Heights Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Heights Elementary School

15200 ALEXANDRIA CT, Fort Myers, FL 33908

http://het.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.

Heights Elementary IB World School is dedicated to developing balanced, lifelong learners through educational excellence, a global perspective, reflection and action.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be a world-class school.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Palow, Doug	Principal	Provide instructional leadership that ensures continuous improvement in measurable student performance and achievement. Provides organizational leadership to include personnel, budget, purchasing safety, public relations, plant operations, food services, and transportation that supports high performance expectations for all stakeholders. Engages in data analysis for instructional planning and improvement and communicates the relationship among academic standards, effective instruction, and student performance. Creates a positive school climate and a culture of collaboration and shared responsibility within the school. Organizes and provides staff development opportunities for all members of the school community. Facilitates parent involvement in the school community. Works collaboratively with teams and/or individuals to gather input for decision making. Supports the district's Vision2030 Plan. The Leadership team attends each grade level's PLC meetings weekly to guide and drive student success. During leadership meetings, each grade level's PLC data is analyzed and discussed to determine what instructional strategies and resources are necessary in order to ensure students are showing academic growth.
Carter, Anika	Assistant Principal	Assists the Principal in ensuring continuous improvement in measurable student performance and achievement, customer satisfaction, performance management, and compliance. Assists the Principal in the overall administration and operation of the school. Assumes full responsibility of the school when the Principal is absent from the building. Provides leadership to teachers and team leaders concerning instructional programs. Manages schedules, delegates, and allocates resources to promote collegial efforts in school improvement and faculty development and demonstrate fiscal responsibility to maximize the impact of fiscal resources on instructional priorities. Analyzes data and monitors student achievement. Seeks input from stakeholders before making decisions and works collaboratively with school staff. Supports the district's Vision 2030 plan. The Leadership team attends each grade level's PLC meetings weekly to guide and drive student success. During leadership meetings, each grade level's PLC data is analyzed and discussed to determine what instructional strategies and resources are necessary in order to ensure students are showing academic growth.
Thorstad, Lindsey	Assistant Principal	Assists the Principal in ensuring continuous improvement in measurable student performance and achievement, customer satisfaction, performance management, and compliance. Assists the Principal in the overall administration and operation of the school. Assumes full responsibility of the school when the Principal is absent from the building. Provides leadership to teachers and team leaders concerning instructional programs. Manages schedules, delegates, and allocates resources to promote collegial efforts in school improvement and faculty development and demonstrate fiscal responsibility to maximize the impact of fiscal resources on instructional priorities. Analyzes data and monitors student achievement. Seeks input from stakeholders before making decisions and works collaboratively with school staff. Supports the district's Vision 2030 plan. The Leadership team attends each grade level's PLC meetings weekly to guide and drive student success. During leadership meetings, each grade level's PLC data

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		is analyzed and discussed to determine what instructional strategies and resources are necessary in order to ensure students are showing academic growth.

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.

Our process involves all stakeholders—teachers, administrators, students, parents, and community leaders. They assist in creating and establishing our vision, setting goals, and outlining action steps. We solicit feedback from all stakeholders throughout the process, and incorporate their feedback into our plan.

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

The SIP plan is a living document that is regularly reviewed and revised as needed throughout the year to ensure we are providing our teachers with the necessary tools and resources to ensure we are making progress towards our goals.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	47%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	77%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL)

(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Asian Students (ASN) 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: A 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
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	6	28	44	35	25	30	0	0	0	168
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	8
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	12	6	21	11	4	0	0	0	55
Course failure in Math	0	3	2	11	9	7	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	59	26	0	0	0	89
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	37	23	0	0	0	64
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	14	48	40	0	0	0	102
	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	4	3	12	32	17	0	0	0	68

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	2	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	2	1	0	11	0	0	0	14

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	9	42	28	42	22	27	0	0	0	170
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	1	2	4	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	2	4	23	2	2	0	0	0	33
Course failure in Math	0	1	3	15	2	1	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	14	20	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	13	19	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	14	48	40	0	0	0	102

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	1	2	20	6	15	0	0	0	44

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	14	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	2	1	1	10	1	0	0	0	15

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	9	42	28	42	22	27	0	0	0	170
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	1	2	4	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	2	4	23	2	2	0	0	0	33
Course failure in Math	0	1	3	15	2	1	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	14	20	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	13	19	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	14	48	40	0	0	0	102

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	1	2	20	6	15	0	0	0	44

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	14	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	2	1	1	10	1	0	0	0	15

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*	58	48	53	68	52	56	67		
ELA Learning Gains				64			63		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52			56		
Math Achievement*	67	57	59	74	45	50	74		
Math Learning Gains				67			63		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57			45		
Science Achievement*	63	53	54	65	59	59	72		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	45	51	59	47			47		

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

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	287
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	494
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
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	24	Yes	1	1
ELL	35	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	86			
BLK	43			
HSP	47			
MUL	57			
PAC				

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%
WHT	68			
FRL	46			

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	45			
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN	88			
BLK	45			
HSP	55			
MUL	84			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	49			

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	58			67			63					45
SWD	18			35			33				5	21
ELL	29			36			64				5	45
AMI												
ASN	82			89							2	
BLK	32			51							3	
HSP	47			55			46				5	49

| **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
MUL	45			68							2	
PAC												
WHT	66			73			70				4	
FRL	43			53			49				5	48

| **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	68	64	52	74	67	57	65					47
SWD	33	54	45	40	60	58	28					41
ELL	44	53	31	57	62	50	35					47
AMI												
ASN	88	86		94	73		100					
BLK	41	36	36	47	50	50	58					
HSP	52	63	50	60	64	65	41					41
MUL	81	75		88	92							
PAC												
WHT	77	66	58	82	68	44	74					
FRL	50	50	42	56	58	60	42					37

| **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	67	63	56	74	63	45	72					47
SWD	22	50	47	36	35	27	15					57
ELL	38	55	67	45	68	79	50					47
AMI												
ASN	80			90								
BLK	36			43								
HSP	44	52	58	52	52	50	58					42
MUL	71			76								
PAC												
WHT	81	69	54	86	71	58	80					

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
FRL	45	58	54	53	51	39	56					40

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	59%	48%	11%	54%	5%
04	2023 - Spring	69%	56%	13%	58%	11%
03	2023 - Spring	51%	42%	9%	50%	1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	64%	55%	9%	59%	5%
04	2023 - Spring	78%	61%	17%	61%	17%
05	2023 - Spring	64%	52%	12%	55%	9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	61%	50%	11%	51%	10%

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.

Proficiency in English Language Arts showed the lowest performance with 61% of students in grades 3-5 demonstrating proficiency.

Contributing factors that contributed to low performance include disrupted learning during COVID-19 pandemic years (continuing to fill academic gaps); The delay in receiving district-adopted curriculum hindered these new teachers; Reading curriculum did not arrive from the Florida Textbook Depository until January; We had a major disruption of learning due to Hurricane Ian; Scope and sequence of curriculum was adjusted due to hurricane; adjustments to new state test.

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

English Language Arts (ELA) for students in grades 3-5 showed the greatest decline from the prior year decreasing from 68% to 61%, a decrease of 7%.

Contributing factors that contributed to low performance include disrupted learning during COVID-19 pandemic years (continuing to fill academic gaps); The delay in receiving district-adopted curriculum hindered these new teachers; Reading curriculum did not arrive from the Florida Textbook Depository until January; We had a major disruption of learning due to Hurricane Ian; Scope and sequence of curriculum was adjusted due to hurricane; adjustments to new state test.

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.

Heights data is significantly higher than the state average across all areas.

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

Math proficiency in 4th grade showed the most improvement from the prior year increasing from 78% to 80%, an increase of 2%.

The school based leadership team continues to contribute many factors to the growth demonstrated in the area of Math. The Math coach was an active part in overseeing and working directly with this population 3-4 times weekly on personalized intervention plans. Many of the students in the Lowest 25% were receiving small group instruction from their classroom teachers targeting current standards, while receiving small group instruction from the math coach in which standards were spiraled back to. Our students participate weekly in math instruction with hands on application. We have also looked at enhancing basic math skills (such as math facts) through the use of programs such as Reflex Math and iReady Math.

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

The high number (89) of level 1s on the statewide ELA assessment, particularly in 4th grade.

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

1. Increasing ELA proficiency for our 3-5th grade students.
2. Increasing ELA proficiency in our Black student subgroup.
3. Increasing ELA proficiency in our Students with Disabilities subgroup.
4. Increasing ELA proficiency for our English Language Learners subgroup.
5. Increasing schoolwide average daily attendance.

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to 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.

Ensuring that students are proficient in ELA helps build a strong academic foundation in literacy.

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

Increase 2nd grade ELA proficiency during the 2023-2024 school year from 64% to 69%.

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

Use of Formative and Summative data points
Heights Benchmark Assessments
Quarterly Diagnostic assessments
Exemplar benchmark assessments
FAST progress monitoring

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Doug Palow (douglascp@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.)

School wide intervention time and enrichment time will be provided for all students K-5 five days per week. Additional instructional supports will be provided to every grade level both during intervention time and during the instructional day to support targeted groups of students in ELA block
-PLC and administration led data review meetings/data chats will review immediate progress monitoring to ensure intended recipients are displaying growth.
-Instructional Coaches and ELA Grade Level Experts will be modeling and providing professional development.
-Administration Classroom Walk through system to gauge and support student engagement
-Student Data Binders and personalized Goal setting
-Use of instructional guides and district provided pacing guides.

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

Our team has chosen to use effective strategies for teaching and learning in pursuit of this goal acquisition. We will be focusing on selecting the strategies that, according to Hattie's Effect Size, will have the potential to accelerate student achievement at a HIGH rate (.30-.69) or considerably accelerate student achievement at a SUPER HIGH rate (.70 and above)
Small Group Differentiation Centers- .47 Effect Size
Hands on Learning- .30 Effect Size
Interventions/ Extensions- .77 Effect Size
MTSS (RTI)- 1.29 Effect Size
Scaffolding- .82 Effect Size
High Level of Student Engagement- .49 Effect Size
Goal Setting (Buckets)- .48 Effect Size

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#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.

ELA proficiency in 3rd grade decreased from 63% to 54% from 2022 to 2023. It is evident that there is a need for focusing on the benchmarks being taught, rigor and instructional practices to ensure student academic understanding and growth.

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

Increase 3rd grade ELA proficiency during the 2023-2024 school year to 70%.

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

Use of Formative and Summative data points
Heights Benchmark Assessments
Quarterly Diagnostic assessments
Exemplar benchmark assessments
FAST progress monitoring

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Doug Palow (douglascp@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.)

School wide intervention time and enrichment time will be provided for all students K-5 five days per week. Additional instructional supports will be provided to every grade level both during intervention time and during the instructional day to support targeted groups of students in ELA block
-PLC and administration led data review meetings/data chats will review immediate progress monitoring to ensure intended recipients are displaying growth.
-Instructional Coaches and ELA Grade Level Experts will be modeling and providing professional development.
-Administration Classroom Walk through system to gauge and support student engagement
-Student Data Binders and personalized Goal setting
-Use of instructional guides and district provided pacing guides.

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

Our team has chosen to use effective strategies for teaching and learning in pursuit of this goal acquisition. We will be focusing on selecting the strategies that, according to Hattie's Effect Size, will have the potential to accelerate student achievement at a HIGH rate (.30-.69) or considerably accelerate student achievement at a SUPER HIGH rate (.70 and above)
Small Group Differentiation Centers- .47 Effect Size
Hands on Learning- .30 Effect Size
Interventions/ Extensions- .77 Effect Size
MTSS (RTI)- 1.29 Effect Size
Scaffolding- .82 Effect Size
High Level of Student Engagement- .49 Effect Size
Goal Setting (Buckets)- .48 Effect Size

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#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.

After reviewing the decrease in 3rd-5th grade ELA proficiency from the previous year, it is evident that there is
a need for more focus on the learner growth patterns. We will be utilizing more stringent bell to bell instruction techniques that focuses specifically on the RIGOR of the benchmark being taught.

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

Increase 3rd-5th grade ELA proficiency during the 2023-2024 school year from 61% to 66%.

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

Use of Formative and Summative data points
Heights Benchmark Assessments
Quarterly Diagnostic assessments
Exemplar benchmark assessments
FAST progress monitoring

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Doug Palow (douglascp@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.)

School wide intervention time and enrichment time will be provided for all students K-5 five days per week. Additional instructional supports will be provided to every grade level both during intervention time and during the instructional day to support targeted groups of students in ELA block
-PLC and administration led data review meetings/data chats will review immediate progress monitoring to ensure intended recipients are displaying growth.
-Instructional Coaches and ELA Grade Level Experts will be modeling and providing professional development.
-Administration Classroom Walk through system to gauge and support student engagement
-Student Data Binders and personalized Goal setting
-Use of instructional guides and district provided pacing guides

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

Our team has chosen to use effective strategies for teaching and learning in pursuit of this goal acquisition. We will be focusing on selecting the strategies that, according to Hattie's Effect Size, will have the potential to accelerate student achievement at a HIGH rate (.30-.69) or considerably accelerate student achievement at a SUPER HIGH rate (.70 and above)
Small Group Differentiation Centers- .47 Effect Size
Hands on Learning- .30 Effect Size
Interventions/ Extensions- .77 Effect Size MTSS (RTI)- 1.29 Effect Size
Scaffolding- .82 Effect Size
High Level of Student Engagement- .49 Effect Size
Goal Setting (Buckets)- .48 Effect Size

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. 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.

We have determined that attendance across the school is playing into the outcome and growth of student proficiency. This attendance concern is applicable to a variety of subgroups (primarily White and economically disadvantaged). Student attendance rates weekly are hovering between 93.2% and 95.7% in attendance. We would like to see a more predictable attendance rate between 96%-97.5%. We know that students IN school are learning at a far greater and more consistent rate of proficiency then students who are not present to receive individual intervention and instruction.

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

For the remainder of the 2023-2024 school year, we will focus on raising weekly attendance to an average of 96-97.5 daily on campus attendance. We believe that by continuing to focus on the student being personally engaged in the classroom setting we will see a rise in our academic goals outlined.

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

Attendance is monitored daily by school assistant principals. The program has initiated a daily tracker called attendance champion. Each day the classes with perfect attendance are rewarded through recognition. As classes achieve the letters Attendance Champion, they are reward with a class treat. Goals for attendance are posted by grade level and discussed monthly in PLC by school administration. Teacher continue to focus on working collaboratively with the school social worker to ensure students in Tiers 2-3 of attendance concerns are monitored through truancy polices and procedures.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Doug Palow (douglascp@leeschools.net)

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

The school focuses on using the district protocol for attendance tracking. The school also uses the Positive Behavior Intervention Support system to reward and recognize students with high levels of attendance. We continue to provide support for families with barriers to attendance. The school and district level social workers work collaboratively with the school, state and families to provide necessary means for transportation to and from school.

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

State and District Data have proven the effectiveness that the "parent and school connections" are the single most important determiner of students' overall academic achievement levels. Collaboration and student engagement continue to be the sole motivator for the parent/school partnership.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

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

n/a

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

n/a

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

n/a

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

n/a

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.

n/a

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

Palow, Doug , douglascp@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?

n/a

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?

n/a

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
n/a	Palow, Doug , douglascp@leeschools.net
n/a	Palow, Doug , douglascp@leeschools.net
n/a	Palow, Doug , douglascp@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.

n/a

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

n/a

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

n/a

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

n/a

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

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

n/a

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

n/a

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

n/a

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

n/a

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

n/a

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$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: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes