

The School District of Lee County

Bayshore 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	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	24
VI. Title I Requirements	27
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	29

Bayshore Elementary School

17050 WILLIAMS RD, North Ft Myers, FL 33917

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The purpose of Bayshore Elementary School is to provide all students an educational foundation that builds skills for independent thinking, instills a love of learning for life, and develops the attitude and character to be respectful and responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Please refer to the mission statement section. Our school purpose is listed there.

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
Ausman, Ben	Principal	Ensure the SIP is implemented and compliance of the goals.

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 school leadership team and SIP team worked together collaboratively to develop the goals and implementation of the SIP. We have included input from a parent and community member when developing our SIP goals, as well as the strategies that will be used to support these goals

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP will be presented to the staff during pre school week with a focus on the goals and the strategies particularly the action plan that is developed for planning improvement. The SIP will also be presented to the SAC committee during the first meeting of the school year. The SIP will be monitored quarterly by the Leadership team and executive directors. A focus will be provided for those students that are performing in the bottom 25% and their interventions will be assessed on a weekly basis.

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	35%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	91%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
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) 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: B 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	24	22	24	28	25	21	0	0	0	144
One or more suspensions	1	0	3	1	1	2	0	0	0	8
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	18	19	16	13	10	20	0	0	0	96
Course failure in Math	6	2	5	9	7	12	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	20	20	26	18	19	28	0	0	0	131
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	24	2	14	18	15	17	0	0	0	90
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	24	22	24	28	25	21	0	0	0	144

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

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

Prior Year (2022-23) 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	19	18	34	17	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	12	13	14	21	10	0	0	0	70
Course failure in Math	0	9	11	6	14	2	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	22	21	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	19	6	0	0	0	35
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	10	11	9	14	8	0	0	0	52

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	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	24	19	18	34	17	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	12	13	14	21	10	0	0	0	70
Course failure in Math	0	9	11	6	14	2	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	22	21	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	19	6	0	0	0	35
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	10	11	9	14	8	0	0	0	52

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	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	53	48	53	53	52	56	51		
ELA Learning Gains				56			38		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			42		
Math Achievement*	65	57	59	69	45	50	62		
Math Learning Gains				71			46		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55			54		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	47	53	54	51	59	59	49		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	50	51	59	59			40		

* 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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	282
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	458
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	26	Yes	2	2
ELL	35	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	49			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	55			

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	26	Yes	1	1
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	51			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	50			

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	53			65			47					50
SWD	25			39			9				4	
ELL	30			52			0				5	50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	45			55			28				5	49
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	60			71			61				4	
FRL	52			60			40				5	50

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	53	56	44	69	71	55	51					59
SWD	17	18	23	31	39	46	9					
ELL	26	43	41	46	62	50	20					59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	41	54	46	59	63	48	38					60
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	62	60	40	78	79	64	62					
FRL	44	52	44	61	64	48	39					48

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	51	38	42	62	46	54	49					40
SWD	15	13		39	53							
ELL	16	25		33	50							40

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	31	42	60	46	48	53	24					40
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	65	38		73	46		64					
FRL	41	35	44	54	43	53	32					48

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	46%	48%	-2%	54%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	58%	56%	2%	58%	0%
03	2023 - Spring	65%	42%	23%	50%	15%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	*	52%	*	54%	*
03	2023 - Spring	64%	55%	9%	59%	5%
04	2023 - Spring	71%	61%	10%	61%	10%
05	2023 - Spring	61%	52%	9%	55%	6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	47%	50%	-3%	51%	-4%

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.

The area that showed the lowest performance was Science. Bayshore had a 4% drop in overall proficiency, 2022-51% to 2023-47%. Over the past 4 years the Science data at Bayshore has been in the upper 40's to low 50's and highly correlated to the ELA proficiency each year. This year Bayshore had reading proficiency of 48% almost an exact match to the 47% Science proficiency scored. This year Science instruction occurred during the ELA block instead of the Math block which was no curriculum for both teachers. The standards and concepts of Science were new for both teachers.

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

The area that showed the greatest decline was Science. Bayshore had a 4% drop from 51% to 47%. This year Bayshore had reading proficiency of 48% almost an exact match to the 47% Science proficiency scored. This year Science instruction occurred during the ELA block instead of the Math block which was no curriculum for both teachers. The standards and concepts of Science were new for both teachers. Pacing was also a contributing factor, due to new teachers and time lost from the hurricane.

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

The area that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is Science. Bayshore had a proficiency score of 47% the state average is 51%. The state average grew by 3% while Bayshore dropped by 4%. This past year Science instruction shifted from the math instructors to the ELA instructors. The one noticeable trend is the correlation between Science proficiency and ELA proficiency. Since the removal of the P-Cell curriculum Bayshore has seen a noticeable drop in Science scores.

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

The area that showed the most improvement was ELA. The overall ELA proficiency increased from 53% to 58% overall. 3rd grade increased by 11%, 4th grade increased by 7% and 5th grade had a decrease of 5%. Bayshore continued to improve their process for daily walk to read intervention. Utilized a standard approach and curriculum for all students needing phonics support. PLC's focused on reviewing the data from formative assessments, and utilized this data for more frequent re-teaching. Teachers were more comfortable and had a better understanding of the curriculum during its second year as well as the new standards. Teachers continued to focus on providing better quality differentiated instruction for students primarily during centers.

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

One area for concern from the EWS system is student attendance. The number of students that missed 10% or more school days last year was 144 students. This number represented close to 25% of our total students population. Leading up to the hurricane we had high attendance, and post hurricane the attendance began to drop drastically.

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

Math proficiency- This past school year we had a 1% decrease in proficiency. In the upcoming school year math will also have 3 school grade components attached to it creating a need to prioritize math
Science proficiency- This past school year we had a 4% decrease in proficiency. In the upcoming school year a focus on utilizing Science material during intervention as well as during the ELA block will be a priority.

ELA Bottom 25%- Although a bottom 25% category for ELA did not exist, we tracked the progress of our bottom 25% in 4th and 5th grade and we struggled to make adequate progress with many of these students. A continued focus on intervention and quality re-teaching to these students will be a priority.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Attendance

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.

Teacher attendance- 25% of teachers had high absenteeism. Student achievement is highly correlated to the quality of teacher in the classroom. When absenteeism occurs the personal responsible for that instruction may not be highly qualified. Class coverage, lack of substitutes, para coverage, consolidate classrooms, teacher lack of prep time all can have a negative impact on student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

During the 2023/2024 school year teacher attendance will improve from 25% high absenteeism (10 days or more) to 15%.

Monitoring:

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

Monitor weekly attendance reports
Monitor monthly attendance school wide attendance reports
Conference with teacher about attendance as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Create a positive school culture where teachers will want to come to work each day.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Increase student achievement- due to higher staff attendance.

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.

Survey staff on ways to increase positive school culture
Share staff survey results
Implement survey options
Analyze results based on teacher attendance

Person Responsible: Ben Ausman (benjaminia@leeschools.net)

By When: Completion of 2023/2024 school year

#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.

This subgroup was identified beginning in 2023 as being below the Federal Index of 41%, as determined by ESSA. As a result, Bayshore Elementary is a R.A.I.S.E and TS&I school that the state is monitoring for improvement. The students with disabilities fell to 26% putting Bayshore Elementary well below the 41% Federal Index.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In 2019, this subgroup was at 26% proficiency in ELA. Our goal is to raise this percentage above 41% proficiency in ELA in 2023.

Monitoring:

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

The desired outcome will be monitored through FAST progress monitoring and student performance through district exemplars to monitor the growth of each individual student and adjust interventions as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The evidence-based strategy approved by the ESSA is intervention RtI) with a focus on closing the gaps for all of our students, especially students with disabilities. The small group setting provides opportunities for students to receive instruction through Really Great Reading. Phonics for Reading and Wonders intervention materials. Students that are excelling based on our data would receive higher level work to extend their learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting this specific area of focus is due to strong ESSA evidence that the strategy is likely to improve student outcomes based on research. Based on the data available from 2019, students with disabilities would benefit from getting small group instruction in reading that is specifically developed to meet their individual needs.

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.

Identify the students with disabilities subgroup and identify the level of intervention they need.

Person Responsible: Ben Ausman (benjaminia@leeschools.net)

By When: During PLC's weekly to assess student progress and FAST progress monitoring 3.

#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.

District Determined

Measurable Outcome:

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

During the 2023-2024 school year 2nd grade ELA proficiency will increase from 68% to 71% as measured by the FAST progress monitoring spring 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Fall and winter FAST/STAR assessment
I-Ready diagnostic
ELA Exemplars
Dibels

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ben Ausman (benjaminia@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.)

Students are receiving evidence based phonics instruction 5 times per week. Students receive on level comprehension based instruction. Students needing enrichment receive BEST literature lessons.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The strategies listed above targets students at their individual needs to close the achievement gap, while continuing to push to proficiency.

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.

Planning System- IDI, Fluency I-ready and FAST baseline assessments. The results of these assessments will determine the students' walk to read placement.

Person Responsible: Ben Ausman (benjaminia@leeschools.net)

By When: September 8th 2023

Tier I/Core Instruction system-
Small group instructional centers
90 minute reading block
Really Great Reading HD word

Wonders
RGR Playground

Person Responsible: Ben Ausman (benjaminia@leeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing coaching for benchmark alignment system.

#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.

District determined

Measurable Outcome:

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

During the 2023-2024 school year 3rd grade ELA proficiency will increase from 65% to 68% as measured by the FAST progress monitoring spring 2024.

Monitoring:

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

- Fall and winter FAST assessment
- I-Ready diagnostic
- ELA Exemplars
- Dibels
- Mock FAST assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ben Ausman (benjaminia@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.)

Students are receiving evidence based phonics instruction 5 times per week. Students receive on level comprehension based instruction. Students needing enrichment receive BEST literature lessons.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The strategies listed above targets students at their individual needs to close the achievement gap, while continuing to push to proficiency.

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.

Planning System- I-ready and FAST baseline assessments. Benchmark tracking system. The results of these assessments will determine the students' walk to read placement.

Person Responsible: Ben Ausman (benjaminia@leeschools.net)

By When: September 8

Tier I/Core Instruction system-
Small group instructional centers

90 minute reading block

Wonders

Person Responsible: Ben Ausman (benjaminia@leeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing coaching for benchmark alignment

#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.

District Determined

Measurable Outcome:

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

During the 2023/2024 school year ELA proficiency in grades 3-5 will increase from 57% to 60% based on the FAST spring 2024 assessment.

Monitoring:

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

FAST progress monitoring
Exemplars
I-ready
Quarterly comprehensive checks
Scales
Standards trackers

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ben Ausman (benjaminia@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.)

Phonics for Reading
Wonders
BEST Literature
I-ready

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The strategies listed above targets students at their individual needs to close the achievement gap, while continuing to push to proficiency.

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.

Planning System- I-ready and FAST baseline assessments. Benchmark tracking system. The results of these assessments will determine the students' walk to read placement and students' small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Ben Ausman (benjaminia@leeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing

Tier I/Core Instruction system-
 Small group instructional centers
 90 minute reading block
 Wonders
 Word Work

Person Responsible: Ben Ausman (benjaminia@leeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing coaching for benchmark alignment

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

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

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

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

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

The evidence based strategies that are being used in K-2 is walk to read (leveled intervention), phonological awareness through RGR and Heggerty. Students also use accelerated reader and

differentiated center activities. The students participate in cooperative learning through Kagan and Whole Brain. The leveled intervention will work with students on their specific needs to make them stronger readers.

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

The evidence based strategies being used is phonics for reading in leveled intervention. Students receive differentiated instruction through iReady. Students also use accelerated reader and differentiated center activities. The students participate in cooperative learning through Kagan and Whole Brain.

5th grade was 46.9% proficient on the end of year FAST progress monitoring. Even though this cohort has transitioned to middle school, leveled intervention is in place to increase reading proficiency. Teacher/instructional support is in place to give students small group with an adult.

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

Students in Kindergarten will achieve at least 55% proficiency in the area of English Language Arts as measured by the Spring 2024 administration of the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST).

Students in 1st Grade will achieve at least 68% proficiency in the area of English Language Arts as measured by the Spring 2024 administration of the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST).

Students in 2nd Grade will achieve at least 70% proficiency in the area of English Language Arts as measured by the Spring 2024 administration of the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST).

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Students in 3rd Grade will achieve at least 58% proficiency in the area of English Language Arts as measured by the Spring 2024 administration of the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST).

Students in 4th Grade will achieve at least 60% proficiency in the area of English Language Arts as measured by the Spring 2024 administration of the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST).

Students in 5th Grade will achieve at least 60% proficiency in the area of English Language Arts as measured by the Spring 2024 administration of the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST).

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.

STAR and FAST progress monitoring data will be analyzed in December. District exemplar data will be used throughout the year to check student progress. iReady data will be analyzed quarterly and drive classroom instruction. PLCs take place weekly to analyze student data and design small group intervention.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Cook , Franklin, franklinsc@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?

Really Great Reading will be used in K-2 and lessons are taught every day. Really Great Reading phonics helps students understand their letter sounds to make them stronger readers. Students will receive additional differentiated instruction with RGR if they need it during leveled intervention in small group. Small group intervention is also used in the classroom. Teachers group students based on data and small group lessons are based on what the group needs. All students have an iReady learning path that they work on for 45 minutes a week. This is a learning path that is based on their abilities so it is differentiated as well. Ready scaffold lessons are also available. In grades 3-5 Phonics for Reading leveled intervention is in place to help students that are still struggling to read. DIBELS reading fluency is also done across all grade levels. This let teachers see the fluency of students.

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?

The reasons for selecting the strategies above is that they are differentiated for all students and they all align to the B.E.S.T. standards. Based on using these strategies, especially small group intervention across all grade levels our reading scores have increased. Students are getting what they need from these programs/leveled intervention. Students get the opportunity if they are struggling reader to always be working with a teacher or instructional support personnel. This in the end will make them stronger readers with practice.

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
-------------	-----------------------------------

The first step is to look at the data and identify the students that need support in reading. Once the students have been identified, instructional support/teachers will be assigned to areas of need. Mrs. Devore (Reading Specialist) and Mrs. Lefko (K-2 Literacy Coach) work with the grade levels in order to determine appropriate passages and methods of teaching the content that align to the B.E.S.T. standards. As Mrs. DeVore and Mrs. Lefko attend district trainings based on literacy, the information is passed on to make sure Bayshore Elementary is following best practices for student achievement. Grade level representatives also attend leading and learning sessions from the school district. District coaches Leading and Learning representatives before they meet with their grade level team and design instruction.

Cook , Franklin,
franklinsc@leeschools.net

Scales are used as part of our assessments. B.E.S.T. standards are explained to our students and they have scales to show them what the standard is asking of them. The scales are leveled so students can explain where they are at on the standard. The goal is to get all students to level 3, which is reaching the level the standard is asking. Students have the scale on their desk and self reflect where they are at and have data chats with teachers so students understand what they still need to be able to do to reach the standard. FAST progress monitoring will be used throughout the year to determine the progress of the students. District exemplars will also be given throughout the year. The frequency of the district exemplars will give many data points to see how students are progressing.

Cook , Franklin,
franklinsc@leeschools.net

PLCs are a critical component of looking at the assessments. It is determining who didn't get it and who is getting it. As the data is analyzed in PLCs, it will be used to drive instruction for the students who need additional support and lessons can be designed to enhance students who did get it. PLCs meet weekly to have consistent communication as team to move forward and talk about the data points. This process is continuous all year in order to make sure instruction is matching what the students need. Teaching and assessing are always taking place to understand the next design of instruction that needs to take place.

Cook , Franklin,
franklinsc@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.

Not Applicable

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))

Not Applicable

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)

Not Applicable

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))

Not Applicable

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))

Not Applicable

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))

Not Applicable

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).

Not Applicable

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))

Not Applicable

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))

Not Applicable

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Attendance	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes