Villas Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Villas Elementary School

8385 BEACON BLVD, Fort Myers, FL 33907

http://vls.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.

Villas' mission is to encourage all children to achieve personal success by establishing a community of P.R.I.D.E

Provide the school's vision statement.

Villas' vision is to be a supportive learning environment that focuses on student successes in and beyond the classroom.

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
Musich, Shane	Principal	The Principal serves as leader of the school in relation to instruction, management, and operations. The Principal and admin designees also attend weekly PLC meetings and report back to the members of the leadership team.
Sanders, Tiffany	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal supports the Principal in the instruction, management, and operations. The Assistant Principal and admin designees also attend weekly PLC meetings and report back to the members of the leadership team.

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.

Stakeholders are involved through surveys and monthly Leadership, SAC, and staff meetings where feedback was solicited during the 2022-2023 school year which helped in the development of the SIP. Community partnerships and Title I outreach opportunities occurred throughout the 2022-2023 which impacted the planning of the SIP for the upcoming school year.

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))

School leadership team will meet on a regular basis to monitor and disaggregate data, which will in turn be disseminated during grade level PLC meetings and individual teacher data chats. This data review will serve as a point of collaboration to align instructional practices and resources, rendering a fluid means for ensuring students are receiving data driven instruction.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	87%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	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) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	13	51	29	49	26	23	0	0	0	191
One or more suspensions	0	2	5	5	6	6	0	0	0	24
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	25	12	12	18	12	0	0	0	79
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	47	37	0	0	0	89
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	58	37	41	0	0	0	136
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	52	33	41	0	0	0	126
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	16	8	7	32	25	0	0	0	88

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	3	0	5	0	1	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	2	3	7	0	0	0	13

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	25	36	37	33	13	23	0	0	0	167
One or more suspensions	0	0	8	1	0	8	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	6	16	16	2	3	0	0	0	43
Course failure in Math	0	6	13	12	5	3	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	23	18	38	0	0	0	79
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	20	19	29	0	0	0	68
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	5	11	21	9	27	0	0	0	73

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	24	0	1	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	2	2	28	13	22	0	0	0	67

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	25	36	37	33	13	23	0	0	0	167
One or more suspensions	0	0	8	1	0	8	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	6	16	16	2	3	0	0	0	43
Course failure in Math	0	6	13	12	5	3	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	23	18	38	0	0	0	79
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	20	19	29	0	0	0	68
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	5	11	21	9	27	0	0	0	73

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	24	0	1	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	2	2	28	13	22	0	0	0	67

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*	42	48	53	40	52	56	48		
ELA Learning Gains				55			53		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43			47		
Math Achievement*	51	57	59	49	45	50	46		
Math Learning Gains				67			54		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64			47		
Science Achievement*	48	53	54	39	59	59	34		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	49	51	59	47			41		

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	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	229
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	404
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	26	Yes	1	1
ELL	36	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	32	Yes	1	
HSP	44			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	43			

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	42			
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	45			
HSP	50			

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%
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	51			

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	42			51			48					49
SWD	23			27			30				5	30
ELL	28			47			27				5	49
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	34			32			44				4	
HSP	40			51			44				5	48
MUL	60			67							2	
PAC												
WHT	56			58			53				4	
FRL	38			49			41				5	49

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	40	55	43	49	67	64	39					47
SWD	19	46	50	33	59	68	21					36
ELL	21	49	52	33	59	71	21					47
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	44	44		37	46	55	44					
HSP	34	56	48	47	69	68	33					48
MUL	50	45		64	64							
PAC												
WHT	59	65		64	84		75					
FRL	37	56	45	47	68	62	45					50

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	48	53	47	46	54	47	34					41
SWD	24	39	27	29	52	47	17					24
ELL	35	51	45	47	59	47	26					41
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	46	52		43	35		44					
HSP	43	49	48	44	57	42	30					41
MUL	59			41								
PAC												
WHT	68	68		67	74		47					
FRL	42	45	43	41	50	50	28					35

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	46%	48%	-2%	54%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	50%	56%	-6%	58%	-8%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	36%	42%	-6%	50%	-14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	51%	55%	-4%	59%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	56%	61%	-5%	61%	-5%
05	2023 - Spring	50%	52%	-2%	55%	-5%

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

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

Villas' 3rd grade ELA Fast proficiency showed the lowest performance. The 3rd grade population at Villas contained a large segment of students being retained. The foundational deficits of the retained population was an opportunity that was not fully addressed, contributing to low performance.

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

Villas made improvements across ELA, Math, and Science alike. No areas showed decline. Focusing on utilizing data driven, high yield instructional practices from weely PLC meetings coupled with a focus on aligning benchmarks to instruction, Villas increased proficiency across all areas.

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.

Compared to the state average, the 3rd graders showed 33% of students below the standard for Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary, compared to 22% at the state level. Intentional, explicit vocabulary instruction at all levels can be improved to focus on remedying this deficiency. While greater deficiency lies with the EL students, all students faired lower in this standard than Reading Prose and Poetry and Reading Informational Text.

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

Villas Elementary made notable gains overall with an 8 point increase. ELA and Math gains were strong with 7 points, and Science gains even stronger with a 10 point increase. PLC implementation with a concerted focus on benchmark alignment contributed to these increases.

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

One area for concern is attendance below 90 percent. Additionally, fourth grade ELA and Math FAST assessment yielded significantly more level 1 scores than third and fifth grades.

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

1. Vocabulary instruction utilizing high yield instructional practices
2. Closing the gap of children needing foundational reading remediation with explicit, systematic small group instruction
3. Data driven, standards based intervention to remediate deficiencies as evidences in exemplars, quarterly comprehensives, iReady, and FAST progress monitoring

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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

Villas Elementary utilizes PBIS as a mechanism to maximize student engagement and instructional time. Creating a positive culture and environment is at the forefront of the PBIS model. Incident referrals increased from 86 during school year 2021-2022 to 109 during school year 2022-2023, indicating need to continue on and fine tune the PBIS initiative at Villas.

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

Decrease referrals from 109 to 85 during the 2023-2024 school year.

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

Discipline data will be disseminated to all staff at regular intervals throughout the year. Additionally, discipline data will be discussed with a problem solving lens by the PBIS team monthly. Discipline data will be compiled through FOCUS.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tiffany Sanders (tiffanyms@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.)

Villas incorporates many facets of PBIS, to include: restorative practices, common PRIDE expectations, mediations, proactive common school rules, and the use of PRIDE tickets to recognize and reward PRIDE behaviors. Students utilize PRIDE tickets to join prize drawings, participate in PRIDE cart, and working as a classroom team to select rewards, and various additional classroom specific rewards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The use of PBIS strategies has been shown to increase positive behaviors while decreasing negative behaviors and incident referrals.

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.

School wide professional development on PBIS foundations and practices and allocation of PRIDE tickets.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Sanders (tiffanyms@leeschools.net)

By When: Prior to the beginning of the 2023-2024 school year.

Daily reiteration of PRIDE expectations delivered daily via Villas morning show.

Person Responsible: Shane Musich (shaneem@leeschools.net)

By When: Beginning on the first day of instruction and will carry on throughout the 2023-2024 school year on a daily basis.

Acquisition of rewards, advertise rewards, creation and public display of prize boxes, and restocking of PRIDE tickets and cart items recur throughout the year. Calendar notices need to be established for prize drawing dates and celebratory photo opportunities.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Sanders (tiffanyms@leeschools.net)

By When: Recurring throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Discipline data will be collected, analyzed for patterns, and disseminated monthly throughout the school year. PBIS team will gather monthly to disaggregate and discuss.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Sanders (tiffanyms@leeschools.net)

By When: Data will be accessible by end of month throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

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

The goal selected for Villas' third grade team is Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction.

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

Villas Elementary will increase the number of students in grade 3 that are proficient in ELA from 40% to 50% or higher by the end of the 2023-2024 school year as measured by FAST.

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

Scheduled monitoring will occur utilizing iReady diagnostics, district exemplars and quarterly comprehensives, and FAST progress monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shane Musich (shaneem@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.)

Utilizing data from monitoring sources, which will be discussed at weekly PLC meetings, teachers will incorporate small group literacy instruction daily with leveled text. Additionally, standards based intervention instruction will be utilized to remediate as needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Leveled small group instruction as well as standards based intervention are best practices related to High Reliability schools.

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.

Teachers will utilize PM 1 FAST data to determine student's current reading level, which will determine the leveled text to utilize in small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Shane Musich (shaneem@leeschools.net)

By When: Upon immediate return of FAST PM 1 results. Teachers may utilize 2022-2023 STAR PM 3 data, as they begin small group instruction prior to current year results.

Students will be monitored to determine if level continues to remain or shift. Fluid grouping will be utilized to ensure student specific placement in appropriate groups.

Person Responsible: Shane Musich (shaneem@leeschools.net)

By When: Upon receipt of FAST results and subsequent exemplars/ quarterly comprehensives.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention

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

The goal selected for Villas' second grade team is Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA Intervention.

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

Villas Elementary will increase the number of students in grade 2 that are proficient in ELA from 46% to 56% or higher by the end of the 2023-2024 school year as measured by STAR.

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

Scheduled monitoring will occur utilizing iReady diagnostics, district exemplars, and STAR progress monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shane Musich (shaneem@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.)

Utilizing data from monitoring sources, which will be discussed at weekly PLC meetings, teachers will incorporate literacy intervention instruction daily utilizing Flyleaf leveled text. Incorporation of phonological awareness, phonics instruction, vocabulary, decoding, and fluency are essential components of literacy instruction. Additionally, standards based intervention instruction will be utilized to remediate as needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Leveled small group intervention instruction with a focus on foundational phonological skills and explicit, systematic phonics instruction, as well as standards based intervention are best practices related to High Reliability schools.

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.

Students will be grouped according to functional phonics level and receive data driven, explicit phonics instruction utilizing Flyleaf materials.

Person Responsible: Shane Musich (shaneem@leeschools.net)

By When: Upon immediate receipt of Flyleaf placement assessment tool results, students will be placed in appropriate levels aligned to Flyleaf systematic sequence.

Teachers will deliver intervention instruction in small group settings, using embedded progress monitoring tools to determine fluid grouping.

Person Responsible: Shane Musich (shaneem@leeschools.net)

By When: Progress monitoring per Flyleaf occurs at specific intervals within the spiraled sequence.

Teachers will receive training on the use of Flyleaf materials, to include all components of essential high yield literacy instruction: phonological awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.

Person Responsible: Lisa Rogers (lisadro@leeschools.net)

By When: Training will be completed by the end of quarter 1 of of the 2023-2024 school year.

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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

The goal selected for Villas' fourth and fifth grade teams is Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark aligned Instruction.

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

Villas Elementary will increase the number of students in grade 4 that are proficient in ELA from 53.3% to 63.3% or higher by the end of the 2023-2024 school year as measured by FAST. Villas Elementary will increase the number of students in grade 5 that are proficient in ELA from 50.5% to 60.5% or higher by the end of the 2023-2024 school year as measured by FAST.

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

Scheduled monitoring will occur utilizing district exemplars and quarterly comprehensives at the individual benchmark level. Additional monitoring will be completed with iReady use of Standards Mastery.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shane Musich (shaneem@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.)

Utilizing data from monitoring sources, which will be discussed at weekly PLC meetings, teachers will incorporate high yield strategies to communicate learning outcome and follow district expectations for Common Board Configuration.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Aligning instruction fully to specific benchmarks as a driving indicator of learning outcome is best practice related to High Reliability schools.

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.

All teachers will engage with explicit directives from district outlining common board configuration expectations.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Sanders (tiffanyms@leeschools.net)

By When: This will be completed before the start of the 2023-2024 school year.

During weekly planning meetings, teachers will follow district provided instructional guides to identify benchmarks of focus, with the expectation that benchmarks are posted and serve as an anchor for

learning throughout the instructional unit. This common focus of benchmark alignment will be collaborative at the grade level.

Person Responsible: Shane Musich (shaneem@leeschools.net)

By When: This will be completed at weekly planning meetings and monitored by administration via walkthroughs.

Progress monitoring of specific benchmarks will occur throughout the year with the completion of each exemplar and quarterly comprehensive. This data will be shared during PLC weekly meetings and utilized as a means to determine need for remediation or enrichment, as well as standards based intervention opportunities.

Person Responsible: Lisa Rogers (lisadro@leeschools.net)

By When: Upon completion of exemplars and quarterly comprehensives throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

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

Based on data:
Kindergarten: The percentage of FY23 students who were not on track to pass the statewide Kindergarten ELA assessment was 70%.
First Grade: The percentage of FY23 students who were not on track to pass the statewide 1st grade ELA assessment was 63%.
Second Grade: The percentage of FY23 students who were not on track to pass the statewide 2nd grade ELA assessment was 65%.

Villas provides a research based intervention program, including Flyleaf and ReadWell, utilizing a walk to read approach, to mitigate deficiencies evident in data noted above.

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

Third Grade: The percentage of FY23 students who were not on track to pass the statewide third grade ELA assessment was 64%.
Fourth Grade: The percentage of FY23 students who were not on track to pass the statewide fourth grade ELA assessment was 51%.
Fifth Grade: The percentage of FY23 students who were not on track to pass the statewide fifth grade ELA assessment was 54%.

Villas provides a research based intervention program, including leveled Phonics for Reading and Magnetic Reading, utilizing a walk to read approach, to mitigate deficiencies evident in data noted above.

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

The percentage of FY 23 students who were not on track to pass the statewide Kindergarten ELA assessment will decrease from 70% to 50%.
The percentage of FY 23 students who were not on track to pass the statewide first grade ELA assessment will decrease from 63% to 50%.
The percentage of FY 23 students who were not on track to pass the statewide second grade ELA assessment will decrease from 65% to 50%.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The percentage of FY 23 students who were not on track to pass the statewide third grade ELA assessment will decrease from 64% to 50%.
The percentage of FY 23 students who were not on track to pass the statewide fourth grade ELA assessment will decrease from 51% to 45%.

The percentage of FY 23 students who were not on track to pass the statewide fifth grade ELA assessment will decrease from 54% to 45%.

Monitoring

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

FAST, iReady diagnostics, and standards based assessments, to include exemplars and quarterly comprehensives, will be analyzed to monitor focus effectiveness.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Musich, Shane, shaneem@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?

Villas staff will utilized approved, evidence based programs to deliver explicit, systematic instruction targeting data driven deficiencies with consistent progress monitoring to evaluate additional learning needs and program progression.

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?

In the primary grades, the tools utilized to deliver instruction focus solely on primary reading foundational skills. As the students needs shift in intermediate grades, data determines whether students require phonics or comprehension instruction. Progress is monitored consistently to address new concerns which may arise, as well as to reevaluate program completion.

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
Academic coaches and administration continue to analyze data to be disseminated during weekly PLC meetings. Exemplars, comprehensives, FAST data, STAR data, and Standards Mastery Progress Monitoring results are analyzed to identify specific benchmarks that were met and those in need of remediation. This information is compiled into slide decks and shared out at weekly PLC, where teams walk through the quantitative data, review questions and blueprints, then share together resources and strategies to increase future performance. Alignment of questions to the benchmark with a notice of rigor drives reflection. Additionally, opportunities for walk to read and fluid intervention groups are capitalized on during these PLC meetings.	Musich, Shane, shaneem@leeschools.net
Teachers and support staff provide direct intervention instruction on a daily basis targeting data determined areas of deficiency. Based on FAST, STAR, and IDI data, teachers group children according to areas of deficiency, then deliver direct explicit instruction to reteach or remediate on a daily basis. As our population necessitates, Villas provides a walk to read model, whereby maximizing teacher instructional time by minimizing the number of varying group within one classroom. This intervention progress monitoring data is monitored school wide and discussed at bi-monthly Villas literacy leadership meetings. Literacy coach and resource teachers analyze progress monitoring data, as well as day to day proficiency of students in small group intervention to discern any trends needing addressed. This data compilation of intervention data also serves as a monitoring mechanism to seek MTSS services, if applicable. Communication between intervention providers and classroom teachers is open and consistent, as we share this information during weekly planning and PLC meetings.	Musich, Shane, shaneem@leeschools.net
Academic coaches provide coaching cycles to further develop teacher capacity, as well as professional development opportunities. Following the procedures outlined in the Lee County School District's Coaching the Lee County Way professional development, coaches meet with teachers to establish goals, to create action plans, and to walk through the steps of effective coaching, ultimately leading to data driven reflection of goals met, needing editing, or needing to be revisited. Coaching cycles happen consistently throughout the year, with both new and veteran teachers. This collaborative process allows teachers and coaches to work together to increase teacher effectiveness. Data is collected and monitored throughout the coaching cycle, per the Coaching the Lee County Way guidelines, with administrative opportunities for feedback.	Musich, Shane, shaneem@leeschools.net

Title I Requirements

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

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

Stakeholders are granted access to the SIP, UniSIG budget, and SWP at all times via our school website, https://vls.leeschools.net/home. Parents can request a copy from the school's front office in their preferred language after publication approval. Additionally, the plan will be shared directly and discussed thoroughly at our annual School Advisory Committee meeting.

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))

Villas recognizes the enormous importance of increasing parental and family engagement in raising student achievement at all levels. To accomplish this and to determine the needs/barriers of our parents, schools, the PFEP team analyzes the current building capacity activities, compares participation numbers, and addresses the barriers that limit parent participation. These barriers include: lack of transportation to meetings, language barriers, childcare, inability to leave work for events/meetings, and in general the difficulties with the current economic conditions. In addition, since we are a Title I school, we complete the Florida DOE template for the Parent and Family Educational Plan (PFEP). School data is reported to the district to become a part of the District PFEP Evaluation and goal setting process. Schools` baseline data sources. i.e., parent workshop and training evaluations, sign in sheets, attendance and volunteer logs, parent surveys, the Title I Crate, the PFEP Evaluation, the School Academic Training and Workshop forms, and test results. The PFEP will be a principal element of the review process for each school in gathering data at the end of the year as the schools complete their SIP (Comprehensive Needs Analysis) in preparation for revising School Improvement Plans.

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

Villa plans to strengthen the academic program, quality of learning time, and provide enriched/ accelerated curriculum by utilizing the following components:
● Additional personnel hired includes: Teachers, Coaches, PCTs, Counselor, Social Workers, Instructional Support/Paraeducators
● Extended day/Tutoring/Enrichment Programs will be created with PM 1 data and offered earlier in the school year to deliver data driven remediation to students in need.
● Leadership team will focus extensively on facilitating routine ongoing data chats at the classroom level, data review and instructional change, baseline/midyear/final, and adjustments to align curriculum, resources, and the results for assessments aligned to Florida's academic standards.
● PD opportunities to improve teacher quality made available using Title I funds, including a school wide focus on Vocabulary

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))

NA

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.

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, Literacy, Math, and Science Coaching, as well as Peer Collaborative Teachers (PCTs) will further support the initiative by collaborating closely with the teacher leaders. These individuals are chosen through a selective process that ensures highly effective instructional practices are shared with classroom teachers.

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

Villas Elementary has 2 prekdg headstart units and 1 ese prekdg unit. As such the school supports the transition of students from prekdg to kdg in an optimal manner: consistent school wide routines are established between prekdg and kgd; kdg classroom visits take place throughout the year (small group and whole group).

Villas Elementary also strives to connect with our feeder private VPK child care centers in the community to build relationships. Local private providers are invited to visit the school and kindergarten classrooms and meet with kindergarten teachers.

Villas Elementary plans to establish an annual kdg boot camp in the future thus allowing incoming kdg students to start school a few days early to learn routines and establish a parent-teacher-school partnership in advance of the regular school year beginning.