

The School District of Lee County

Tanglewood 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	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	28
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Tanglewood Elementary School

1620 MANCHESTER BLVD, Fort Myers, FL 33919

<http://tan.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.

To Inspire Leaders with Character and a Passion for Learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Together we Lead and Succeed.

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
Buckley, Linda	Principal	Administration - Oversees all areas of the school. Includes overseeing implementation of MTSS process, problem-solving process in the building, provides/coordinates valuable and continuous professional development. Conducts classroom walkthroughs and evaluations to monitor fidelity.
Crews, Marilyn	Assistant Principal	Administration - Oversees transportation, daily student behavior concerns as well as teacher and parent concerns. Oversees PBIS team and provides supports for teachers and paras. Designs master schedule as well as early release schedules and testing schedules.
Pabon, Nicole	Instructional Coach	Works with teachers to provide curriculum and in class academic supports for ELA. Liaison to iReady curriculum team, ELA liaison contact for district representative. Works to assist with Wonders curriculum. Also works in classrooms to assist teachers. Also works directly with students.
Hering, Jessica	Dean	Works with students to de-escalate and problem solve disputes. Uses restorative practices to help students to resolve peer conflicts.
Miller, Nicole	Other	Implements MTSS process for both academic and behavioral needs - meets with parents, tracks data, assists teachers with data tracking.
Velasquez, Dawn	Teacher, ESE	Serves ESE students and works as a liaison between ESE students and gen ed teachers. Writes IEPs, communicates with parents, services students, ensures students are working towards IEP goals.
Bentz, Lindsay	School Counselor	Meets with students to provide emotional supports, works closely with teachers to determine student needs, leads mental health team, works on threat assessment team.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The Tanglewood SIP process begins with data analysis. Leadership team, teachers, and staff input data into data trackers both from previous year and present year. Data is reviewed by administration with teachers and in-depth discussions are held regarding the data, including strengths and weaknesses. These discussions occur throughout the school year in PLCs. Data trackers are prepared and updated throughout the school year. Teachers use the data to track and monitor progress and decide how to best provide individualized instruction for each student. The SIP development comes from the data that teachers track and discuss at PLC meetings, at all grades, including final FAST scores. This ensures that the SIP is relevant to every teacher. Students track their data using data folders. Students enter their

data into their data folders and discuss their data at Student Led Conferences. They are able to discuss their strengths and weaknesses with their parents/guardians. The Tanglewood SIP is shared at the SAC meetings and updates are given throughout the year on the newest data available.

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 Tanglewood SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation at each PLC meeting by reviewing the school goals and updating data trackers to check for progress. Also during PLCs, teachers will review each student's progress to determine differentiated instructional tracks needed. Teachers will have one data chat per semester with an administrator to review student progress. The Tanglewood SIP will be revised as needed based on quarterly data, data chats with teachers and leadership meetings.

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	52%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	87%
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) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	9	2	4	4	4	5	0	0	0	28
One or more suspensions	3	3	4	6	3	8	0	0	0	27
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	21	13	23	7	7	8	0	0	0	79
Course failure in Math	9	4	11	4	5	10	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	35	24	36	0	0	0	95
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	23	28	41	0	0	0	92
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	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	10	2	9	19	36	51	0	0	0	127

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	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	16	25	15	22	24	29	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	8	15	17	14	23	17	0	0	0	94
Course failure in ELA	11	42	35	35	29	29	0	0	0	181
Course failure in Math	4	18	30	16	28	22	0	0	0	118
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	29	34	28	0	0	0	91
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	16	31	33	0	0	0	80
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	6	20	27	19	16	19	0	0	0	107
	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	7	0	5	12	49	54	0	0	0	127

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	16	25	15	22	24	29	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	8	15	17	14	23	17	0	0	0	94
Course failure in ELA	11	42	35	35	29	29	0	0	0	181
Course failure in Math	4	18	30	16	28	22	0	0	0	118
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	29	34	28	0	0	0	91
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	16	31	33	0	0	0	80
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	6	20	27	19	16	19	0	0	0	107
	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	7	0	5	12	49	54	0	0	0	127

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	58	48	53	62	52	56	64		
ELA Learning Gains				60			57		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43			26		
Math Achievement*	61	57	59	69	45	50	65		
Math Learning Gains				53			54		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37			22		
Science Achievement*	62	53	54	59	59	59	56		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	44	51	59	59			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	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	283
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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	442
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	30	Yes	2	2
ELL	39	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	30	Yes	2	1
HSP	54			
MUL	72			
PAC				

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
WHT	69			
FRL	47			

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	30	Yes	1	1
ELL	41			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	1	
HSP	48			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	48			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	58			61			62					44
SWD	19			22			25				5	60
ELL	38			49							4	44
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33			24			43				4	
HSP	53			55			52				5	46

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
MUL	81			63							2	
PAC												
WHT	67			74			69				4	
FRL	47			47			48				5	47

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	62	60	43	69	53	37	59					59
SWD	22	33	32	34	43	31	10					31
ELL	37	43	33	51	39	38	25					59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25	37	36	46	46	33						
HSP	50	58	37	58	47	36	37					58
MUL	64	56		62	47							
PAC												
WHT	78	68	62	81	59		77					
FRL	47	57	46	55	45	31	47					55

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	64	57	26	65	54	22	56					48
SWD	24	25	20	24	15	10	17					
ELL	29			37								48
AMI												
ASN	64			55								
BLK	43	44		21	22	20	18					
HSP	53	65		57	52		50					51
MUL	64			50								
PAC												
WHT	75	59		83	69		75					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
FRL	52	48	25	50	40	24	34					42

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	56%	48%	8%	54%	2%
04	2023 - Spring	65%	56%	9%	58%	7%
03	2023 - Spring	55%	42%	13%	50%	5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	70%	55%	15%	59%	11%
04	2023 - Spring	63%	61%	2%	61%	2%
05	2023 - Spring	51%	52%	-1%	55%	-4%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	57%	50%	7%	51%	6%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

Tanglewood Elementary's data component that showed the lowest performance was in ELA grades 3-5, with a proficiency level of 63%. Contributing factors include students lacking foundational reading skills and having gaps in their learning. While this is our lowest performing area, our proficiency levels are above district (48%) and state levels (54%).

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

Tanglewood Elementary's greatest decline from the prior year was math. Spring 22 FSA scores showed a proficiency level of 69%. This spring, 2023 results from the FAST PM 3 show a proficiency level of 64% which is a decrease of 5 percentage points. Factors that may have contributed to the decline include a lack of foundational math skills and gaps in student learning. Another factor that may have contributed is that the FAST test was new to our teachers and students.

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

The data component with the greatest gap compared to the state average was science. Our Tanglewood Elementary proficiency level is 63%, while the state average is 51%. TWES is +12 points over the state average. We attribute this to our commitment to using hands-on science experiments and participating in the live shows from the district based curriculum. Teachers also used some WINN time for science activities.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was in science. Proficiency level in spring of 22 was 59% while spring 23 proficiency level was 63%, an improvement of 4 percentage points. Tanglewood utilized some WINN time and dedicated it to science.

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

One potential area of concern is the number of students with course failure in ELA in grades K, 1 and 2. This means that students are not meeting benchmark requirements and mastering foundational skills early in their schooling career.

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

1. Increase ELA proficiency
2. Increase Math proficiency
3. Increase Science proficiency
4. Increase ESSA sub-population of Black student's ELA proficiency
5. Increase ESSA sub-population of SWD's ELA proficiency

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 Other**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.

At TWES, we are continuing to strengthen and broaden our PBIS program. Last year, we reinvigorated our PBIS program by using "Hoot Bucks" to help teachers and staff to incentivize positive behaviors. We also implemented a Hoot Bucks store to allow students to use their Hoot Bucks to purchase items. In addition, we implemented SOAR days. Students were allowed to purchase these special days at the end of each quarter using their Hoot Bucks. Due to the hurricane, we started the program later than anticipated, but we did do two store sales opportunities and three SOAR days which included a day of bounce houses, a black light dance party and a BMX show. This year, we are again using Hoot Bucks, store days and SOAR days and continuing to reinvigorate our PBIS program. We have already prepared to stock the store and have planned the SOAR days into our school calendar. We also plan to have PBIS assemblies at the beginning of the year and after the first quarter to share expectations with students. We have also added an incentive for positive behavior in the cafe, called the "Silver Spoon Award." Our staff meeting at the beginning of the year will include training for teachers and staff as well. This year, we are expecting to be able to apply for Model School status for our PBIS program here at Tanglewood for the first year in many years. We hope that by continuing to strengthen and helping our PBIS program to evolve, our students will have fewer behavior concerns, including fewer minor infractions, referrals and disciplinary concerns. This in turn, should allow more time for teachers to be able to instruct and spend less time dealing with behavioral concerns. We also hope to be able to increase our attendance percentage.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 23-24 school year, 100% of students will use Hoot Bucks to purchase an item at the incentive cart or an event at SOAR day.

Monitoring:

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

Each time a student accesses the incentive cart or an event at SOAR day, the teacher will check off the student's name. At the end of the quarter at PLCs, teachers will note which students have not yet accessed the incentive cart or SOAR day. During the next quarter, teachers will assist these students to make sure they understand how to use their Hoot Bucks for incentives.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marilyn Crews (marilynjc@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.)

Teachers and staff are using Hoot Bucks.
Students are using Hoot Bucks to trade for items on the incentive cart or at a SOAR event.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When PBIS systems are implemented, there are fewer discipline issues and more instruction can occur. PBIS system praises and incentivizes positive behavior.

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.

PBIS team purchases items for school store.

Person Responsible: Marilyn Crews (marilynjc@leeschools.net)

By When: Third week in August.

All PBIS posters are up in critical areas.

Person Responsible: Marilyn Crews (marilynjc@leeschools.net)

By When: First day of school.

SOAR days organized and prepped.

Person Responsible: Marilyn Crews (marilynjc@leeschools.net)

By When: Quarterly.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

ELA Achievement for Black/African American students for the past 5 years is as follows:

22-23: 31% proficient

21-22: 25% proficient

20-21: 43% proficient

19-20: No data available due to pandemic

18-19: 26%

17-18: 27%

Because the data for this subgroup is consistently below the federal index of 41% except for the year of 20-21, Tanglewood Elementary will focus on this subgroup as a critical need area.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 23-24 school year, Black/African American students will increase proficiency from 31% to 41% or higher on ELA Standards test items as measured by FAST ELA PM3 2024.

Monitoring:

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

FAST PM 1 and 2 will be monitored. Also, iReady scores will be monitored for growth and areas of needed improvement. Individual FAST data for each student in current grades 4 and 5 will be disaggregated to be able to focus on specific student needs. Students in third grade will have data disaggregated after FAST PM 1 data is available. Data will include 2022 FSA, 2023 FAST, 2022 iReady and current fall iReady scores. Data will be monitored in weekly PLCs by teachers and during data chats with administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Linda Buckley (lindaebu@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.)

Dedicated intervention time daily implemented with fidelity.

iReady implementation with required minutes/lessons passed weekly.

iReady individualized learning paths

Really Great Reading phonics implemented in K-2 daily.

Implement Phonics for Reading daily during intervention.

Continue Wonders core curriculum.

Magnetic Reading 3-5

Fluency

Just In Time

Filling In the Gaps

After school tutoring program starting in January

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Daily intervention time implemented with fidelity will help teachers to be able to focus on specific areas of need and differentiate instruction to fill the academic gaps for these students. iReady implementation with required minutes/lessons passed weekly will assist teachers with another way to monitor student

progress. Individualized learning paths will help to fill academic gaps. Phonics for Reading during instruction will help students to master phonics skills. Other interventions including Magnetic Reading and Fluency practice will help students to master skills.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Weekly PLCs to disaggregate data by student to determine specific student needs of differentiated instruction and benchmark mastery.

Person Responsible: Linda Buckley (lindaebu@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Data chats with administration will give teachers the opportunity to share successes and challenges. Administration will be able to monitor student progress and suggest possible interventions to assist with instruction.

Person Responsible: Linda Buckley (lindaebu@leeschools.net)

By When: 1 per semester.

#3. 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.

ELA Achievement for SWD students for the past 5 years is as follows:

22-23: 36% proficient

21-22: 22% proficient

20-21: 24% proficient

19-20: No data available due to pandemic

18-19: 14%

17-18: 22%

Because the data for this subgroup is consistently below the federal index of 41%, Tanglewood Elementary will focus on this subgroup as a critical need area.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 23-24 school year, 38% of SWD will score at the proficient level or higher on ELA Standards test items as measured by FAST ELA 2024 and/or show a learning gain.

Monitoring:

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

Classroom teachers and ESE teacher will disaggregate FAST 2023 ELA scores to determine areas of strength and intervention needed. After FAST PM1, classroom teacher and ESE teacher will disaggregate data to determine any new strengths and areas of intervention needed. In addition, iReady scores will be monitored for growth and areas of needed improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Linda Buckley (lindaebu@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.)

Dedicated intervention time daily implemented with fidelity.

iReady implementation with required minutes/lessons passed weekly.

iReady individualized learning paths

Really Great Reading phonics implemented in K-2 daily.

Implement Phonics for Reading daily during intervention.

Continue Wonders core curriculum.

Magnetic Reading 3-5

Fluency

Just In Time

Filling In the Gaps

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Dedicated intervention time daily implemented with fidelity allows classroom teacher and ESE teacher to focus on differentiated skills for SWD. ESE teacher will support classroom teacher and assist with student instruction.

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.

Classroom teacher and ESE teacher will work together to determine how to best assist student to meet academic goals.

Person Responsible: Linda Buckley (lindaebu@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

#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.

2nd grade ELA is a priority to ensure students are mastering foundational skills in reading.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 23-24 school year, 2nd grade students will increase proficiency from 57% to 60% or higher on ELA Standards test items as measured by STAR ELA Spring 2024 scores.

Monitoring:

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome by weekly PLCs - following the instructional cycle, holding and participating in grade level meetings. Teachers will keep data dashboards updated as data becomes available.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marilyn Crews (marilynjc@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.)

What: Benchmarks mastered and not mastered based on exemplars, FlyLeaf, iReady implementation with required minutes/lessons passed, Mindplay (ESE students)
How Often: WINN TIME: What I Need Now - Daily for 1 hour
Monitor: Marilyn Crews
Who: Second Grade Teachers, ESE Resource Teacher and Literacy Coach

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

TWES is using District approved ELA resources for reading instruction.

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.

Individual student progress will be monitored weekly at PLCs as teachers disaggregate data to determine which benchmarks were mastered based on exemplars, Flyleaf, iReady implementation with required minutes/lessons passed and Mindplay for ESE students.

Person Responsible: Marilyn Crews (marilynjc@leeschools.net)

By When: In Weekly PLC meetings.

Planning Systems

What: PLCs (Following the Instructional Cycle), Grade Level Meetings

How Often: Weekly

Monitor: Marilyn Crews

Who: Second Grade, ESE Resource Teacher and Literacy Coach

Person Responsible: Marilyn Crews (marilynjc@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Tier I/Core System

What: WONDERS, Heggerty, Really Great Reading (HD Word) Instructional Guide Resources, Fluency Passages.

How Often: 90 Minute reading block: Daily with differentiation during centers.

Monitor: Marilyn Crews

Who: Second Grade Teachers, ESE Teacher and Literacy Coach

Person Responsible: Marilyn Crews (marilynjc@leeschools.net)

By When: Daily

Benchmark Alignment Coaching will occur in weekly PLCs as part of the instructional cycle to determine if classroom activities/work samples are aligned to grade level benchmarks. The desired result of our system is for students to finish the year at a proficient level or beyond. Success of the system will be measured by the STAR progress monitoring.

Person Responsible: Marilyn Crews (marilynjc@leeschools.net)

By When: At weekly PLCs.

#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.

Third grade will have its own school grade component this next year and we will be tracking student by student for the mastery of benchmarks.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 23-24 school year, 3rd grade students will increase proficiency from 59% to 62% or higher on ELA Standards test items as measured by FAST ELA PM 3 2024.

Monitoring:

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome by weekly PLCs - following the instructional cycle, holding and participating in grade level meetings. Teachers will keep data dashboards updated as data becomes available.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Linda Buckley (lindaebu@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 will receive 60 minutes of intervention each day. During the intervention block, students will receive differentiated instruction in which students will rotate through different centers. The centers will consist of teacher directed instruction, computer station which students will receive enrichment or additional intervention and independent reading or independent practice. Phonics for Reading will be used during intervention. These will be monitored by classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans and open communication other than during PLC times.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

TWES is using District approved ELA resources for reading instruction. In addition, strategies used will include High Yield Instructional strategies, Kagan strategies, Thinking Maps, Text-Dependent Questioning and Higher Order Thinking. High Yield strategies are researched-based instructional practices linked to increased student achievement. They can be applied to all content areas and enable teachers to focus on improving the quality of instruction students will receive.

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.

Individual student progress will be monitored weekly at PLCs as teachers disaggregate data to determine which benchmarks were mastered based on exemplars. iReady implementation with required minutes/ lessons passed and Mindplay for ESE students.

Person Responsible: Linda Buckley (lindaebu@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Teachers will have the opportunity to have data chats with administration each semester.

Person Responsible: Linda Buckley (lindaebu@leeschools.net)

By When: 1 per semester

All students will have a 90 minute ELA Block daily. Within the block of time, students will receive instruction that covers foundational skills, whole group instruction and small group instruction. Instruction will be differentiated during small group instruction. Students may work independently on their Chromebook, work directly with the teacher and have an independent reading center where students will focus on practicing reviewing skills for mastery.

Person Responsible: Linda Buckley (lindaebu@leeschools.net)

By When: 90 minute reading block will be done daily for the entire school year.

Benchmark Alignment Coaching will occur in weekly PLCs as part of the instructional cycle to determine if classroom activities/work samples are aligned to grade level benchmarks. The desired result of our system is for students to finish the year at a proficient level or beyond. Success of the system will be measured by the FAST progress monitoring.

Person Responsible: Linda Buckley (lindaebu@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly PLCs, FAST progress monitoring 1, 2 and 3 as the school year progresses.

#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.

3rd - 5th grade ELA Proficiency is the foundation for our school grade.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 23-24 school year, 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students will increase proficiency from 62% - 65% or higher on ELA Standards test items as measured by FAST ELA PM3 2024.

Monitoring:

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome by weekly PLCs - following the instructional cycle, holding and participating in grade level meetings. Teachers will keep data dashboards updated as data becomes available.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Linda Buckley (lindaebu@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 will receive 60 minutes of intervention each day. During the intervention block, students will receive differentiated instruction in which students will rotate through different centers. The centers will consist of teacher directed instruction, computer station which students will receive enrichment or additional intervention and independent reading or independent practice. Phonics for Reading will be used during intervention. These will be monitored by classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans and open communication other than during PLC times.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

TWES is using District approved ELA resources for reading instruction. In addition, strategies used will include High Yield Instructional strategies, Kagan strategies, Thinking Maps, Text-Dependent Questioning and Higher Order Thinking. High Yield strategies are researched-based instructional practices linked to increased student achievement. They can be applied to all content areas and enable teachers to focus on improving the quality of instruction students will receive.

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.

Individual student progress will be monitored weekly at PLCs as teachers disaggregate data to determine which benchmarks were mastered based on exemplars. iReady implementation with required minutes/ lessons passed and Mindplay for ESE students.

Person Responsible: Linda Buckley (lindaebu@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Teachers will have the opportunity to have data chats with administration each semester.

Person Responsible: Linda Buckley (lindaebu@leeschools.net)

By When: 1 per semester

All students will have a 90 minute ELA Block daily. Within the block of time, students will receive instruction that covers foundational skills, whole group instruction and small group instruction. Instruction will be differentiated during small group instruction. Students may work independently on their Chromebook, work directly with the teacher and have an independent reading center where students will focus on practicing reviewing skills for mastery.

Person Responsible: Linda Buckley (lindaebu@leeschools.net)

By When: 90 minute reading block will be done daily for the entire school year.

Benchmark Alignment Coaching will occur in weekly PLCs as part of the instructional cycle to determine if classroom activities/work samples are aligned to grade level benchmarks. The desired result of our system is for students to finish the year at a proficient level or beyond. Success of the system will be measured by the FAST progress monitoring.

Person Responsible: Linda Buckley (lindaebu@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly PLCs, FAST progress monitoring 1, 2 and 3 as the school year progresses.

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.