

The School District of Lee County

# Tortuga Preserve Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

**Table of Contents**

---

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>                                   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>I. School Information</b>                                       | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>                            | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>                               | <b>14</b> |
| <b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>                       | <b>29</b> |
| <b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b> | <b>29</b> |
| <b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>                                    | <b>32</b> |
| <b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>                       | <b>0</b>  |

# Tortuga Preserve Elementary School

1711 GUNNERY RD N, Lehigh Acres, FL 33971

<http://tpe.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),<br>(7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B)<br>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.

Tortuga Preserve is shaping well-rounded leaders by being Proactive, Organized, Wise, Engaged, and Respectful. Our mindset is #ALLIN!

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

One TEAM with one MINDSET on the path to SUCCESS.

### 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   |
|-------------------|---------------------|---|
| Shonak, Jennifer  | Principal           | Oversees all processes and procedures for the students and staff of the school. Ensure teachers and staff are working towards SIP goals.  |
| Vest, Marla       | Assistant Principal | Oversees all processes and procedures for the students and staff of the school. Ensure teachers and staff are working towards SIP goals. AP over grades K-2, K-5 ELA, Title 1 and ESOL.             |
| Crawford, Dave    | Assistant Principal | Oversees all processes and procedures for the students and staff of the school. Ensure teachers and staff are working towards SIP goals. AP over grades 3-5, K-5 Math and Science, ESE, and Safety. |
| Putnam, Amy       | Instructional Coach | Supports instruction related to SIP goals and assists in leading PLC's.   |
| Carter, Elizabeth | Assistant Principal | Supports behavioral SIP goals with grades K-5.  |

#### 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 stakeholder involvement in our School Improvement Plan consists of gathering data from our HRS survey given to students, staff, and parents. Monthly SAC/PTA meetings allow the school and parents to give input and feedback. Teachers and admin meets weekly to discuss data.

**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))

SIP data will be monitored by instructional staff, support staff, and our weekly PLC meetings on Wednesdays. Data chats between students/teachers and teachers/administration is used to review data regularly.

**Demographic Data**

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

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2023-24 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>   | Yes   |
| <b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>   | 84%   |
| <b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>   | 100%  |
| <b>Charter School</b>  | No  |
| <b>RAISE School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>ESSA Identification</b><br>*updated as of 3/11/2024   | ATSI  |
| <b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>  | No  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)*<br>English Language Learners (ELL)*<br>Black/African American Students (BLK)*<br>Hispanic Students (HSP)<br>Multiracial Students (MUL)<br>White Students (WHT)<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| <b>School Grades History</b><br>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.  | 2021-22: C<br>2019-20: C<br>2018-19: C<br>2017-18: C  |
| <b>School Improvement Rating History</b>   |   |
| <b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>   |   |

**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   | 15          | 63 | 63 | 63 | 32 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 270 |       |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 1  | 3  | 7  | 6  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20  |       |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)   | 0           | 23 | 19 | 34 | 29 | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 110 |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 12 | 9  | 14 | 21 | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 13 | 74 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 10 | 63 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 119 |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 0  | 0  | 13 | 74 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 |       |

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |    |    |    |   |   |   | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 9 | 8 | 19 | 55 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 123   |

**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           | 1 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 1 | 3 | 2  | 4 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23    |

#### **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   | 24          | 27 | 30 | 35 | 30 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 182 |       |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5   |       |
| Course failure in ELA   | 26          | 16 | 25 | 44 | 5  | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 133 |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 15          | 6  | 6  | 14 | 13 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 40 | 26 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 31 | 33 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 117 |       |
| 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           | 3 | 0 | 47 | 47 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 161   |



**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 | 40 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1     |

**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   | 24          | 27 | 30 | 35 | 30 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 182 |       |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5   |       |
| Course failure in ELA   | 26          | 16 | 25 | 44 | 5  | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 133 |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 15          | 6  | 6  | 14 | 13 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 40 | 26 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 31 | 33 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 117 |       |
| 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           | 3 | 0 | 47 | 47 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 161   |

**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 | 40 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1     |

**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*                | 41     | 48       | 53    | 43     | 52       | 56    | 46     |          |       |
| ELA Learning Gains              |        |          |       | 54     |          |       | 47     |          |       |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile      |        |          |       | 44     |          |       | 47     |          |       |
| Math Achievement*               | 46     | 57       | 59    | 46     | 45       | 50    | 44     |          |       |
| Math Learning Gains             |        |          |       | 53     |          |       | 48     |          |       |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile     |        |          |       | 36     |          |       | 30     |          |       |
| Science Achievement*            | 45     | 53       | 54    | 38     | 59       | 59    | 37     |          |       |
| Social Studies Achievement*     |        |          |       |        | 62       | 64    |        |          |       |
| Middle School Acceleration      |        |          |       |        | 47       | 52    |        |          |       |
| Graduation Rate                 |        |          |       |        | 50       | 50    |        |          |       |
| College and Career Acceleration |        |          |       |        |          | 80    |        |          |       |
| ELP Progress                    | 49     | 51       | 59    | 52     |          |       | 36     |          |       |

\* 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           | 43   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 3    |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 216  |
| 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 | 46   |

**2021-22 ESSA Federal Index**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 3   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 366 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 8   |
| Percent Tested                                 | 99  |
| Graduation Rate                                |     |

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

| <b>ESSA Subgroup</b> | <b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b> | <b>Subgroup Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b> |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| SWD                  | 21                                     | Yes                       | 4  | 2  |
| ELL                  | 31                                     | Yes                       | 3  | 1  |
| AMI                  |  |                           |  |  |
| ASN                  |  |                           |  |  |
| BLK                  | 37                                     | Yes                       | 2  |  |
| HSP                  | 41                                     |                           |  |  |
| MUL                  | 50                                     |                           |  |  |
| PAC                  |  |                           |  |  |
| WHT                  | 54                                     |                           |  |  |
| FRL                  | 41                                     |                           |  |  |

**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

| <b>ESSA Subgroup</b> | <b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b> | <b>Subgroup Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b> |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| SWD                  | 22                                     | Yes                       | 3  | 1  |
| ELL                  | 38                                     | Yes                       | 2  |  |
| AMI                  |  |                           |  |  |
| ASN                  |  |                           |  |  |
| BLK                  | 40                                     | Yes                       | 1  |  |
| HSP                  | 46                                     |                           |  |  |

**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

| <b>ESSA Subgroup</b> | <b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b> | <b>Subgroup Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b> |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| MUL                  | 60                                     |                           |  |  |
| PAC                  |  |                           |  |  |
| WHT                  | 57                                     |                           |  |  |
| FRL                  | 41                                     |                           |  |  |

**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**

| <b>Subgroups</b> | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2021-22</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2021-22</b> | <b>ELP Progress</b> |
|------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| All Students     | 41              |               |                    | 46               |                |                     | 45              |                |                  |                          |                                | 49                  |
| SWD              | 14              |               |                    | 20               |                |                     | 28              |                |                  |                          | 5                              | 36                  |
| ELL              | 26              |               |                    | 32               |                |                     | 30              |                |                  |                          | 5                              | 49                  |
| AMI              |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |
| ASN              |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |
| BLK              | 39              |               |                    | 33               |                |                     | 35              |                |                  |                          | 5                              | 43                  |
| HSP              | 38              |               |                    | 46               |                |                     | 43              |                |                  |                          | 5                              | 49                  |
| MUL              | 44              |               |                    | 56               |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          | 2                              |                     |
| PAC              |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |
| WHT              | 51              |               |                    | 57               |                |                     | 56              |                |                  |                          | 4                              |                     |
| FRL              | 40              |               |                    | 45               |                |                     | 41              |                |                  |                          | 5                              | 48                  |

**2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS**

| <b>Subgroups</b> | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2020-21</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2020-21</b> | <b>ELP Progress</b> |
|------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| All Students     | 43              | 54            | 44                 | 46               | 53             | 36                  | 38              |                |                  |                          |                                | 52                  |
| SWD              | 21              | 43            | 38                 | 14               | 15             | 0                   | 9               |                |                  |                          |                                | 39                  |
| ELL              | 26              | 51            | 40                 | 26               | 45             | 41                  | 22              |                |                  |                          |                                | 52                  |
| AMI              |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |
| ASN              |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups                                      | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 | ELP Progress |
| BLK  | 36       | 54     | 44          | 33        | 39      | 19           | 25       |         |           |                   |                     | 67           |
| HSP  | 40       | 55     | 46          | 45        | 53      | 40           | 37       |         |           |                   |                     | 50           |
| MUL  | 56       | 50     |             | 61        | 71      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 56       | 48     |             | 62        | 65      |              | 54       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 37       | 53     | 45          | 39        | 46      | 33           | 30       |         |           |                   |                     | 46           |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups                                      | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 | ELP Progress |
| All Students                                   | 46       | 47     | 47          | 44        | 48      | 30           | 37       |         |           |                   |                     | 36           |
| SWD  | 23       | 56     |             | 24        | 25      |              | 19       |         |           |                   |                     | 35           |
| ELL  | 33       | 45     | 42          | 29        | 41      | 42           | 23       |         |           |                   |                     | 36           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 36       | 42     | 50          | 32        | 39      | 20           | 23       |         |           |                   |                     | 23           |
| HSP  | 43       | 51     | 45          | 42        | 42      | 24           | 36       |         |           |                   |                     | 37           |
| MUL  | 72       |        |             | 72        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 62       | 40     |             | 59        | 72      |              | 54       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 37       | 42     | 47          | 36        | 43      | 30           | 31       |         |           |                   |                     | 37           |

### 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 | 40%    | 48%      | -8%                        | 54%   | -14%                    |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 58%    | 56%      | 2%                         | 58%   | 0%                      |

| ELA   |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 31%    | 42%      | -11%                       | 50%   | -19%                    |

| MATH  |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 40%    | 55%      | -15%                       | 59%   | -19%                    |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 52%    | 61%      | -9%                        | 61%   | -9%                     |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 45%    | 52%      | -7%                        | 55%   | -10%                    |

| SCIENCE |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05      | 2023 - Spring | 43%    | 50%      | -7%                        | 51%   | -8%                     |

### 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.**

According to the data components our lowest performing area is ELA proficiency. The contributing factors for last years low performance is our district being out of school due to Hurricane Ian and 3-5 teachers having new curriculum and benchmarks. We also had some teacher turnover in one of the 3rd grade and 5th Grade classrooms.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year is 4th grade Math. We went from 60% proficient in 21-22 to 53% proficient in 22-23 which is a decline of 7%. Factors that contributed to this decline was Hurricane Ian closing schools and causing math pacing to shorten. Teachers also had new benchmarks and new curriculum this school year.

**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 components that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was in two areas. 1) 3rd Grade ELA Proficiency and 2) 3rd Grade Math Proficiency.

3rd Grade ELA Proficiency was 35% proficient a -15 % gap compared to the state (50%)  
3rd Grade Math Proficiency was 44% proficient, a -15 % gap compared to the state (59%)

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

For the 2023-2024 Science proficiency rose from 38% (2022-2023 NGSSS) to 47% according to the NGSSS Assessment.

New Actions: 3rd and 4th Grade implementing more District Resources (Science Investigations/pacing/standard specific). District Science support for teachers planning and pacing. Use of District supported science resources. Science on the Specials Wheel. Science Resource Teacher support in classrooms. Science camp for 5th grade students.

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

According to our EWS the area of concerns we have for the 23-24 school year are Level 1 students on the statewide ELA assessment and Level students 1 on the statewide Math assessment. For the 22-23 school year we had 122 students with a level 1 on the ELA assessment and 119 students with a level 1 on the math assessment.

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

Our highest priorities for our school improvement plan for the 23-24 school year are:

- 1) Student attendance and celebrations
- 2) Staff attendance and celebrations
- 3) 3rd Grade ELA Proficiency (lowest scoring)
- 4) Grades 2 - 5 ELA Proficiency
- 5) Grades 2 - 5 Math 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.

Based on our High Reliability Schools survey from teachers and staff for the 22-23 school year our area of focus will be on celebrating teachers and staff to help build morale in our school climate which is leading indicator 1.7.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

We want to decrease our standard deviation from 1.22 to below 1.0 based on the High Reliability School survey on leading indicator 1.7.

**Monitoring:**

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

Our area of focused will be monitored by asking for teacher input on how we can celebrate teachers and staff, holding monthly leadership meetings with team and administration and giving surveys from HRS quarterly.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jennifer Shonak (jenniferis@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.)

Intervention that will be implemented includes using a School Reformed Initiative Protocol to identify the areas teachers and staff want to be celebrated in. From that data we will use Leading a High Reliability School book and trainings to help support our goal. HRS team will meet quarterly to review data and ways to implement.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Based on our data we have learned from HRS the strategies above help support our school and districts goal in HRS.

**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.

1. Review survey results from HRS.
2. Create a plan through \_\_\_\_\_ SRI protocol during preschool week with HRS team.
3. Based on the results from teacher/staff input HRS team will focus on leading indicator 1.7.
4. Leadership/Admin/HRS Teams will meet monthly to support celebrating teachers, staff, and teams throughout the year.
5. The HRS team will give surveys quarterly to show the progress in leading indicator 1.7.



6. Based on the data from the surveys the HRS team will meet to identify areas to celebrate or opportunities for improvement.

**Person Responsible:** Amy Putnam (amympu@leeschools.net)

**By When:** By the end of first semester of the 22-23 school year.

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

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

For the 2023-2024 school year our 2nd Grade Proficiency scores were 38% proficient. The scores dropped from the baseline (46% proficient) and mid year (47% proficient) scores.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

In the Spring of 2022-2023, students in Grade 1 (now 2nd Graders) scored at 57% proficient.

Goal: By the Spring of 2023-2024, students in Grade 2 will increase ELA Proficiency from 38% to 60% as measured by STAR Reading. Our goal is to maintain or increase that ELA proficiency score.

**Monitoring:**

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

This area of focus will be monitored through classroom assessment and progress monitoring (STAR/ DIBELS) data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Marla Vest (marlamv@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.)

To achieve the goal we will use the following evidence based practices/programs in 2nd Grade. We will use Wonders Curriculum embedded in the 90 minute uninterrupted ELA Block, I-Ready lesson path/ toolkit, Heggerty Phonemic Awareness/Phonics and Really Great Reading HD Word for on grade level instruction. 2nd Grade will use District supported FlyLeaf Curriculum during the 60 minutes intervention for students who are not meeting grade level standards. High Yield Strategies will be implemented in to daily instruction. Students will also be placed in flexible intervention groups during intervention time for 60 minutes daily. During this time students will work in small groups that consists of teacher led, computer station working on I-ready path, and an independent reading activity to receive enrichment or additional intervention.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

For the 2023-2024 school year. Administration, PCTs and the 2nd Grade Team will focus on Instructional Planning as well as Instructional Practice through the use of effective teaching strategies. Teachers will take self assessments (through the New Art and Science of Teaching/Improving Teacher Development Evaluation) to understand their strengths and opportunities for improvement in instruction. PCTs will support teachers in this process. Discussions will be held at PLCs and Grade Level Planning days. Strategies will include High-Yield Instructional Strategies such as Chunking Content, Answering Text-Dependent Questions, Reflecting on Learning, Student Engagement such as increasing response rates and using academic games. High-Yield Strategies are research-based instructional practices that help increase student academic success. The strategies help support students in higher order thinking questions that tie to level 3 and 4 questions on Webb's Depth of Knowledge. Teachers will focus on building student vocabulary and comprehension using question stems from our districts scope and sequence.

### **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.

- 1) Share prior year ELA proficiency data with the team
- 2) Set an ELA Proficiency Goal for students
- 3) Teachers self assess instructional practices and identify strengths/opportunities.
- 4) Teachers plan together weekly to discuss standards along with instruction/teaching strategies.
- 5) PCTs support teachers in the classrooms with instruction.
- 6) Student data is collected on standards mastery/progress monitoring.
- 7) Intervention groups are formed and are data focused. Instructional strategies planned together with PCTs.
- 8) Highly Effective/Reading Endorsed teachers will instruct lowest performing students.
- 9) Data review and discussed for changes.

**Person Responsible:** Marla Vest (marlamv@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Weekly through Planning/PLC Meetings Quarterly through Progress Monitoring Data

**#3. 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.

Based on the 2022-2023 FAST Spring Data, one of our lowest performing categories with our Black/African-American subgroup was English Language Arts with 40%. This is below the 41% target.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

In the Spring of 2023-2024, we will increase this subgroup data from 40% to 45% based on FAST data.

**Monitoring:**

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

This area of focus will be monitored through FAST Progress Monitoring, iReady and District Formatives and Exemplars.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jennifer Shonak (jenniferis@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.)

TPE's Resource Team along with the Reading Leading and Learning Teams will support 3 - 5 with Reading planning. They will work with grade levels and administration to review data and determine the areas of greatest need in reference to the Reading Benchmarks. Students will use iReady intervention to support classroom instruction along with the reading standards. Students will also use Phonics for intervention if data supports their placement. High Yield Strategies will be implemented in to daily instruction. Students will also be placed in flexible intervention groups during intervention time for 60 minutes daily. During this time students will work in small groups that consists of teacher led, computer station working on I-ready path, and an independent reading activity to receive enrichment or additional intervention. All students, in all subgroups will be placed on their individual needs for benchmark mastery/enrichment mastery. Students in our lowest groups will also be supported in tutoring and breakfast clubs. Monitored by classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans, open communication other than during PLC times, and exit tickets given by classroom teachers.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

As a team we have determined that small group instruction will allow teachers to differentiate and target benchmarks that are not being met and are specific to individual student needs. This also allows teachers to enrich those students that have mastered the benchmarks. Students will be placed in their intervention groups based on data from I-Ready/FAST and moved to the next benchmark when they have shown mastery. Strategies will include High-Yield Instructional Strategies such as Chunking Content, Answering Text-Dependent Questions, Reflecting on Learning, Student Engagement such as increasing response rates and using academic games. High-Yield Strategies are research-based instructional practices that help increase student academic success. The strategies help support students in higher order thinking questions that tie to level 3 and 4 questions on Webb's Depth of Knowledge. Teachers will focus on building student vocabulary and comprehension using question stems from our districts scope and sequence.

**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.

- 1) Identify Black/African Students in this subgroup who are not proficient.
- 2) Determine benchmarks needed based on data breakdown on FAST and current I-Ready data/STAR data.
- 3) Determine the intervention/enrichment groups based on need.
- 4) Instruct on level for 90 minute block and 60 minutes for intervention, providing support from resource teachers to push in/pull out or coaching.
- 5) 90 minute ELA block will include Foundational Skills (15 minutes); Whole Group Instruction (30 min); small group instruction (45 min).
- 5) Assess, review data, plan for instruction and change instruction/groups based on needs.

**Person Responsible:** Jennifer Shonak (jenniferis@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Spring of 2024

**#4. 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.

Based on the 2022-2023 FAST Spring Data, one of our lowest performing categories was our Students with Disabilities, performing at 22%. This is below the 41% target.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

In the Spring of 2023-2024, we will increase this subgroup data from 22% to 41% based on FAST data.

**Monitoring:**

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

This area of focus will be monitored through FAST Progress Monitoring, iReady and District Formatives and Exemplars.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jennifer Shonak (jenniferis@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.)

ESE Resource Team and teachers will identify students needs based on IEP Goals. Areas of concern will be identified and interventions will be planned to meet all needs. Students will use iReady intervention to support classroom instruction along with the reading standards. Students will also use Phonics for intervention if data supports their placement. High Yield Strategies will be implemented into instruction. Students will also be placed in flexible intervention groups during intervention time for 60 minutes daily. Students will work in small groups that consists of teacher led, computer station working on I-ready, and an independent reading activity. All students, in all subgroups will be placed on their individual needs for benchmark mastery/enrichment. Students in our lowest groups will also be supported in tutoring and breakfast clubs. Monitored by classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans, open communication other than during PLC times, and exit tickets given by classroom and ESE teachers.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

As a team we have determined that small group instruction will allow teachers to differentiate and target benchmarks that are not being met and are specific to individual student needs. This also allows teachers to enrich those students that have mastered the benchmarks. Students will be placed in their intervention groups based on data from I-Ready/FAST and moved to the next benchmark when they have shown mastery. Strategies will include High-Yield Instructional Strategies such as Chunking Content, Answering Text-Dependent Questions, Reflecting on Learning, Student Engagement such as increasing response rates and using academic games. High-Yield Strategies are research-based instructional practices that help increase student academic success. The strategies help support students in higher order thinking questions that tie to level 3 and 4 questions on Webb's Depth of Knowledge. Teachers will focus on building student vocabulary and comprehension using question stems from our districts scope and sequence.

**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.

- 1) Identify students that have not met proficiency during the 2022-2023 School Year based on FAST data.
- 2) Determine benchmarks needed based on data breakdown on FAST and current I-Ready data/STAR data.
- 3) Determine the intervention/enrichment groups based on need.
- 4) Instruct on level for 90 minute block and 60 minutes for intervention, providing support from resource teachers to push in/pull out or coaching.
- 5) ESE Teachers will support student goals based on their IEP.
- 6) 90 minute ELA block will include Foundational Skills (15 minutes); Whole Group Instruction (30 min); small group instruction (45 min).
- 7) Assess, review data, plan for instruction and change instruction/groups based on needs.

**Person Responsible:** Jennifer Shonak (jenniferis@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Spring of 2024

**#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners****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.

Based on the 2022-2023 FAST Spring Data, one of our lowest performing categories was our English Language Learners performing at 38%. This is below the 41% target.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

In the Spring of 2023-2024, we will increase this subgroup data from 38% to 43% based on FAST data.

**Monitoring:**

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

This area of focus will be monitored through FAST Progress Monitoring, iReady and District Formatives and Exemplars.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Marla Vest (marlamv@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.)

TPE's ESOL, Resource Team and Reading Leading and Learning Teams will support 3 - 5 with Reading planning. They will work with grade levels and administration to review data and determine the areas of greatest need in reference to the Reading Benchmarks. Students will use Imagine Learning and I-Ready intervention to support classroom instruction along with the reading standards. Students will also use Phonics for intervention if data supports their placement. High Yield Strategies will be implemented in daily instruction. Students will also be placed in flexible intervention groups during intervention time for 60 minutes daily. During this time students will work in small groups that consists of teacher led, computer station working on Imagine/I-ready path, and an independent reading activity. All students, in all subgroups will be placed on their individual needs for benchmark mastery/enrichment mastery. Students in our lowest groups will also be supported in tutoring and breakfast clubs. Monitored by classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans, open communication other than during PLC times, and exit tickets given by classroom and ESOL teachers.

We have 6 ESOL paraprofessionals to support our ELL population. A schedule is created to support our ELL students based on language needs. Teachers will communicate needs and provide resources to support the ELL students.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers have been trained in 6 Principles of Exemplary Teaching for English Learners during the 2022-2023 school year. Teachers will be trained by Beth Skelton on Making Content Comprehensible to Multilingual Learners during pre-school. These trainings along with the support from Resource and Reading Leading and Learning will allow for comprehensible support to our students.

**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.

- 1) Identify students that have not met proficiency during the 2022-2023 School Year based on FAST data.
- 2) Determine students and benchmarks needed (mastery/enrichment) based on iReady data and District Exemplars/Comprehensives, and FAST Progress Monitoring.
- 3) Determine intervention/enrichment based on need, including Imagine Learning.
- 4) 90 minute ELA Block to include whole group and small group instruction both on level and reteach benchmarks not mastered. 60 minutes of intervention.
- 5) Assess, review data, plan for instruction and change instruction/groups based on needs.

**Person Responsible:** Marla Vest (marlamv@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Spring 2024

**#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 Grade ELA Proficiency**

For the 2022-2023 school year, our overall proficiency for grades 3rd grade in ELA, was 35%. This was an increase of 7% from 28% in the 2021-2022 school year.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

In the Spring of 2022-2023, students in Grade 2 (now 3rd Graders) scored at 38% proficient.

Goal: By the Spring of 2023-2024, students in Grade 3 will increase ELA Proficiency from 38% to 43% as measured by FAST Reading. Our goal is to overachieve the 35% proficient (22-23 3rd Grade) and increase proficiency of incoming 3rd Graders by 5%.

**Monitoring:**

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

This area of focus will be monitored through classroom assessment and progress monitoring (FAST PM) data.

**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.)

TPE's Resource Team along with the Reading Leading and Learning Teams will support 3rd grade with Reading planning. They will work with grade levels and administration to review data and determine the areas of greatest need in reference to the Reading Benchmarks. Students will use iReady intervention to support classroom instruction along with the reading standards. Students will also use Phonics for intervention if data supports their placement. High Yield Strategies will be implemented in to daily instruction. Students will also be placed in flexible intervention groups during intervention time for 60 minutes daily. During this time students will work in small groups that consists of teacher led, computer station working on I-ready path, and an independent reading activity to receive enrichment or additional intervention. All students, in all subgroups will be placed on their individual needs for benchmark mastery/enrichment mastery. Students in our lowest groups will also be supported in tutoring and breakfast clubs. Monitored by classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans, open communication other than during PLC times, and exit tickets given by classroom teachers.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Administration, PCTs and the 3rd Grade Teams will focus on Instructional Planning as well as Instructional Practice through the use of effective teaching strategies. Teachers will take self assessments (through the New Art and Science of Teaching/Improving Teacher Development Evaluation) to understand their strengths and opportunities for improvement in instruction. PCTs will support teachers in this process. Discussions will be held at PLCs and Grade Level Planning days. Strategies will include High-Yield Instructional Strategies such as Chunking Content, Answering Text-Dependent Questions, Reflecting on Learning, Student Engagement such as increasing response rates and using academic games. High-Yield Strategies are research-based instructional practices that help increase student academic success. The strategies help support students in higher order thinking questions that tie to level 3 and 4 questions on

Webb's Depth of Knowledge. Teachers will focus on building student vocabulary and comprehension using question stems from our districts scope and sequence.

### **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.

- 1) Share prior year ELA proficiency data with the team
- 2) Set an ELA Proficiency Goal for students
- 3) Teachers self assess instructional practices and identify strengths/opportunities.
- 4) Teachers plan together weekly to discuss standards along with instruction/teaching strategies.
- 5) PCTs support teachers in the classrooms with instruction.
- 6) Student data is collected on standards mastery/progress monitoring.
- 7) Intervention groups are formed and are data focused. Instructional strategies planned together with PCTs.
- 8) Highly Effective/Reading Endorsed teachers will instruct lowest performing students.
- 9) Data review and discussed for changes.

**Person Responsible:** Dave Crawford (davehc@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Spring 2024

**#7. 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.

**3 - 5 ELA Proficiency**

For the 2022-2023 school year, our overall proficiency for grades 3-5 in ELA, was 46%. This was an increase of 4% from 42% in the 2021-2022 school year.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

In the Spring of 2022-2023, students in Grades 3-5 were 46% proficient overall.

Goal: By the Spring of 2023-2024, students in Grades 3-5 will increase ELA Proficiency from 46% to 51% as measured by FAST PM 3.

**Monitoring:**

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

This area of focus will be monitored through classroom assessment and progress monitoring (FAST PM) data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jennifer Shonak (jenniferis@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.)

TPE's Resource Team along with the Reading Leading and Learning Teams will support 3-5 Reading planning. They will work with grade levels and administration to review data and determine the areas of greatest need in reference to the Reading Benchmarks. Students will use iReady intervention to support classroom instruction along with the reading standards. Students will also use Phonics for intervention if data supports their placement. High Yield Strategies will be implemented in to daily instruction. Students will also be placed in flexible intervention groups during intervention time for 60 minutes daily. During this time students will work in small groups that consists of teacher led, computer station working on I-ready path, and an independent reading activity to receive enrichment or additional intervention. All students, in all subgroups will be placed on their individual needs for benchmark mastery/enrichment mastery. Students in our lowest groups will also be supported in tutoring and breakfast clubs. Monitored by classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans, open communication other than during PLC times, and exit tickets given by classroom teachers.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Administration, PCTs and 3-5 grade teams will focus on Instructional Planning as well as Instructional Practice through the use of effective teaching strategies. Teachers will take self assessments (through the New Art and Science of Teaching/Improving Teacher Development Evaluation) to understand their strengths and opportunities for improvement in instruction. PCTs will support teachers in this process. Discussions will be held at PLCs and Grade Level Planning days. Strategies will include High-Yield Instructional Strategies such as Chunking Content, Answering Text-Dependent Questions, Reflecting on Learning, Student Engagement such as increasing response rates and using academic games. High-Yield Strategies are research-based instructional practices that help increase student academic success. The strategies help support students in higher order thinking questions that tie to level 3 and 4 questions on

Webb's Depth of Knowledge. Teachers will focus on building student vocabulary and comprehension using question stems from our districts scope and sequence.

### **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.

- 1) Share prior year ELA proficiency data with the team
- 2) Set an ELA Proficiency Goal for students
- 3) Teachers self assess instructional practices and identify strengths/opportunities.
- 4) Teachers plan together weekly to discuss standards along with instruction/teaching strategies.
- 5) PCTs support teachers in the classrooms with instruction.
- 6) Student data is collected on standards mastery/progress monitoring.
- 7) Intervention groups are formed and are data focused. Instructional strategies planned together with PCTs.
- 8) Highly Effective/Reading Endorsed teachers will instruct lowest performing students.
- 9) Data review and discussed for changes.

**Person Responsible:** Jennifer Shonak (jenniferis@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Spring 2024

### **CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review**

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

The School District of Lee County follows all state and federal guidelines when allocating funding to schools. The schools are budgeted in multi-faceted methods based on the student needs. Initially the schools are tiered based on the following criteria: student proficiency, learning gains, struggling schools, % of new teachers, % of ELL students, % of ESE students for academic support and for funding purposes. Content tiers are also established to provide instructional support resources based on individual student group needs. Within each school's Title I, SAI, and UniSIG plans as appropriate there is a requirement to address ESSA student groups through high quality instruction and monitoring systems. School funding needs are addressed weekly throughout the school year in collaboration with principal supervisors and the budget department. Ongoing monitoring of student data and underperforming subgroups is provided through monthly visits and data chats by principal supervisors.

### **Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

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

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

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

Instructional practices specifically relating to Reading/ELA for grades K-2 include Resource Team, K-2 Literacy Coach along with the Reading Leading and Learning Teams will support K-2 with Reading planning. They will work with grade levels and administration to review data and determine the areas of greatest need in reference to the reading benchmarks. Students will use i-Ready intervention, flyleaf, and Readwell to support classroom instruction along with the grade level reading benchmarks. High Yield Strategies will be implemented in daily instruction. Students will also be placed in flexible intervention groups during WIN Time for 60 minutes daily. All students, in all subgroups will be placed on their individual needs for standards mastery/enrichment mastery and reevaluated every 2-3 weeks.

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

Instructional practices specifically relating to Reading/ELA for grades 3-5 include Resource Team, PCT's, along with the Reading Leading and Learning Teams will support 3 - 5 with reading planning. They will work with grade levels and administration to review data and determine the areas of greatest need in reference to the reading benchmarks. Students will also be placed in flexible intervention groups during WIN Time for 60 minutes daily. All students, in all subgroups will be placed on their individual needs for standards mastery/enrichment mastery. Students will be placed into intervention groups supporting phonics using i-Ready Phonics or standards based using Magnetic Reading Books. instruction along with the reading standards. High Yield Strategies will be implemented in to daily instruction.

**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**

By the Spring of 2023-2024 students in grades K-2 will increase their English Language Arts scores from 53% proficient to 60% proficient as measured by STAR Reading and STAR Early Lit.

Focus Goal: By the Spring of 2023-2024 students in grade 2 will increase their English Language Arts score from 38% proficient to 50% proficient as measured by STAR Reading.

### **Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes**

By the Spring of 2023-2024 students in grades 3-5 will increase their English Language Arts scores from 46% proficient to 51% proficient as measured by FAST.

Focus Goal: By the Spring of 2023-2024, students in Grade 3 will increase ELA Proficiency from 35% to 43% as measured by FAST Reading.

## **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.

This area of focus will be monitored through iReady diagnostics, district reading formatives and FAST progress monitoring/or STAR.

### **Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Shonak, Jennifer, jenniferis@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?

To achieve the goal we will use the following evidence based practices/programs in K-2. We will use Wonders curriculum, I-Ready lesson path/Toolkit, Haggerty Phonics and Really Great Reading Phonics for on

grade level instruction. K-1 will use Read Well and 2nd grade will use Fly Leaf during intervention for students who are not meeting grade level standards. Tutoring for K-2 students.

To achieve the goal we will use the following evidence based practices/programs in 3-5. We will use Wonders curriculum, I-Ready lesson path/Toolkit for on grade level instruction. 3-5 will use I-Ready Phonics for



Reading and I-Ready Magnetic for students who are not meeting grade level standards. Tutoring for 3-5 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?

For selecting these programs we identified specific programs that address our school needs and have shown effective student achievement in our student population.

**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                      |
|--|--|
| <p>K-2 Literacy leadership will identify all students in level 2 and low level 3 according to STAR Progress Monitoring Resource/PCT's will plan for intervention to help support the targeted students.</p> <p>We will use STAR PM1 and FAST PM2 to identify students to support.</p> <p>During PLC teachers will look at what standards the students need to know as well as how will we respond when students do not meet mastery of benchmarks.</p>   | <p>Vest, Marla,<br/>marlamv@leeschools.net</p>         |
| <p>3-5 Literacy leadership will identify all students in level 3, 4 and 5 according to FAST PM 1 and FAST PM2.</p> <p>Resource/PCT's will plan for intervention to help support the targeted students.</p> <p>We will use FAST PM1 and FAST PM2 to identify students to support.</p> <p>During PLC teachers will look at what standards the students need to know, how will we respond when some students are not meeting benchmark mastery and how will we extend the learning for students who are already proficient?</p> | <p>Shonak, Jennifer,<br/>jenniferis@leeschools.net</p> |

**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.

- District protocol is for each school to do the following:
  - School Improvement Plans (SIPs) must be created and managed using the Florida CIMS website. This will allow for our completed SIPs to be made available publicly and parents can request a copy from the school's front office in their preferred language after publication approval.
  - On Aug 1, 2023, schools must have SIPs reviewed by Academic Services & Title I Depts
  - On or before Oct 6, 2023, School Advisory Council (SAC) must present, review, and request feedback on the SIP and budget. The meeting minutes will be uploaded into the school's Title I Crate (web-based site) and FY24 School document folder in the google team drive.
  - On Oct 17, 2023, The Lee County School Board will approve publication and dissemination.
  - Schools must review Annual School Improvement Assurances, complete & submit School Advisory Council Membership List 2023-2024, complete & submit School Advisory Council 2022-2023 Nomination and Election Process Verification on or before Nov 1, 2023, in the google drive FY24 School Document Folder.

**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))

Tortuga's School Improvement Plan can be found on our website located at [tpe.leeschools.net](http://tpe.leeschools.net)<Our School<Title I

Here is a summary of our Parent Involvement Plan: Tortuga Preserve Elementary will involve parents in an organized and timely manner concerning the planning, review and improvement of the Title I programs. All parents will be invited through the Title I Parent Newsletter, social media, School Messenger, Peachjar flyers, planner notes and personal phone calls to attend the SAC/Title I meetings. During a scheduled SAC meeting where all families are invited, the committee will hold an open discussion and will decide, with input from parents, how the 1% set aside for Parent Involvement will be used. Ideas and input from parents will be documented in the SAC Meeting Minutes. SAC meetings will be scheduled with 10 days advance notice. If voting needs to take place, meetings will be scheduled with 3 days advance notice. As needed, virtual meetings can take place per parent request. Documentation for all SAC and parent meetings to include flyers, agendas, handouts, minutes, and sign-in sheets will be maintained in the Title I Crate.

Tortuga Preserve Elementary values the parent involvement and feedback that contributes to academic and behavioral success of its students. Tortuga Preserve Elementary will create a SAC Committee with a variety of representation of our student population including gender, ethnicity, teachers, administration, staff and community/business partners. Our PTA members will be recruited from our parents, teachers and community. PTA positions/office holders will be voted on at a PTA meeting at the end of SY 22-23 or beginning SY 23-24.

Parents will be invited to be involved in a quarterly SAC and monthly PTA meetings through Title I Parent Newsletter, website, flyers, electronic flyers on Peach Jar, School Facebook Page, ClassDojo, School Messenger messages, marquee postings, parent letters and personal invitations. All parent communications will be provided in a parent friendly format and the language requested of the parent (Spanish, Haitian-Creole, etc.). The meetings will take place on designated days, at times which are

convenient to parents. Tortuga Preserve Elementary will jointly develop, with parents and the SAC committee, a plan that describes how the 1% set aside for Parent Involvement will be used. An open discussion regarding the use of Title I funds, reserved for parent involvement at the school level, will take place and decisions regarding how the funds will be spent will be recommended. The Plan will be provided to parents in a format and language the parents can easily understand. The Plan will be reviewed and updated as needed, but not less than annually. All documentation of SAC and parent meetings including, agendas, handouts, meeting minutes and sign in sheets will be maintained in the Title I Crate.

**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)**

Our school plans to strengthen our academic program by providing quality of learning time, and provide enriched/accelerated curriculum. During our 60 minute invention time teachers are trained to implement phonics programs and on grade level reading comprehension programs from I-Ready to close the gaps or enrich students. Our school has aligned our supplemental Title I funds by purchasing magnetic books for grades 2-5, Hand to Mind- math and reading manipulatives and supplemental resources. Personnel hired for the 23-24 school year are Resource Teachers, 2 PCTs, Counselor, Social Workers, Instructional Support/Para, parent involvement specialist. Tutoring for students in grades K-5 twice a week to focus on math and reading skills.

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

District general funds provide the foundation for all programs. Title I A funds will be the primary supplemental source for the activities listed in this need. Title I, Part A coordinates with other federal grants, such as Titles 1C, 1D, II, III and IV, IDEA, and Homeless to expand academic enrichment opportunities for subgroups of students and Professional Development for teachers. These services include extended learning opportunities, professional development, supplemental evidence-based resources, and materials.

Title I, Part A coordinates with Title I, Part C to provide expanded academic enrichment opportunities to Migrant students. Services include; tutorials in reading and math, health services, and literacy workshops for parents because of the coordination of these funds.

Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under ESEA also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs to align towards student academic success.

**Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan**

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

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

The Lee County School District follows the mental health guidelines set forth by the State of Florida Department of Education. This includes providing universal positive and behavioral support. The district also, with parental permission, assesses and screens students to determine what level of mental health support would best meet their mental health needs. These supports range from school check-ins, school-based mental health counseling as well as a referral pathway to outside mental health services.

The Lee County School District employs evidence-based practices in the foundational instruction of students with a focus on building resiliency, promoting physical and emotional wellness, overall health, social development, overcoming adversity, critical thinking and problem solving, prevention of substance use, and other topics.

The Lee County School District employs school-based mental health professionals, school counselors, school social workers, school psychologists, and licensed mental health professionals to ensure that school-based mental health services are provided to students.

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

N/A

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

The district ensures that every school implements a tiered model of evidence-based behavior supports within a Multi-tiered System of Supports (MTSS). District level personnel are designated to assist schools with their site-based implementation by providing training, modeling, program monitoring, technical assistance, and data collection/analysis. They work with site-based personnel to implement the tiered approach that includes:

Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS)/Positive Behavior System (PBS) - All schools are required to implement the elements of PBIS including a school-based team that facilitates systems that support positive behavior: school-wide expectations, classroom expectations and rules, positive recognition/rewards, data collection and analysis, and ongoing professional development. Most schools participate in the Florida PBIS Project. Some schools implement the elements within other approaches including the Building Assets Reducing Risks (BARR) program. PBIS/PBS integrates with the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) utilized in Florida school districts for behavior support.

All schools in the School District of Lee County are required to maintain MTSS for all students (tier 1), students needing supplemental support (tier 2), and students needing intensive support (tier 3). Each school has a team that utilizes the Response to Intervention (RtI) process in examining individual student data to identify those that may need additional behavior support beyond the universal PBIS/PBS approach, and to monitor the effectiveness of these interventions. Data analyzed include office discipline referrals, in-school suspension, out-of-school suspension, bus referrals/suspension, as well as positive behavior data. Interventions may include supplemental positive behavior interventions and/or interventions to address inappropriate behavior.

Each school has a designated Intervention Specialist that facilitates team processes and ensures that identified interventions are implemented and monitored for effectiveness. Currently, the district utilizes "Insights to Behavior" to assist with the ongoing teamwork for behavior support in the tiered model using RtI. This includes the use of additional tools such as the Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA), data collection tools, reporting tools, and behavior intervention plan tools. Intervention Specialists assist classroom teachers and school-based personnel in the implementation of behavioral interventions and data collection, as well as serve as the primary contact for families with students receiving interventions. In the School District of Lee County, the Multi-tiered System of Supports school-based teams may, when needed, refer students to other district/school supports including the school-based mental health team, Section 504 eligibility consideration, and/or evaluation for consideration of eligibility under IDEA.

Likewise, when students respond to interventions, the team may recommend maintaining current levels of interventions, reducing interventions, or exiting interventions as appropriate.

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

The district's Curriculum and Staff Development department will offer training opportunities for paraprofessionals in the core subject areas and technology. In addition, new ESOL paraprofessionals will receive 12 hours of training regarding strategies to assist English Language Learners (ELL) to improve student performance. When appropriate, Instructional Support (Para) will participate in the same training as teachers at Title I schools.

Curriculum and Staff Development will offer teachers a multitude of opportunities to improve effectiveness. They will include (but are not limited to) the following: Florida Standards, Differentiated Instructional Strategies, Analytics (Data Analysis) and Instructional Change, Classroom Walkthrough, Kagan Cooperative Learning, Instruction within the Block, SIOP, and subject area training for adopted texts.

Teacher leaders at schools will support classroom instructional staff daily by coaching, modeling, and/or providing resources to improve instructional activities. Professional development and Peer Collaborative Teachers (PCTs) will further support the initiative by collaborating closely with the teacher leaders. These individuals are chosen through a selective process that ensures highly effective instructional practices are shared with classroom teachers.

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

The district has Early 5, Pre-K and Special Education programs in place to prepare students socially, emotionally and academically for Kindergarten. Many of our schools have their upcoming Kindergarten students come to school to meet the teachers and take assessments, so that they can better place them for the school year. Another transitional strategy used is to offer Kindergarten camp for a few days to acclimate students to their school and teachers instruct them on basic processes.