

The School District of Lee County

# Tropic Isles Elementary 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>11</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>38</b>

## Tropic Isles Elementary School

5145 ORANGE GROVE BLVD, North Fort Myers, FL 33903

<http://trp.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.**

Impacting the World by creating Leaders, Learners, and Innovators.

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

To be a National Role Model for Academic Excellence.

### 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
Arana, Judy	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade Team Leader - Grade-Level Chair
Burch, Caroline	Teacher, K-12	4th Grade Team Leader - Grade-Level Chair
Matelski, MonaLisa	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade Team Leader - Grade-Level Chair
Hernandez, Sabrina	Teacher, K-12	2nd Grade Team Leader - Grade-Level Chair
Cady, Jen	Teacher, K-12	1st Grade Team Leader - Grade-Level Chair
Rutter, Sienna	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Team Leader - Grade-Level Chair
Bernhardt, Colleen	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach - K-2 Grades-Admin Team representative
Flecha, Rose	Behavior Specialist	SIP Coordinator, Behavior Specialist
Frankel, Ginny	Teacher, ESE	Speech Pathologist and ESE Team Leader - Chair
Hultz, Laura	Instructional Coach	Academic Coach grade 3rd-5th - Admin Team representative
Johnson, Jacqueline	Teacher, K-12	Intervention Support Specialist - Admin Team Representative
Lombardo, Lisa	Teacher, ESE	Intermediate Resource Teacher - supporting ELA and writing
Mazzoli, Robert	Principal	Principal - Daily operations, instructional leader
Puzder, Kristin	Science Coach	Intermediate Resource Teacher - Science support
Tracy, Doug	Math Coach	Intermediate resource Teacher - math support
Schaal, Shannon	Assistant Principal	

### 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 process for involving all stakeholders takes into account the need to address the ABC's, Attendance, Behavior and Academic Success.

Tropic Isles addresses these areas by using a Student Support Services team, which includes our school guidance counselor, school social worker, MTSS Intervention Specialist, Behavior Specialist and Academic Coach. In addition, parents and local community partners are also included as stakeholders. We connect with these individuals through our Parent Involvement Specialist. The following parents and community businesses are partnered with Tropic Isles Elementary:

- \*Blessings in a Backpack gives us the weekend food bags for students.
- \*Big Brother Big Sisters has a Reading Bigs program for students.
- \*The Counsel of Catholic Women from Saint Therese Church provides school supplies
- \*Parent - Greg Callen donates shoes for students during the year.
- \*Pfit donates Christmas gifts
- \*WaWa Gas Station donate free donut coupons
- \*Harry Chapin Food Bank will be our school food pantry during the 2023-2024 school year
- \*Dominos pizza gives certificates for perfect attendance initiatives.
- \*All Ears Program - therapy dogs reading with children
- \*On Campus Clothe and Food Pantry

\*Parents and businesses are contacted by the Parent Involvement Specialist and they are asked how they can help support students at our school to meet schoolwide initiatives in the areas of attendance, behaviors and academic success. They are made aware of how their contributions and supports help meet a schoolwide improvement towards these areas.

\*School Advisory Committee is presented with School Improvement Plan at the beginning of the year for collaboration.

### **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))

Weekly meetings are held at Tropic Isles Elementary with the student support services team to discuss the effectiveness and continuation of the partnerships with all stakeholders, parent and community businesses.

School Improvement Plan is monitored by continuous analysis of goals within grade levels during weekly PLC's. Schoolwide goals are displayed, along with grade level goals. After progress monitoring PM1, PM2 and PM3, goals are reviewed and comparisons are displayed in PLC/Data Room. Revision of goals are done by grade level. Schoolwide goals are reviewed and targeted students are identified after each PM1, PM2, PM3.

School Advisory Committee collaborates and is given opportunities to share concerns with school function and has the opportunity to give ideas on how to support school for student achievement.

### **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)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	Yes
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	56%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	100%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	Yes
<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) 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: C  2018-19: C  2017-18: C
<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	15	39	35	43	19	33	0	0	0	184	
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	5	4	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	26	3	14	4	16	0	0	0	63	
Course failure in Math	0	18	3	5	6	7	0	0	0	39	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	22	25	0	0	0	61	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	13	16	28	0	0	0	57	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	18	4	17	15	27	0	0	0	81

**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	1	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	2	0	3	6	1	0	0	0	12

### 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	15	39	35	43	19	33	0	0	0	184
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	5	4	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	26	3	14	4	16	0	0	0	63
Course failure in Math	0	18	3	5	6	7	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	22	25	0	0	0	61
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	13	16	28	0	0	0	57
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	18	4	17	15	27	0	0	0	81

**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	14	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	2	0	3	6	1	0	0	0	12

### 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	15	39	35	43	19	33	0	0	0	184	
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	5	4	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in ELA	0	26	3	14	4	16	0	0	0	63	
Course failure in Math	0	18	3	5	6	7	0	0	0	39	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	22	25	0	0	0	61	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	13	16	28	0	0	0	57	
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	18	4	17	15	27	0	0	0	81

**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	14	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	2	0	3	6	1	0	0	0	12

## 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*	47	48	53	48	52	56	42		
ELA Learning Gains				64			43		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46			48		
Math Achievement*	56	57	59	55	45	50	44		
Math Learning Gains				65			46		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51			50		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	50	53	54	44	59	59	34		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	62	51	59	54			65		

\* 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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	261
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	427
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**

<b>2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY</b>				
<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	22	Yes	4	1
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	49			
MUL	40	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	52			

<b>2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY</b>				
<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	33	Yes	3	
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	1	
HSP	52			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	52			

**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	47			56			50					62
SWD	11			19			12				5	64
ELL	33			47			38				5	62
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35			47							2	
HSP	42			56			45				5	61
MUL	33			47							2	
PAC												
WHT	53			59			53				4	
FRL	46			56			48				5	67

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	48	64	46	55	65	51	44					54
SWD	16	39	33	20	42	41	8					64
ELL	40	53	43	50	79	79	24					54
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33	57		38	43		21					
HSP	45	60	42	54	65	58	38					55
MUL	50	64		50	55							
PAC												
WHT	54	67	58	59	70	59	55					
FRL	45	63	52	50	61	51	45					52

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	42	43	48	44	46	50	34					65
SWD	7	30	45	16	43	46	15					
ELL	33	41		45	50		29					65

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	43	67		35	67		43					
HSP	36	42	47	42	44	42	26					63
MUL	47			53								
PAC												
WHT	46	37		46	48		37					
FRL	37	41	50	40	41	45	25					58

### 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	42%	48%	-6%	54%	-12%
04	2023 - Spring	61%	56%	5%	58%	3%
03	2023 - Spring	43%	42%	1%	50%	-7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	58%	55%	3%	59%	-1%
04	2023 - Spring	70%	61%	9%	61%	9%
05	2023 - Spring	45%	52%	-7%	55%	-10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	42%	50%	-8%	51%	-9%

### 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.**

Primary grades K and 1 showed low proficiency overall in ELA, with K showing 46% proficiency, 1st showing 37% proficiency. Based on 22-23 data, the data component that showed the lowest performance was in our primary grade, 1st grade at 37% proficiency. First grade shows the lowest proficiency performance and is 18% points below the district proficiency. A goal will be written to address this group of students moving into 2nd grade. In addition, data from EWS, 1st grade also showed the highest number of ELA course failures with 26 students.

Factors with last year's performance in part are due to Hurricane Ian impacting families across the district. Nonetheless, 1st grade showed the highest student absenteeism. Based on the Early Warning Systems, 39-1st graders were absent 10% or more days. Teacher effectiveness with using high yield strategies and rigor in lessons was an ongoing coaching piece within the 1st grade level team.

Students with Disabilities Subgroup category continues to be our lowest performing subgroup over the past 3 years for both ELA and Math. Trend data for Students with Disabilities continue to be a large portion of our L25 population. We will create goals for subgroups Students with Disabilities.

ELA Achievement - SWD Subgroup Math Achievement - SWD Subgroup

2018-2019: 10% 2018-2019: 13%

2020-2021: 7% 2020-2021: 16%

2021-2022: 16% 2021-2022: 20%

Factors for students with disabilities continue to show fluctuating achievements and remain the lowest performing subgroup. Due to teacher absences, many times ESE Resource teachers filled in for not being able to acquire substitutes throughout the year. It became a challenge to provide more frequent direct instruction for SWD who needed more help with foundational skills.

In addition, subgroups for Black/African American students showed low proficiency 2 years in a row with 38%.

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

The data trend that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was 1st grade with a drop to 37% proficiency.

Contributing factors for last year's performance in part are due to Hurricane Ian impacting families across the district. Nonetheless, 1st grade showed the highest student absenteeism. Based on the Early Warning Systems, 39-1st graders were absent 10% or more days. Teacher effectiveness with using high yield strategies and rigor in lessons was an ongoing coaching need within the 1st grade level team.

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

The data component that had the greatest gap compared to the state average was 1st grade with 37%. The district average was 55% proficiency.

Based on the Early Warning Systems, 39-1st graders were absent 10% or more days. Teacher effectiveness with using high yield strategies and rigor in lessons was an ongoing coaching need within the 1st grade level team.

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

The data component that showed the most improvements were ELA proficiencies in grades 3-5 with overall achievements in ELA, Math and Science.

ELA Overall Achievement:

2021-2022: 48%

2022-2023: 52% ^4%

Math Overall Achievement:

2021-2022: 55%

2022-2023: 62% ^7%

Science Overall Achievement:

2021-2022: 44%

2022-2023: 51% ^7%

New actions taken were:

ELA - Data analysis was a focus during PLC's. Consistent systems for data collection, lesson planning and intervention were used throughout the year. An emphasis during PLC's was the use of the instructional guides and pacing guides. Data walls and data chats were a schoolwide expectation. PLC focus for progress monitoring required strategic intervention groups being created. A focus on differentiation was part of grade level planning. Teachers were given 2 half-days and provided additional paid time to backwards design as a team. I-Ready progress monitoring targeted small groups being identified and direct small group instruction was provided by resource teachers and academic coaches.

Math - Reflex Math was made a schoolwide expectation and both students and teachers were incentivized for making weekly goals. Weekly challenges were done across grade levels and teachers and students were rewarded on the weekly news. Targeted small groups were identified and Math resource teacher increased push-in supports and small groups for individualized skill based instruction.

Science - STEM Teacher was rotated into classes and was fluid with planning with 5th grade. Science rotation with Science teacher was part of specials rotation.

ELL subgroup had 15 students test out of WIDA this year. Although we have had an increase of monolingual enrollment, there has been positive trends with use of Imagine Learning.

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

Area of concern based on Early Warning System is student absenteeism.

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

Highest priorities for school improvement this upcoming year are:

\*Attendance

\*Continuous increase in student academic achievement from Level 2 (bubble kids) to Level 3 Proficiency in ELA and Math

- \*Teacher effectiveness with using High Yield Strategies and Rigor
- \*Schoolwide Culture
- \*Relationship Building

**Area of Focus**

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

## #1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Students with Disabilities Subgroup category continues to be our lowest performing subgroup over the past 3 years for both ELA and Math. Trend data for Students with Disabilities continue to be a large portion of our L25 population. We will create goals for subgroups Students with Disabilities.

#### ELA Achievement - SWD Subgroup

2018-2019: 10%

2020-2021: 7%

2021-2022: 16%

#### Math Achievement - SWD Subgroup

2018-2019: 13%

2020-2021: 16%

2021-2022: 20%

### Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on the trend data for Students with disabilities subgroup at 20% proficient, SWD will increase to 30% proficient as demonstrated by 2024 Spring PM3 FAST ELA data.

### Monitoring:

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

Monitored through iReady Diagnostic Progress Monitoring

Grade Level PLC Meetings

Specific data collection in correlation to IEP goals and progress reports

ESE Resource Teachers pushing in as Co-Teaching

ESE Resource Teachers pull-out to provide direct instruction of foundational skills

Continual data chats with students

Ongoing fluidity of small groups that target foundational skills to close the gap

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ginny Frankel (virginiaef@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.)

Really Great Reading implemented with fidelity in grades K-2

iReady implemented with fidelity in grades K-5

Interventions to close the learning gaps to provide instruction on missing foundational skills in Reading

Mindplay implemented with fidelity

Professional development of High Yield Strategies

Resource teacher providing interventions to all SWD

Resource teachers providing differentiation strategies to teachers

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

\*Really Great Reading closes the gaps in missing foundational skills of students.

\*iReady Reading monitors progress for specific skills and creates individualized learning paths. It creates goals and stretch goals for students to reach proficiency.

\*High Yield Strategies are research based practices linked to increase student achievement. High Yield strategies increase teacher instructional competence.

\*Mindplay emphasizes the mastery of basic reading skills to support the development of reading fluency.

\*Use of resource teachers helps to individualize the lessons in the Instructional Guides.

### **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.

\*Continue to monitor data in PLC meetings with administration

\*ESE Resource teacher to be involved in PLC meetings to review and analyze data together with grade level teachers

\*Quarterly Data chats with students, teachers and administration so that students are focused on making progress

\*Students to take ownership of individual progress and track data in the classroom on data walls and data binders

\*Provide Professional Development to teachers as needed

\*Implement High Yield Strategies according to Marzano

\*ESE Resource teacher support differentiation in the classroom with SWD and collaborate to create lessons to target foundational skills to close the gap in Reading

**Person Responsible:** Ginny Frankel (virginiaef@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Spring of 2024

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

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

According to Spring 2023 STAR ELA PM3 Data shows 2nd grade was at 57% proficiency.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

During the 2022-2023 School year, 57% of students in 2nd grade showed proficiency in ELA. During the 2023-2024 school year, 2nd grade proficiency in ELA will increase to 61% as measured by FAST PM 3.

**Monitoring:**

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

- \*Monthly Grade Level PLC's with Admin Strategic Team
- \*Data chats with Admin with both teachers and students
- \*iReady Diagnostic Progress Monitoring, continuous use of data dashboards
- \*Continuous Data Analysis that involves students monitoring their own progress- data walls and binders
- \*Resources teachers pushing into classrooms and collaborating in the data chat process with students

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Robert Mazzoli (robertwm@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.)

- \*Really Great Reading in grades K-2
- \*iReady Reading implemented with fidelity in grades K-2 and 3-5
- \*Professional Development in High Yield Strategies
- \* Instructional Rounds focusing on instructional coaching cycles

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

- \*Really Great Reading closes the gaps in missing foundational skills of students.
- \*iReady Reading monitors progress for specific skills and creates individualized learning paths. It creates goals and stretch goals for students to reach proficiency.
- \*High Yield Strategies are research based practices linked to increase student achievement. High Yield strategies increase teacher instructional competence.

**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.

- \*Provide Professional Development in High Yield Strategies to teachers
- \*Utilize the coaching model for teachers in need of strengthening differentiation of content areas in Reading

- \*Monitor the Implementation of High Yield Strategies
- \*Strengthen systems in analyzing diagnostic data during PLC's
- \*Collaborate with MTSS Intervention Specialist in forming Tier 2 and Tier 3 small groups
- \*Continue with after school tutoring program with primary grades
- \*Strengthen backwards design during planning and utilize the PDSA cycle during PLC's

**Person Responsible:** Colleen Bernhardt (colleenmbe@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Spring 2024

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

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

According to the Sprint FAST PM3 data shows 52% of students in 3rd-5th grade showed proficiency in ELA. Although there was an increase of 4% points from previous year, it continues to be an area of focus as we want to increase proficiency within all subgroups.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

During the 2022-2023 School year, 52% of students in 3rd-5th grade showed proficiency in ELA. During the 2023-2024 school year, 3rd-5th grade proficiency in ELA will increase to 56% as measured by FAST PM 3.

**Monitoring:**

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

- \*Progress Monitoring will be ongoing throughout the year to ensure students are making gains.
- \*Weekly PLC's will focus on backwards design structure and the PDSA cycle will be a focus to keep consistent. \*Administration, Resource and Literacy Coaches will strengthen the data analysis piece, planning for intervention for students.
- \*Data dashboards will maintain accurate and up to date information to make decisions with intervention groups during PLC meetings.
- \*Shared google drives will have up to date progress monitoring and data walls in classrooms will be up to date for students to see progress consistently.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Laura Hultz (laurame@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.)

- \*Really Great Reading in grades K-2
- \*iReady Reading implemented with fidelity in grades K-2 and 3-5
- \*Professional Development in High Yield Strategies
- \* Instructional Rounds focusing on instructional coaching cycles

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

- \*Really Great Reading closes the gaps in missing foundational skills of students.
- \*iReady Reading monitors progress for specific skills and creates individualized learning paths. It creates goals and stretch goals for students to reach proficiency.
- \*High Yield Strategies are research based practices linked to increase student achievement. High Yield strategies increase teacher instructional competence.

**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.

- \*i-Ready Progress Monitoring
- \*Provide PD on High Yield Strategies
- \*Analyze data using systems, such as double bubble maps during weekly PLC's
- \*Use vertical alignment and benchmark alignment when lesson planning
- \*Use of curriculum maps and Instructional Guides to strengthen the differentiation in lessons needed to close gaps in foundational skills
- \*Work with 3-5 Literacy Coach to form small groups in Tier 2 and Tier 3 students
- \*Work with resource teachers to push in during centers and intervention groups for students in L25
- \*Create a culture of coaching and utilize coaches to model strategies.

**Person Responsible:** Laura Hultz (laurame@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Spring 2024

**#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.

According to the 2022-2023 ESSA Subgroup data, Black/African American subgroup increased from 33% ELA Achievement to 38%. Nonetheless, this is still below the 41% of students making proficiency 2 consecutive years.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Tropic Isles will increase the percentage of BLK students making gains from 38% to 43% proficiency in ELA as measured by the PM 3 ELA FAST results in the Sprint of 2024

**Monitoring:**

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

Tropic Isles will use iReady baseline data, have data chats with students and teachers, use data walls for consistent reflection of progress and use Spring PM 3 FAST for results.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Shannon Schaal (shannonsc@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.)

- \*iReady Progress Monitoring
- \*High Yield Instructional Strategies
- \*Kagan strategies to increase engagement
- \*PBIS to incentivize academic success and progress in foundational skills

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

- \*iReady Reading monitors progress for specific skills and creates individualized learning paths. It creates goals and stretch goals for students to reach proficiency.
- \*High Yield Strategies are research based practices linked to increase student achievement. High Yield strategies increase teacher instructional competence.
- \*Kagan strategies are research based practices to allow students to engage in their learning and participate in the classroom.
- \*PBIS is a Positive Behavior Intervention of Supports to establish positive behaviors and reward good behaviors and success within the classroom.

**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.

- \*i-Ready Progress Monitoring
- \*Provide PD on High Yield Strategies
- \*Analyze data using systems, such as double bubble maps during weekly PLC's
- \*Use vertical alignment and benchmark alignment when lesson planning
- \*Use of curriculum maps and Instructional Guides to strengthen the differentiation in lessons needed to close gaps in foundational skills
- \*Work with resource teachers to push in during centers and intervention groups for students in L25
- \*Provide teachers PD with Kagan structures and utilize coaches to model strategies.
- \*Reward students making progress using PBIS.

**Person Responsible:** [no one identified]

**By When:** Spring 2024

**#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.

Tropic Isles Elementary is implementing Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports schoolwide. The desire is to create an environment and culture of kindness, caring and mutual respect. The goal is to stop undesirable behaviors and teach new positive behaviors. Tropic Isles prides itself on it's STAR core values of Safety, Taking Responsibility, Active Learning and Respecting Others. A focus area this year amongst staff is to strengthen positive talk amongst colleagues and become solution minded problem solvers. As Principal, my personal mission is to foster a positive school culture centered around collaboration, support, professionalism and mutual respect.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

During the 2023-2024 school year, 90% of the staff will demonstrate a 100% positive satisfaction rate as measured by a climate survey by May of 2024.

**Monitoring:**

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

- \*we will conduct 3 climate surveys at the end of each quarter
- \*open door policy
- \*Assistant Principal will conduct meetings with staff to get acquainted during the first month of school.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Robert Mazzoli (robertwm@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.)

- \*Begin staff meetings with rewarding each other with "SeaStars"
- \*Use surveys monthly to address the climate of the school
- \*Have "circles" as a way to solve any problems that arise
- \*Staff will give each other kuddos
- \*PBIS will incentivize staff for showing acts of kindness, such as using Kuddos
- \*Display the "WHY" inside classrooms and on doors
- \*House Team Challenges

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Building a positive climate will enhance the culture of the school which in turn will positively impact student achievement.

**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.

- \*Kudos are written from FOCUS, Admin acknowledges teachers receiving \*Kuddos and rewards behavior
- \*Teachers are acknowledged on the news
- \*Provide teachers with surveys to share their climate as the year progresses
- \*Have an open door policy with administration
- \*PBIS Team organizes prizes and rewards for teachers
- \*Principal parties to reward students reaching satisfactory personal development, having excellent attendance and progressing academically
- \*PTO supports Tropic Isles with providing fundraising, supporting school events and supporting teachers.
- \*SAC meets quarterly to support academics and curriculum.
- \*Stakeholders have opportunities to express concerns with school progress and make suggestions to improve student achievement

**Person Responsible:** Robert Mazzoli (robertwm@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Spring 2024

**#6. 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.

According to Spring 2023 STAR PM3, 3rd grade students showed 46% Proficiency in ELA.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

During the 2022-2023 school year, 46% of 3rd grade students were proficient in ELA. During the 2023-2024 school year, 3rd grade proficiency in ELA will increase to 54% proficiency as measured by FAST PM3.

**Monitoring:**

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

- \*Progress Monitoring will be ongoing throughout the year to ensure students are making gains.
- \*Weekly PLC's will focus on backwards design structure and the PDSA cycle will be a focus to keep consistent. \*Administration, Resource and Literacy Coaches will strengthen the data analysis piece, planning for intervention for students.
- \*Data dashboards will maintain accurate and up to date information to make decisions with intervention groups during PLC meetings.
- \*Shared google drives will have up to date progress monitoring and data walls in classrooms will be up to date for students to see progress consistently.
- \*3-5 Academic coach will work with 3rd Grade Tier 2 and Tier 3 and closely monitor fluidity of students in small groups and centers in the classroom with differentiation that targets foundations skills to close gaps
- \*Strategic Star Team to check lesson planning fidelity and make sure teams are working together for the entire grade level

**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.)

- \*iReady Reading implemented with fidelity in grades 3-5
- \*Professional Development in High Yield Strategies
- \*Strategic Tier 2 and 3 Interventions that are fluid based on skills needed, for example Walk to Read
- \*Resource push-in for academic supports
- \*Resource pull-out for intensive direct instruction of foundational skills

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

- \*iReady Reading monitors progress for specific skills and creates individualized learning paths. It creates goals and stretch goals for students to reach proficiency.
- \*High Yield Strategies are research based practices linked to increase student achievement. High Yield strategies increase teacher instructional competence.
- \*Push in supports is an effective Tier of supports for small group or centers rotation to target specific skills
- \*Pull-out for direct instruction is an effective Tier of support for foundational skills and students well below on grade level reading skills

**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.

- \*i-Ready Progress Monitoring
- \*Provide PD on High Yield Strategies
- \*Analyze data using systems, such as double bubble maps during weekly PLC's
- \*Use vertical alignment and benchmark alignment when lesson planning
- \*Use of curriculum maps and Instructional Guides to strengthen the differentiation in lessons needed to close gaps in foundational skills
- \*Work with 3-5 Literacy Coach to form small groups in Tier 2 and Tier 3 students
- \*Work with resource teachers to push in during centers and intervention groups for students in L25
- \*Work with resource teachers to pull-out or walk to read for direction instruction and support students below grade level in Reading.
- \*Create a culture of coaching and utilize coaches to model strategies.

**Person Responsible:** Laura Hultz (laurame@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Spring 2024

### CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

The School District of Lee County follows all state and federal guidelines when allocating funding to schools. The schools are budgeted in multi-faceted methods based on the student needs. Initially the schools are tiered based on the following criteria: student proficiency, learning gains, struggling schools, % of new teachers, % of ELL students, % of ESE students for academic support and for funding purposes.

Content tiers are also established to provide instructional support resources based on individual student group needs. Within each school's Title I, SAI, and UniSIG plans as appropriate there is a requirement to address ESSA student groups through high quality instruction and monitoring systems.

School funding needs are addressed weekly throughout the school year in collaboration with principal supervisors and the budget department. Ongoing monitoring of student data and underperforming subgroups is provided through monthly visits and data chats by principal supervisors.

### Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

### Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Area of Focus for K-2 Reading/ELA will be addressing Phonics and Phonemic Awareness.

Data shows that Kindergarten had 49% of students below the 40th percentile.

Data shows that 1st grade had 62% of students below the 40th percentile

Data shows that 2nd grade had 40% of students below the 40th percentile.

Each grade moving up shows the need for intensive intervention in the area of Phonics and Phonemic Awareness. These students are on track to score below a 3 on standardized ELA Assessments. After 2023-2024 FAST PM1 Progress Monitoring it was identified that intervention groups would be formed to address phonics.

Systems that will be put in place:

Continuous progress monitoring using i-Ready learning paths

Weekly PLC meetings to discuss student progress

Backwards Design Planning

Vertical Alignment

High Yield Strategies and Rigor

Literacy Walks and Collaborative Planning

Board Configurations

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

Area of Focus for 3-5 Reading/ELA will be addressing an intensive need for Phonemic Awareness and Decoding Skills.

Data shows that 3rd grade had 55% of students below the Level 3 Proficiency.

Data shows that 4th grade had 40% of students below the Level 3 Proficiency.

Data shows that 5th grade had 53% of students below the Level 3 Proficiency.

These students are on track to score below a 3 on standardized ELA Assessments. After 2023-2024 FAST PM1 Progress Monitoring it was identified that intervention groups would be formed to address Phonics.

Systems that will be put in place:

Continuous progress monitoring using i-Ready learning paths  
Weekly PLC meetings to discuss student progress  
Backwards Design Planning  
Vertical Alignment  
High Yield Strategies and Rigor  
Literacy Walks and Collaborative Planning  
Board Configuration

### Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

### Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Grade 1 will increase students not on track to score a level 3 on statewide ELA Assessments from 62% below to 40% as determined by the STAR PM3.

### Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Grade 3 will increase students not on track to score a level 3 proficiency on statewide ELA Assessments from 55% below to 40% as determined by FAST PM3.

Grade 5 will increase students not on track to score a level 3 proficiency on statewide ELA Assessments from 53% below to 40% as determined by FAST PM3.

### Monitoring

#### Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

1st Grade:

Area of focus will be monitored using FAST PM, I-Ready Diagnostics and Growth Monitoring and Exemplars.

#### Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Mazzoli, Robert, robertwm@leeschools.net

### Evidence-based Practices/Programs

**Description:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term “evidence-based” means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida’s definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Evidence Based Practices and Programs implemented will be:

These practices and programs align with the Districts K-12 Comprehensive Evidence Based Reading Plan.

These practices and programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards.

**Rationale:**

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

These programs along with the systems and processes in place will address the identified needs for these students.

These programs show proven record of the effectiveness of the target population.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school’s Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Action Step 1 - Utilize PLC and analyze the data from PM1 as a team. Target how to form groups by using both progress monitoring results from PM1 results and formative classroom assessments so far in Quarter 1. Assign target students to grade level teachers, resource and coaches.	
Action Step 2 - Provide evidence based interventions using research based curriculum.	
Action Step 3 - Progress monitor groups within the intervention cycles.	Hultz, Laura, laurame@leeschools.net
Action Step 4 - Utilize data chats, double bubble graphs and identify "L25's and bubble kids" strategically.	
Action Step 5 - Target smaller groups of students and hold data chats with them. Formulate short term goals with those students and meet weekly.	

## Title I Requirements

### Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))**  
List the school's webpage\* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Schoolwide Improvement Plan will be created using the Florida CIMS website. This will allow for our completed SIP to be made available publicly and parents can request a copy from the schools front office in their preferred language after publication.

On August 8, 2023, Tropic Isles will have the SIP reviewed by Academic Services and Title I Departments.

On or before October 6, 2023 the School Advisory Council will present, review and request feedback on the SIP and budget. Meeting minutes will be uploaded into the schools Title I Crate and FY24 School document folder in the google team drive.

On Oct. 17, 2023, The Lee County School Board will approve publication and dissemination.

Tropic Isles will review Annual School Improvement Assurances, complete and submit School Advisory Council membership List 2023-2024 Nomination and Election Process Verification on or before Nov. 1, 2023, in the google drive FY24 School Document Folder.

The SIP for Tropic Isles Elementary will also be available on the school website,  
<https://trp.leeschools.net>

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.**

List the school's webpage\* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The Family Engagement Plan for Tropic Isles Elementary will be made public on our website, <https://trp.leeschools.net>

#### Parent and Family Engagement Plan

In support of strengthening student academic achievement, Tropic Isles, receives Title I, Part A funds and therefore must jointly develop with, agree on with, and distribute to parents and family members of participating children a written parent and family engagement policy that contains information required by section 1116(b) and (c) of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). The policy establishes the school's expectations for parent and family engagement and describes how the school will implement a number of specific parent and family engagement activities, and it is incorporated into the school's plan submitted to the local educational agency (LEA).

Tropic Isles recognizes the enormous importance of increasing parental and family engagement in raising student achievement at all levels. To accomplish this and to determine the needs and barriers of our parents, schools, the PFEP team analyzes the current building capacity activities, compares participation numbers, and addresses the barriers that limit parent participation. These barriers include lack of transportation to meetings, inability to leave work, custody battles within households, and language barriers.

In addition, since we are a Title I school, we complete the Florida DOE template for the Parent and Family Educational Plan (PFEP). School data is reported to the district to become part of the District PFEP Evaluation and goal setting process. School baseline data sources, for example, include number of volunteers and volunteer service hours, become the guiding force to annual evaluation and improvement of the school's parent involvement program to enhance student achievement for the upcoming school year.

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

**Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)**

Tropic Isles plans to strengthen the academic programs by:

- Effectively tracking and documenting student progress
- Strengthening the Professional Learning Communities
- Professional Development opportunities
- Create a coaching culture
- Explain Walk-Through's and their purpose

Tropic Isles plans to strengthen the amount and quality of learning time by:

- Create a core team that represents various factions of the school
- Meet weekly to debrief and discuss future strategies and plans

- Analysis of school/student data
- Attend professional development together to grow professionally
- Build in time for teachers and staff to collaborate regarding instruction (In addition to allotted planning time)
- Building relationships
- Survey and interview staff to collect input regarding school's social and academic environment

Tropic Isles will help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum by:

- Supporting new teachers
- Intervene with struggling teachers via a peer in a non-evaluative environment
- Be actively involved in academic meetings
- Model lessons
- Sustainable systems and documentation
- Provide academic support to both enrich and remediate students

**If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))**

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

Title I, Part A coordinates with Title I, Part C to provide expanded academic enrichment opportunities to Migrant students. Services include: tutorials in Reading and Math, Health Services, and Literacy Workshops for parents because of the coordination of these funds.

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

### **Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan**

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

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

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

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

use, and other topics.

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

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

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

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

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

They work with site-based personnel to implement the tiered approach that includes:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	\$0.00

5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
6	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

### Budget Approval

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

No