A K-2 Literacy Coach will work closely with the 2nd grade teacher who is new to teaching 2nd grade. A scheduled school-wide ELA and intervention block is in place to allow for targeted support. Before-school tutoring is available on an as-needed basis. Volunteer Training will be held in order to provide in-class support to primary grades. Incentives include Million Word Reader and I-Ready (time-on-task and lessons passed) to improve motivation. Interventions provided by intervention support specialist based on students' needs. Small group instruction will be provided to ESE students as SWD were at 44% proficiency which is close to the ESSA target.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

FLDOE standards, statutory guidelines, district benchmarks, and instructional guides were adhered to when selecting the above strategies.

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.

Weekly PLC meetings to review exemplar data based on instructional guide
Leadership meetings with intervention support specialist and ESE resource teacher

Person Responsible: Jill Gurgal (jillmg@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly on Wednesdays

School-wide ELA block and intervention block are incorporated into the master schedule so that non-classroom teachers can push in and support where necessary. Special Area teachers will push in to 2nd grade in order to support during the intervention block. An additional intervention block was scheduled at the end of the day for additional support.

Person Responsible: Jill Gurgal (jillmg@leeschools.net)

By When: Master Schedule completed in July.

School-wide incentives for I-Ready and AR

Person Responsible: Jill Gurgal (jillmg@leeschools.net)

By When: Quarterly

Mentor teacher assigned to 2nd grade teacher who previously taught middle school. The K-2 literacy coach and media specialist will mentor her.

Person Responsible: Jill Gurgal (jillmg@leeschools.net)

By When: August, ongoing

#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.

In order to avoid the mandatory retention in 3rd grade and to continue to build on students' foundational skills, 3rd grade proficiency was chosen as an area of focus.

Measurable Outcome:

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

3rd grade students at The Sanibel School will maintain 100% proficiency as demonstrated by FAST Progress Monitoring by the end of the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Students will be monitored and identified for additional intervention/enrichment using the district progress monitoring system and exemplars.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robin Lear (robinlle@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 Yield Instructional Strategies are utilized within all classrooms. A scheduled school-wide ELA and intervention block is in place to allow for targeted support. Before-school tutoring is available on an as-needed basis. Volunteer Training will be held in order to provide in-class support to 3rd grade which currently has 32 students in the class. Incentives include Million Word Reader and I-Ready (time-on-task and lessons passed) to enrich and improve motivation. Interventions provided by intervention support specialist based on students' needs. Small group instruction will be provided to ESE students as SWD were at 44% proficiency which is close to the ESSA target.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

FLDOE standards, statutory guidelines, district benchmarks, and instructional guides were adhered to when selecting the above strategies.

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.

Weekly PLC meetings to review exemplar data based on instructional guides

Leadership meetings with intervention support specialist and ESE resource teacher

Person Responsible: Jill Gurgal (jillmg@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly PLC meetings Quarterly progress monitoring data review

School-wide ELA block and intervention block are incorporated into the master schedule so that non-classroom teachers can push in and support where necessary. An additional intervention block was scheduled at the end of the day for additional support.

Person Responsible: Jill Gurgal (jillmg@leeschools.net)

By When: Master Schedule Completed in July

School-wide incentives for I-Ready and AR

Person Responsible: Jill Gurgal (jillmg@leeschools.net)

By When: Quarterly

#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.

Because both 3rd and 4th grade students demonstrated 100% proficiency, we felt it was necessary to devote additional attention to 5th grade proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In order to improve ELA proficiency in grades 3-5, 5th grade students will improve from 87% proficient to 90% proficient while both 3rd-4th grade students will maintain 100% proficiency as demonstrated on the FAST Progress Monitoring by the end of the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Students will be monitored and identified for additional intervention/enrichment using the district progress monitoring system and exemplars.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robin Lear (robinlle@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 Yield Instructional Strategies are utilized within all classrooms. A scheduled school-wide ELA and intervention block is in place to allow for targeted support. Before-school tutoring is available on an as-needed basis. Volunteer Training will be held in order to provide in-class support to 3rd grade which currently has 32 students in the class. 5th grade class size is currently only 13 students which will allow for specific targeted interventions and small group instruction. Incentives include Million Word Reader and I-Ready (time-on-task and lessons passed) to enrich and improve motivation. Interventions provided by intervention support specialist based on students' needs. Small group instruction will be provided to ESE students as SWD were at 44% proficiency which is close to the ESSA target.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

FLDOE standards, statutory guidelines, district benchmarks, and instructional guides were adhered to when selecting the above strategies.

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.

Weekly PLC meetings to review exemplar data based on instructional guides

Leadership meetings with intervention support specialist and ESE resource teacher

Person Responsible: Jill Gurgal (jillmg@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly PLC meetings Quarterly progress monitoring data review

School-wide ELA block and intervention block are incorporated into the master schedule so that non-classroom teachers can push in and support where necessary. An additional intervention block was scheduled at the end of the day for additional support.

Person Responsible: Jill Gurgal (jillmg@leeschools.net)

By When: Master Schedule completed in July

School-wide incentives for I-Ready and AR.

Person Responsible: Jill Gurgal (jillmg@leeschools.net)

By When: Quarterly

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

ELA proficiency showed a steady decline from 6th through 8th grades.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students in 6th through 8th grades at The Sanibel School will improve from 87% proficient to 90% proficient as measured by FAST Progress Monitoring at the end of the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Students will be monitored and identified for additional intervention/enrichment using the district progress monitoring system and exemplars. Intervention teacher will send out weekly missing/late assignments to families. These students will be encouraged to attend morning tutoring for intervention or enrichment. Attendance at tutoring will be taken and reviewed with the leadership team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dr. Gregory Bergamo (gregoryjbe@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 Yield Instructional Strategies are utilized within all classrooms. Students who scored a Level 1 or 2 will automatically be enrolled in intensive reading. Global Perspectives will be offered to all middle school students. Before-school tutoring is available on an as-needed basis. Incentives include Million Word Reader and I-Ready (time-on-task and lessons passed) to enrich and improve motivation. Interventions provided by intervention support specialist based on students' needs. Small group instruction will be provided to ESE students as SWD were at 44% proficiency which is close to the ESSA target. Connect with Lee will be available as needed. Missing/Late assignment reports will be sent out weekly.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

FLDOE standards, statutory guidelines, district benchmarks, and instructional guides were adhered to when selecting the above strategies.

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.

Weekly PLC meetings to review exemplar data based on instructional guides

Leadership meetings with intervention support specialist and ESE resource teacher

Person Responsible: Jill Gurgal (jillmg@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly PLC meetings Quarterly progress monitoring data review

Mentoring period is scheduled each Monday for additional support and accountability for students. In addition, Peer Counseling will be scheduled for 6th grade students to increase responsibility, independence, and organization.

Person Responsible: Jill Gurgal (jillmg@leeschools.net)

By When: Master Schedule completed in July

All students in grades 6-8 will be scheduled into Global Perspectives in order to add a research-based enrichment for all students.

Person Responsible: Jill Gurgal (jillmg@leeschools.net)

By When: August

#6. 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.

Students at The Sanibel School demonstrated an improvement in 8th grade science proficiency and we would like to maintain that momentum.

Measurable Outcome:

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

8th grade students at The Sanibel School will improve proficiency from 88% to 90% as measured by state assessments by the end of the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Students will be monitored using the district progress monitoring system and exemplars.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

High Yield Instructional Strategies are utilized within all classrooms. STEM Teacher provides instruction to all students daily. Field trips are connected to science standards. Cross-curricular instruction occurs within Global Perspectives and is offered to all middle school students. Gifted teacher recently attended a week-long PD on science standards for enrichment. STEM teacher is working closely with community organizations to provide hands-on enrichment opportunities connected to science standards such as a "living wall." Cross-curricular instruction will also occur with the Home Economics teacher, also connected to science standards. Before-school tutoring is available on an as-needed basis. Connect with Lee will be available as needed. Missing/Late assignment reports will be sent out weekly.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

FLDOE standards, statutory guidelines, district benchmarks, and instructional guides were adhered to when selecting the above strategies.

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.

Weekly PLC meetings to review exemplar data based on instructional guides

Weekly parent communication regarding missing/late assignments

Person Responsible: Jill Gurgal (jillmg@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly PLC meetings Quarterly progress monitoring data review

Cross-curricular instruction between Global Perspectives and Science. All middle school students are scheduled into Global Perspectives.

Person Responsible: Jill Gurgal (jillmg@leeschools.net)

By When: August

Field Trips offered based on Science Standards

Person Responsible: Jill Gurgal (jillmg@leeschools.net)

By When: ongoing

Installation of Living Wall - STEM teacher is working with community organizations to install a "living wall" and will connect the process and its upkeep with science standards. Cross-curricular instruction will occur with the Home Economics teacher.

Person Responsible: Jill Gurgal (jillmg@leeschools.net)

By When: Process started in July, ongoing

#7. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**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.

Due to the effects of Hurricane Ian, student enrollment at The Sanibel School has decreased from approximately 280 students before the storm to 230 students for the 23-24 school year. In addition, significantly more students have 2 or more indicators as shown on the Early Warning System due to attendance and displacement due to the storm.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the conclusion of the 23-24 school year, student enrollment at The Sanibel School will increase from 230 students to 300 students as measured by FOCUS analytics data.

Monitoring:

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

Leadership Team will continue to monitor student enrollment via FOCUS.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Lusk (jenniferllu@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 Principal has increased community involvement and has scheduled speaking engagements with The Realtor's Association, Kiwanis Club, and Rotary Club. In addition, she has increased exposure through interviews with local news outlets and admin attended the Sanibel Partners Hurricane Preparedness Meeting. The new administrative team held a meet and greet with families and shared the top priorities this year and the goal to increase enrollment. Parents were interested in ways that they could help get the word out.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Now that The Sanibel School is listed on the school choice application, we want to make sure that the community is aware that as long as they agree to transport their child to our school that they are able to enroll their child.

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.

Parent meet and greet in order to review top priorities and meet the new administrative team

Person Responsible: Jennifer Lusk (jenniferllu@leeschools.net)

By When: Meet and Greet with new admin was held in July.

Speaking engagement with the Realtor's Association in order to inform parents of the availability of enrollment at The Sanibel School as long as they could provide transportation.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Lusk (jenniferllu@leeschools.net)

By When: August

Kiwanis and Rotary involvement by administration

Person Responsible: Jennifer Lusk (jenniferllu@leeschools.net)

By When: July, ongoing

#8. 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.

Middle School Acceleration is the only area that The Sanibel School was below the state average. Previously, due to parent requests and other reasons, 3 8th grade students were not scheduled into Algebra which may have resulted in a lower percentage since there were 18 possible students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

8th grade students at The Sanibel School will improve middle school acceleration from 44% to 70% as measured by the Algebra EOC at the end of the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Students will be identified for enrichment/tutoring based on exemplar and progress monitoring data. Math Intervention teacher will make weekly contact with families regarding missing/late assignments. She will track attendance for tutoring/enrichment and review this with the leadership team. Students will be monitored using the district progress monitoring system and exemplars.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jill Gurgal (jillmg@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 yield instructional strategies are being utilized within the classroom. Our teacher incorporates visual representations within her lessons and differentiates according to students' needs. She often builds upon fact fluency foundational skills required in problem solving skills. Scaffolding is routinely done and exit tickets reinforce previously taught concepts. Tutoring will be available before school on an as-needed basis. An additional math certified intervention teacher has been hired to provide targeted interventions and possible enrichment. Weekly parent communication regarding missing/late assignments will be sent out. All 8th grade students who scored a level 3 will be scheduled into Algebra.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In addition to providing enrichment and tutoring opportunities, by scheduling all Level 3s into Algebra, we will increase our chances of having a higher middle school acceleration score.

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.

Weekly PLC meetings each Wednesday - Within these meetings, we will review exemplar data, lesson planning with instructional guides, before-school tutoring attendance, and Connect with Lee.

Person Responsible: Jill Gurgal (jillmg@leeschools.net)

By When: Data will be reviewed weekly at PLC meetings. Lesson plans are submitted weekly.

All Level 3 students are scheduled into Algebra.

Person Responsible: Jill Gurgal (jillmg@leeschools.net)

By When: August

Additional certified math teacher was hired to provide targeted interventions and enrichment. She will be available for before-school tutoring and was not assigned a daily morning duty.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Lusk (jenniferllu@leeschools.net)

By When: July/August, pending HR

Weekly parent communication regarding missing/late assignments will occur. Administration will review this information with the Math Intervention teacher weekly during leadership meetings.

Person Responsible: Jill Gurgal (jillmg@leeschools.net)

By When: August, Weekly

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 % 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: 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: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
6	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00

7	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
8	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$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