

The School District of Lee County

Pinewoods Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	27
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Pinewoods Elementary School

11900 STONEYBROOK GOLF DR, Estero, FL 33928

<http://pin.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.

We, at Pinewoods Elementary, will work together to learn, grow and achieve our goals in a safe environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We will SOAR to the top! Success, Opportunity, Achieve, Respect

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
Maston, Akiya	Principal	Oversees school safety, academic progress, and various administrative tasks to ensure students, staff, and stakeholders are successful at Pinewoods.
Falzone, Gina	Assistant Principal	Oversees school safety, academic progress, and various administrative tasks to ensure students, staff, and stakeholders are successful at Pinewoods.

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.

In order to involve all stakeholders in the School Improvement Plan (SIP) development process, administration meets frequently with the School Advisory Committee. Prior to the meeting, an agenda is shared to help prepare all members of the committee. During these meetings, the committee discusses school goals, progress towards those goals, and action steps for areas of improvement. Members include the leadership team, school staff members, parents, community members, and business members. Input and consensus from these members are used when making all decisions related to the SIP.

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 is monitored numerous times throughout the school year. Initially, students take baseline assessments (F.A.S.T., i-Ready Diagnostic, Dibels, etc.), then the leadership team analyzes initial student data to determine how far we are from our end of year goals. This early data is used during Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) to determine specific intervention groups, "What I Need" (WIN intervention), and differentiated instructional groupings in the classroom. Students will also complete the same progress monitoring mid-year. From there, we reanalyze student progress, note students who are demonstrating continuous improvement, students who are still working towards their goals, and students who have experienced a decrease in mastery of specific academic standards from the beginning of the year. We are sure to focus on data related to Students with Disabilities (SWD) and develop intensive intervention plans to meet their individual needs. That second analysis opportunity also prompts thoughtful conversations during PLCs, which will support the necessary changes to interventions, WIN time, and differentiated small groups. The team also uses mid-year data to establish leadership conferencing groups to ensure students are being held accountable for their individual goals. Finally, mid-year data is used to select and recommend students for in-school and after-school tutoring opportunities to reach reading and math goals. At the final progress monitoring window, the leadership team's data analysis will reveal the level of mastery for students regarding state academic standards.

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	37%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	52%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: 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	11	24	27	16	21	24	0	0	0	123	
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	6	16	14	9	3	0	0	0	49	
Course failure in Math	0	2	2	2	1	4	0	0	0	11	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	20	7	0	0	0	28	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	21	11	0	0	0	33	
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	2	3	3	16	6	0	0	0	30

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	24	22	21	17	19	0	0	0	103	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	3	1	3	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in ELA	0	18	8	3	0	6	0	0	0	35	
Course failure in Math	0	6	4	0	0	2	0	0	0	12	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	7	16	0	0	0	26	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	8	16	0	0	0	27	
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	7	4	3	4	13	0	0	0	31

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	3	0	1	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	4

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	24	22	21	17	19	0	0	0	103	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	3	1	3	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in ELA	0	18	8	3	0	6	0	0	0	35	
Course failure in Math	0	6	4	0	0	2	0	0	0	12	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	7	16	0	0	0	26	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	8	16	0	0	0	27	
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	7	4	3	4	13	0	0	0	31

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	3	0	1	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	4

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*	75	48	53	79	52	56	75		
ELA Learning Gains				76			59		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				61			47		
Math Achievement*	85	57	59	86	45	50	83		
Math Learning Gains				81			69		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				70			58		
Science Achievement*	81	53	54	80	59	59	79		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	55	51	59	43			48		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	73
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	367
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	576
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

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

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	36	Yes	2	
ELL	41			
AMI				
ASN	97			
BLK				
HSP	60			
MUL	87			
PAC				
WHT	85			
FRL	62			

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	29	Yes	1	1
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN	89			
BLK	90			
HSP	62			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	83			
FRL	63			

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	75			85			81					55
SWD	40			48			30				5	36
ELL	27			52			40				5	55
AMI												
ASN	93			100							2	
BLK												
HSP	56			73			63				5	55
MUL	87			87							2	
PAC												
WHT	82			90			89				4	
FRL	55			73			69				5	62

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	79	76	61	86	81	70	80					43
SWD	26	38	33	46	24	19	18					
ELL	39	48	36	49	64	59	37					43
AMI												
ASN	93	90		93	80							
BLK	90			90								
HSP	63	64	52	72	73	61	64					43
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	85	80	70	92	85	77	90					
FRL	61	69	56	70	73	63	64					46

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	75	59	47	83	69	58	79					48
SWD	14	40	50	24	40		33					
ELL	28	41	40	51	59	50	36					48
AMI												
ASN	85			92								
BLK												
HSP	59	54	31	67	74	62	57					48
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	84	61	75	91	67	54	90					
FRL	58	44	38	66	70	61	66					57

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	73%	48%	25%	54%	19%
04	2023 - Spring	86%	56%	30%	58%	28%
03	2023 - Spring	66%	42%	24%	50%	16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	79%	55%	24%	59%	20%
04	2023 - Spring	86%	61%	25%	61%	25%
05	2023 - Spring	88%	52%	36%	55%	33%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	78%	50%	28%	51%	27%

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.

After analyzing state progress monitoring data, it was determined that the lowest performing subgroup was Students with Disabilities (SWD). Data from the past few years has fluctuated between subject areas with this specific sub-group, and SWD were at a 29% for the Federal Percent of Points Index in 2021-2022. SWD were at 26% proficient based on 21-22 end of year English Language Arts (ELA) data. In math, 19% of the L25 showed growth based on 21-22 data. The following factors contributed to these low percentages: Many SWD students are lacking foundational reading skills, which negatively affects their ability to read rigorous, grade level text, and answer high level comprehension questions. Vocabulary is also an area where SWD could strengthen their skills in order to easily navigate the required reading benchmarks and demonstrate proficiency. In math, SWD specifically struggle to retain foundational skills and struggle to utilize problem solving strategies when tackling challenging math problems.

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

When compared to prior years' data, the greatest decline was with ELA L25 LG. In 20-21, 50% of students made gains, where as in 21-22 only 33% of students made gains. There were similar trends in

Math LGs for SWD (40% to 24%) and in Science for SWD (33% to 18%). A lack of foundational reading skills negatively affects the ability to read rigorous, grade level text, and answer high level comprehension questions. High level vocabulary skills are necessary for SWD to easily navigate the required reading benchmarks and demonstrate proficiency.

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.

TBD

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

The component that showed the most improvement was SWD in the math achievement category. Students increased from 24% to 40% from 20-21 to 21-22. This past school year, students who were nearing proficiency were invited to attend a free tutoring opportunity. Students could either participate during Specials or after school. Teachers were able to tutor students on grade level reading and math benchmarks in order to support mastery. In addition, during grade level PLC meetings, classroom teachers would discuss student data and opportunities for improvement in the classroom. Students would participate in differentiated small groups during math instruction, led either by the classroom teacher or by a paraprofessional to reinforce previously taught skills. Groups were flexible based on the benchmarks being taught and the skills needing support by individual student.

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

One major area of concern is the achievement and growth for SWD across subject areas. We plan to focus on reading achievement and Math L25 growth for SWD.

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

1. ELA L25 LG for SWD
2. Math LG for SWD
3. Science achievement for SWD

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The component with the greatest need is our SWD in ELA. We noted a decrease in learning gains for the L25 SWD and determined this as an area of focus. In 20-21 ELA LG for L25 SWD was 50%. In 21-22, that decreased to 33%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May of 2024, ELA LG for L25 SWD will increase from 33% to 40% as measured by FAST PM3.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor this specific area of focus throughout the various progress monitoring windows during the 23-24 school year. There is a baseline state and district progress monitoring window in August, a mid-year window in December and January, and a final window in the spring. We will use data from state progress monitoring (FAST ELA), in addition to data derived from district progress monitoring (i-Ready ELA and Dibels) in order to track SWD L25 ELA progress and growth. After each assessment window, progress towards our desired outcomes will be reevaluated for progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Akiya Maston (akiyam@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

In order to achieve this goal, we will implement evidence-based interventions during WIN time. To address foundational concerns with this groups of students, we will support their learning through the Phonics for Reading intervention program. Additionally, qualifying students will be screened and enrolled into Read 180 and the support of various instructional personnel (Reading Specialist, Reading Coach, Intervention Specialist, ESE teachers, and paraprofessionals). Read 180 will help students interact with various reading benchmarks, increase their vocabulary usage and knowledge, and support foundational skills through fluency building and spelling activities. In the classroom, these students will be supported through differentiated small group instruction on a regular basis, in addition to conferencing with members of the leadership team to encourage progress, and free tutoring during specials or after-school.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our rationale for selecting these interventions is to provide consistent differentiated small group instruction which will cover previously taught benchmarks and provide students with individualized support. These interventions also cover targeted areas of improvement in reading, including foundational reading skills and vocabulary.

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.

Identifying SWD who are also L25, administer baseline state assessments, district assessments, and appropriate screeners to develop initial intervention WIN groups (Phonics for Reading, Read 180).

Person Responsible: Jamie Mackereth (jamielma@leeschools.net)

By When: This will be completed by the end of the 1st quarter.

Identifying SWD who are also L25, administer baseline state assessments, district assessments, and appropriate screeners to discuss and plan grade level differentiation (WIN) and small group instruction (in class differentiation) during PLC meetings.

Person Responsible: Akiya Maston (akiyam@leeschools.net)

By When: This will be completed by the end of the 1st quarter, as well as ongoing throughout the school year.

After mid-year state progress monitoring, the team will analyze student progress. Based on improvement and growth, the team will reevaluate intervention (WIN) placement, classroom differentiation, and will compile a list of students need of additional conferencing with leadership.

Person Responsible: Akiya Maston (akiyam@leeschools.net)

By When: This will be completed by the end of the 1st semester, as well as ongoing throughout the school year.

After mid-year state progress monitoring, the team will analyze student progress. Based on improvement and growth, the team will recommend students for the free tutoring program taking place during specials or after school.

Person Responsible: Akiya Maston (akiyam@leeschools.net)

By When: This will be completed by the end of the 1st semester.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

The next component with the greatest need is our SWD in Math. We noted a decrease in learning gains for the SWD and determined this as an area of focus. In 20-21 Math LG for SWD was 40%. In 21-22, that decreased to 24%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May of 2024, Math LG for SWD will increase from 24% to 30% as measured by FAST PM3.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor this specific area of focus throughout the various progress monitoring windows during the 23-24 school year. There is a baseline state and district progress monitoring window in August, a mid-year window in December and January, and a final window in the spring. We will use data from state progress monitoring (FAST Math), in addition to data derived from district progress monitoring (i-Ready Math) in order to track SWD Math LG progress and growth. After each assessment window, progress towards our desired outcomes will be reevaluated for progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Akiya Maston (akiyam@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

In order to achieve this goal, we will implement evidence-based interventions. To address foundational concerns with this groups of students, we will support their learning through small group, differentiated instruction on a regular basis. These groups are facilitated by teachers and trained paraprofessionals. In addition, teachers will work together in PLCs to plan additional practice opportunities using various supplemental math programs (i-Ready teacher assigned lessons, i-Ready standards mastery, ADLs, Reflex, etc.). Outside of the classroom, members of the leadership team will conference with these students to encourage progress. Later in the year, teachers use planning time or afterschool opportunities to tutor struggling students in this subgroup through our free tutoring program.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our rationale for selecting these interventions is to provide consistent differentiated small group instruction which will cover previously taught benchmarks and provide students with individualized support. These interventions also cover targeted areas of improvement in math, including foundational math skills and problem solving strategies.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Identifying SWD, administer baseline state assessments, district assessments, and appropriate screeners to develop initial intervention groups.

Person Responsible: Jamie Mackereth (jamielma@leeschools.net)

By When: This will be completed by the end of the 1st quarter.

Identifying SWD, administer baseline state assessments, district assessments, and appropriate screeners to discuss and plan grade level differentiation and small group instruction during PLC meetings.

Person Responsible: Akiya Maston (akiyam@leeschools.net)

By When: This will be completed by the end of the 1st quarter, as well as ongoing throughout the school year.

During PLC meetings, teams will plan grade level differentiation and small group instruction using supplemental math tools and programs (i-Ready teacher assigned lessons, i-Ready standards mastery, ADLs, Reflex, etc.).

Person Responsible: Akiya Maston (akiyam@leeschools.net)

By When: This will be completed by the end of the 1st quarter, as well as ongoing throughout the school year.

After mid-year state progress monitoring, the team will analyze student progress. Based on improvement and growth, the team will reevaluate small group placement, classroom differentiation, and will compile a list of students in need of additional conferencing with leadership.

Person Responsible: Akiya Maston (akiyam@leeschools.net)

By When: This will be completed by the end of the 1st semester, as well as ongoing throughout the school year.

After mid-year state progress monitoring, the team will analyze student progress. Based on improvement and growth, the team will recommend students for the free tutoring program taking place during specials or after school.

Person Responsible: Akiya Maston (akiyam@leeschools.net)

By When: This will be completed by the end of the 1st semester.

#3. 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.

During the 22-23 school year, 123 students were identified as being absent 10% or more days. This was an increase from the year prior (103 students in 21-22), therefore determined as an area of focus, which impacts all students, including Students with Disabilities (SWD).

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May of 2024, students absent 10% or more days will decrease from 123 students (K-5) to 100 students (K-5) as measured by daily attendance and Early Warning Systems data.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor progress towards improved attendance during daily attendance checks, weekly PLC meetings, and through annual teacher/admin data chats, where attendance is emphasized. The school social worker also works closely with classroom teachers and the leadership team to monitor truancy on a weekly basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Akiya Maston (akiyam@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

In order to improve attendance, we will implement a variety of techniques. Each teacher will receive a magnet to display on their door when there is 100% attendance in their class. Other teachers, support staff, and leadership are actively congratulating and celebration these classes for their complete class attendance. Additionally, individualized plans are constructed for students who struggle with attendance. They will meet with the principal to determine a reasonable attendance goal and determine an incentive that is motivating for the student (lunch with the principal, snack from the vending machine, recognition on the news, etc.) Students with Disabilities will discuss attendance and its positive impact on learning with members of the leadership team during 1-on-1 conferencing.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We have determined these interventions to be effective due to the emphasis on positive choices and positive incentives/positive impact on learning. Evidence shows that when students are recognized for a desired behavior, they will exhibit this behavior more frequently. By recognizing the class, as well as the individual, students will take more ownership in achieving that goal.

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.

Communicate attendance goals and rationale to all staff and students. Distribute attendance magnets to classroom teachers and monitor hallways for magnet use.

Person Responsible: Akiya Maston (akiyam@leeschools.net)

By When: This first action step will be completed prior to the start of the school year and implemented on the very first day of school.

Through daily attendance and weekly monitoring, the teacher, school social worker, and leadership team will be able to identify students who are experiencing attendance struggles.

Person Responsible: Akiya Maston (akiyam@leeschools.net)

By When: Monitoring and feedback will occur on a weekly basis.

Once individual students are identified, administration will create specific goals with students and families.

Person Responsible: Akiya Maston (akiyam@leeschools.net)

By When: Monitoring and feedback will occur on a weekly basis.

Once individual students have met the agreed upon goals, administration will celebrate their accomplishments (lunch with the principal, snacks, positive call home to parents, etc.)

Person Responsible: Akiya Maston (akiyam@leeschools.net)

By When: Monitoring and feedback will occur on a weekly basis.

For SWD, the leadership team will host a quarterly attendance celebration for those who have met and improved their attendance goals.

Person Responsible: Akiya Maston (akiyam@leeschools.net)

By When: Monitoring and feedback will occur on a weekly basis with recognition occurring quarterly.

After PM2, students who are struggling academically will meet with leadership twice monthly for conferencing. For SWD, administration will meet to discuss academic and attendance goals during conferences.

Person Responsible: Akiya Maston (akiyam@leeschools.net)

By When: These conferences will begin after the evaluation of PM2 progress.

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

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

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

The next area of focus is 2nd Grade ELA proficiency. During the 2021-2022 school year, 76% of 2nd grade students demonstrated proficiency as measured by the end of year FAST assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May of 2024, ELA Proficiency for 2nd Grade will increase from 76% to 80% as measured by FAST PM3.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor this specific area of focus throughout the various progress monitoring windows during the 23-24 school year. There is a baseline state and district progress monitoring window in August, a mid-year window in December and January, and a final window in the spring. We will use data from state progress monitoring (FAST ELA), in addition to data derived from district progress monitoring (i-Ready ELA and Dibels) in order to track 2nd Grade ELA progress and growth. After each assessment window, progress towards our desired outcomes will be reevaluated for progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Akiya Maston (akiyam@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

In order to achieve this goal, we will implement evidence-based interventions during WIN time. To address foundational concerns with this groups of students, we will support their learning through Really Great Reading (HD Word - Core/Tier 1, Blast - Tier 2, and/or Countdown - Tier 3), in addition to the Flyleaf reading program.

These programs will help students interact with various reading benchmarks, including phonics benchmarks, phonemic awareness benchmarks, vocabulary usage and knowledge, support fluency building and spelling, and support grade-level reading comprehension skills. Teachers will also emphasize the texts outlined as B.E.S.T. literature recommended readings and aligned reading benchmarks through WIN time, literature circles, and/or through book studies. In the classroom, these students will be supported through differentiated small group instruction on a regular basis, in addition to free tutoring during specials or after-school.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our rationale for selecting these interventions is to provide consistent differentiated small group instruction which will cover previously taught benchmarks and provide students with individualized support. These interventions also cover targeted areas of improvement in reading, including foundational reading skill, vocabulary, and reading comprehension.

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 and members of the testing team will administer baseline state assessments, district assessments, and appropriate screeners to develop initial intervention groups for WIN (Really Great Reading placement, Flyleaf placement).

Person Responsible: Jamie Mackereth (jamielma@leeschools.net)

By When: This will be completed by the end of the 1st quarter, as well as ongoing throughout the school year.

Teachers will administer baseline state assessments, district assessments, and appropriate screeners to discuss and plan grade level differentiation and small group instruction during PLC meetings (WIN time, B.E.S.T. Literature lessons, and in class differentiation).

Person Responsible: Akiya Maston (akiyam@leeschools.net)

By When: This will be completed by the end of the 1st quarter, as well as ongoing throughout the school year.

After mid-year state progress monitoring, the team will analyze student progress. Based on improvement and growth, the team will reevaluate intervention (WIN) placement, classroom differentiation, and will compile a list of students need of additional conferencing with leadership.

Person Responsible: Akiya Maston (akiyam@leeschools.net)

By When: This will be completed by the end of the 1st semester, as well as ongoing throughout the school year.

After mid-year state progress monitoring, the team will analyze student progress. Based on improvement and growth, the team will recommend students for the free tutoring program taking place during specials or after school.

Person Responsible: Akiya Maston (akiyam@leeschools.net)

By When: This will be completed by the end of the 1st semester.

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

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

Another area of focus is 3rd Grade ELA proficiency. During the 2021-2022 school year, 70% of 3rd grade students demonstrated proficiency as measured by the end of year FAST assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May of 2024, ELA Proficiency for 3rd Grade will increase from 70% to 75% as measured by FAST PM3.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor this specific area of focus throughout the various progress monitoring windows during the 23-24 school year. There is a baseline state and district progress monitoring window in August, a mid-year window in December and January, and a final window in the spring. We will use data from state progress monitoring (FAST ELA), in addition to data derived from district progress monitoring (i-Ready ELA and Dibels) in order to track 3rd Grade ELA progress and growth. After each assessment window, progress towards our desired outcomes will be reevaluated for progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Akiya Maston (akiyam@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

In order to achieve this goal, we will implement evidence-based interventions during WIN. To address foundational concerns with these students, we will support their learning through the Phonics for Reading intervention. Members of leadership and other support staff will work with 3rd grade teachers during PLCs to organize/group students for this intervention. This will allow for smaller student/teacher ratios during small group instruction. Additionally, in the classroom, these students will be supported through differentiated small group instruction on a regular basis. Students will use supplemental reading programs (Magnetic Reading, i-Ready Standards Mastery, B.E.S.T. Literature recommended reading, Flocabulary, etc.) to interact with various reading benchmarks, increase their vocabulary usage and knowledge, and support high levels of reading comprehension. Finally, students not making adequate progress will be referred to the conferencing program with members of the leadership team to encourage progress and will be referred for free tutoring during specials or after-school.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our rationale for selecting these interventions is to provide consistent differentiated small group instruction which will cover previously taught benchmarks and provide students with individualized support. These interventions also cover targeted areas of improvement in reading, including foundational reading skill, vocabulary, and reading comprehension.

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 and members of the testing team will administer baseline state assessments, district assessments, and appropriate screeners to develop initial intervention groups for WIN (Phonics for Reading).

Person Responsible: Jamie Mackereth (jamielma@leeschools.net)

By When: This will be completed by the end of the 1st quarter, as well as ongoing throughout the school year.

Teachers will administer baseline state assessments, district assessments, and appropriate screeners to discuss and plan grade level differentiation and small group instruction during PLC meetings (WIN time, Magnetic Instruction, Standards Mastery Opportunities, B.E.S.T. Literature lessons, and in class differentiation).

Person Responsible: Akiya Maston (akiyam@leeschools.net)

By When: This will be completed by the end of the 1st quarter, as well as ongoing throughout the school year.

After mid-year state progress monitoring, the team will analyze student progress. Based on improvement and growth, the team will reevaluate intervention (WIN) placement, classroom differentiation, and will compile a list of students need of additional conferencing with leadership.

Person Responsible: Akiya Maston (akiyam@leeschools.net)

By When: This will be completed by the end of the 1st semester, as well as ongoing throughout the school year.

After mid-year state progress monitoring, the team will analyze student progress. Based on improvement and growth, the team will recommend students for the free tutoring program taking place during specials or after school.

Person Responsible: Akiya Maston (akiyam@leeschools.net)

By When: This will be completed by the end of the 1st semester.

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

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

An additional area of focus is 3rd, 4th, and 5th Grade ELA proficiency. During the 2021-2022 school year, 77% of 3rd-5th grade students demonstrated proficiency as measured by the end of year FAST assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May of 2024, ELA Proficiency for 3rd-5th Grade will increase from 77% to 80% as measured by FAST PM3.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor this specific area of focus throughout the various progress monitoring windows during the 23-24 school year. There is a baseline state and district progress monitoring window in August, a mid-year window in December and January, and a final window in the spring. We will use data from state progress monitoring (FAST ELA), in addition to data derived from district progress monitoring (i-Ready ELA and Dibels) in order to track 3rd-5th Grade ELA progress and growth. After each assessment window, progress towards our desired outcomes will be reevaluated for progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Akiya Maston (akiyam@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

In order to achieve this goal, we will implement evidence-based interventions during WIN time. To address foundational concerns with this groups of students, we will support their learning through the Phonics for Reading intervention program. Additionally, qualifying students will be screened and enrolled into Read 180 and will receive the 1-on-1 support of various leadership and support personnel. Read 180 helps students interact with various reading benchmarks, increase vocabulary knowledge, and supports foundational skills through fluency building/spelling activities. In the classroom, these students will be supported through differentiated small group instruction on a regular basis. Students will use supplemental reading programs (Magnetic Reading, i-Ready Standards Mastery, B.E.S.T. Literature recommended reading, Flocabulary, etc.) to increase their vocabulary usage and knowledge and support high levels of reading comprehension. Students not reaching the desired outcomes will be referred for conferencing with members of leadership and free tutoring during specials or after-school.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our rationale for selecting these interventions is to provide consistent differentiated small group instruction which will cover previously taught benchmarks and provide students with individualized support. These interventions also cover targeted areas of improvement in reading, including foundational reading skill, vocabulary, and reading comprehension.

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 and members of the testing team will administer baseline state assessments, district assessments, and appropriate screeners to develop initial intervention WIN groups (Phonics for Reading, Read 180).

Person Responsible: Jamie Mackereth (jamielma@leeschools.net)

By When: This will be completed by the end of the 1st quarter.

Teachers and the leadership team will administer baseline state assessments, district assessments, and appropriate screeners to discuss and plan grade level differentiation (WIN) and small group instruction (in class differentiation, Magnetic Instruction, Standards Mastery Opportunities, B.E.S.T. Literature lessons, etc.) during PLC meetings.

Person Responsible: Akiya Maston (akiyam@leeschools.net)

By When: This will be completed by the end of the 1st quarter, as well as ongoing throughout the school year.

After mid-year state progress monitoring, the team will analyze student progress. Based on improvement and growth, the team will reevaluate intervention (WIN) placement, classroom differentiation, and will compile a list of students need of additional conferencing with leadership.

Person Responsible: Akiya Maston (akiyam@leeschools.net)

By When: This will be completed by the end of the 1st semester, as well as ongoing throughout the school year.

After mid-year state progress monitoring, the team will analyze student progress. Based on improvement and growth, the team will recommend students for the free tutoring program taking place during specials or after school.

Person Responsible: Akiya Maston (akiyam@leeschools.net)

By When: This will be completed by the end of the 1st semester.

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.