

The School District of Lee County

North Fort Myers Academy For The Arts School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 10 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 28 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 28 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 30 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 31 |

North Fort Myers Academy For The Arts

1856 ARTS WAY, North Fort Myers, FL 33917

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To be a World-Class School.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Academics and Arts for lifelong learning in a safe and caring environment.

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 |
|---------------------|---------------------|---|
| Miller, Andrew | Principal | As principal, Mr. Miller is responsible for the overall vision and direction of the school. He provides leadership and data based decision making. Other responsibilities include Instructional Leadership, PLC guidance, strategies for increasing student learning, budget, and positive climate of the school. |
| Samz, James | Assistant Principal | As AP, Mr. Samz supports the principal, implements school and school board policies under the guidance of the principal. As part of the Admin team, Mr. Samz has an active role in the overall decision making. Additionally, Mr. Samz is responsible for Elementary Curriculum, behavior/discipline, the Arts Program, and transportation. |
| Ptak, Andrea | School Counselor | Ms. Ptak is the School Counselor for the Middle School. She supports the overall mental health and physical wellbeing of students. Ms. Ptak is actively engaged in working with the APC Mrs. Cooke to schedule classes, monitor student progress academically- especially 8th graders moving up to High School. |
| Cooke, Jill | Assistant Principal | As APC, the responsibility is to support the principal in ensuring quality instruction is occurring in all classrooms. Additionally, the APC will monitor failing grades, and make sure all students achieve success and get the required credits. |
| Mercadente, Richard | Assistant Principal | As AP, Mr. Mercadante supports the principal, implements school and school board policies under the guidance of the principal. As part of the Admin team, Mr. Mercadante has an active role in the overall decision making. Additionally, he is responsible for Elementary and Middle Curriculum and behavior/discipline. |

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

The Principal works with stakeholders to understand the data from prior year State Progress Monitoring Assessments and to identify areas for improvement, set goals, and create action plans to increase achievement. The leadership team will meet monthly to reflect on the most recent data and help inform decision making.

SIP Monitoring

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

The Admin team will meet weekly and the School Leadership team will meet monthly to discuss the most recent data, our progress towards our goals, and ways to achieve them. As we receive the State Data, we will specifically look at our areas for improvement and our progress towards our goals to revise plans if necessary.

Demographic Data

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

| | |
|--|--|
| 2023-24 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Combination School PK-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | No |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 46% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 100% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | Yes |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | ATSI |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: B |

| | |
|--|--|
| | 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B |
| School Improvement Rating History | |
| DJJ Accountability Rating History | |

Early Warning Systems

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 3 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 17 | 14 | 25 | 82 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 1 | 12 | 12 | 32 | 21 | 20 | 48 | 59 | 68 | 273 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 11 | 1 | 6 | 32 | 27 | 23 | 52 | 44 | 55 | 251 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

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

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

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

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

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 32 | 29 | 26 | 24 | 36 | 51 | 39 | 53 | 290 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 12 | 16 | 23 | 61 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 2 | 18 | 11 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 61 | |
| Course failure in Math | 2 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 9 | 15 | 46 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 10 | 19 | 36 | 37 | 66 | 177 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 21 | 17 | 39 | 55 | 67 | 204 | |
| 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 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 17 | 26 | 46 | 57 | 173 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 2 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 18 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 18 |

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

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

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 32 | 29 | 26 | 24 | 36 | 51 | 39 | 53 | 290 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 12 | 16 | 23 | 61 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 2 | 18 | 11 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 61 | |
| Course failure in Math | 2 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 9 | 15 | 46 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 10 | 19 | 36 | 37 | 66 | 177 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 21 | 17 | 39 | 55 | 67 | 204 | |
| 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 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 17 | 26 | 46 | 57 | 173 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 2 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 18 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 18 |

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* | 50 | 45 | 53 | 58 | 48 | 55 | 57 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 54 | | | 50 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 38 | | | 35 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 49 | 48 | 55 | 57 | 37 | 42 | 53 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 57 | | | 36 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 45 | | | 32 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 53 | 47 | 52 | 53 | 47 | 54 | 48 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 59 | 60 | 68 | 64 | 51 | 59 | 68 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | 78 | 77 | 70 | 81 | 42 | 51 | 74 | | |
| Graduation Rate | | 51 | 74 | | 43 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | 33 | 53 | | 66 | 70 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 44 | 47 | 55 | 45 | 69 | 70 | 45 | | |

* 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 | 54 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 378 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
|--|------|
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 55 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 552 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 96 |
| Graduation Rate | |

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

| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
|---------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| SWD | 25 | Yes | 4 | 2 |
| ELL | 30 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 32 | Yes | 2 | |
| HSP | 52 | | | |
| MUL | 50 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 58 | | | |

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| FRL | 47 | | | |

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| SWD | 31 | Yes | 3 | 1 |
| ELL | 45 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 36 | Yes | 1 | |
| HSP | 53 | | | |
| MUL | 62 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 59 | | | |
| FRL | 47 | | | |

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
|------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| All Students | 50 | | | 49 | | | 53 | 59 | 78 | | | 44 |
| SWD | 25 | | | 25 | | | 36 | 35 | | | 6 | 19 |
| ELL | 30 | | | 35 | | | 30 | | | | 5 | 44 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 31 | | | 29 | | | 17 | 36 | | | 5 | |
| HSP | 49 | | | 47 | | | 47 | 57 | 75 | | 7 | 46 |
| MUL | 48 | | | 52 | | | | | | | 2 | |

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
|-----------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 53 | | | 51 | | | 60 | 62 | 79 | | 6 | |
| FRL | 43 | | | 41 | | | 43 | 53 | 68 | | 7 | 43 |

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 | ELP Progress |
|--------------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| All Students | 58 | 54 | 38 | 57 | 57 | 45 | 53 | 64 | 81 | | | 45 |
| SWD | 26 | 36 | 27 | 28 | 36 | 23 | 19 | 43 | | | | 38 |
| ELL | 41 | 50 | 40 | 44 | 56 | 44 | 36 | 53 | | | | 45 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 31 | 35 | 29 | 33 | 49 | 53 | 27 | 31 | | | | |
| HSP | 57 | 52 | 34 | 55 | 57 | 44 | 49 | 61 | 80 | | | 45 |
| MUL | 57 | 71 | | 61 | 75 | | 45 | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 61 | 55 | 42 | 60 | 56 | 42 | 60 | 70 | 83 | | | |
| FRL | 48 | 45 | 33 | 47 | 55 | 40 | 44 | 50 | 68 | | | 44 |

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 | 57 | 50 | 35 | 53 | 36 | 32 | 48 | 68 | 74 | | | 45 |
| SWD | 18 | 37 | 39 | 20 | 20 | 22 | 25 | 8 | | | | |
| ELL | 42 | 48 | 38 | 18 | 23 | 27 | | | | | | 45 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 37 | 45 | 30 | 33 | 41 | | 33 | 45 | | | | |
| HSP | 54 | 48 | 37 | 46 | 31 | 27 | 41 | 57 | 75 | | | 45 |
| MUL | 69 | 71 | | 64 | 43 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 59 | 50 | 33 | 58 | 38 | 36 | 51 | 76 | 75 | | | |
| FRL | 45 | 43 | 37 | 37 | 25 | 21 | 36 | 48 | 52 | | | 43 |

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 | 51% | 48% | 3% | 54% | -3% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 48% | 44% | 4% | 47% | 1% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 45% | 44% | 1% | 47% | -2% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 68% | 56% | 12% | 58% | 10% |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 47% | 44% | 3% | 47% | 0% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 46% | 42% | 4% | 50% | -4% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 40% | 52% | -12% | 54% | -14% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 29% | 37% | -8% | 48% | -19% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 53% | 55% | -2% | 59% | -6% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 65% | 61% | 4% | 61% | 4% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 53% | 60% | -7% | 55% | -2% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 47% | 52% | -5% | 55% | -8% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 41% | 43% | -2% | 44% | -3% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 67% | 50% | 17% | 51% | 16% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 79% | 39% | 40% | 50% | 29% |

| GEOMETRY | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | * | 43% | * | 48% | * |

| CIVICS | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 58% | 59% | -1% | 66% | -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.

Our lowest performing area was ELA proficiency at 51%. Our 4th grade scores were very high, but the rest of the grades 3,5,6,7,8 were at or below our school average. We had many vacancies throughout the year in several grades.

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

Our area that had the largest decline was ELA proficiency going from 58% down to 51%. Inconsistency of instruction due to vacancies.

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 greatest gap between our school score and the state average was Civics. We scored a 60% and the State Average was a 66%. We believe that our students ELA performance impacted the Civics scores.

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

Each of our tested areas this year decreased from the 21-22 school year. ELA 58% to 51%. Math 57% to 52%, Science 53% to 52%, Civics 64% to 60% and Middle acceleration points 81% to 75%.

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

Attendance shows approximately between 1/4 and 1/3 of our students in K-8 were absent 10% or more days absent. Additionally, though our STAR Progress Monitoring III is strong in 1st and 2nd grade, we have a large number who failed in ELA.

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

Focus on ELA- Benchmark Alignment (should translate into increase academic performance in ELA, ELA LG, ELA L25 LG, Civics, and Sci), Backwards design common planning through PLCs, and a positive school culture and climate to boost morale and increase student attendance.

Area of Focus

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

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

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

Our first area of focus is 2nd Grade ELA. Though the scores from 22/23 Progress Monitoring III is strong at 69%, we would like to see those numbers continue as those 1st graders move into 2nd this year. It is important for our students to have all of the foundational skills mastered in 2nd grade so that they are prepared for the rigor of 3rd grade.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to increase the percentage of students in 2nd grade who are proficient from 69% to 75% as measured by the STAR Progress Monitoring Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Students will be taking the district Exemplars at the conclusion of each unit and will take the state progress monitoring assessments. Teachers will analyze the data using specific data protocols in PLC to plan for intervention.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Andrew Miller (andrewjm@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Teachers will be utilizing high yield instructional strategies. The school K-5 has a pre-scheduled 60 minute intervention block in the master schedule. The schedule is staggered to allow our ESE co-teachers/ resource teachers to attend several blocks throughout the day to attend to our SLD population. Intervention times will be walk to WIN (what I need) so that the teachers can focus in on skills and benchmarks that small groups of students need. PLC teams will be focused heavily on the benchmark alignment regarding instruction, questioning, and student tasks. Walk throughs by ADMIN will be looking for these items and coaching will be provided by ADMIN since we currently do not have any literacy coaches.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Benchmarks/Standards are set by the FLDOE, so it is incredibly important to align our instruction to the outcomes necessary to meet our goals. Providing structured time, resources, and training will set the stage for the most robust achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Weekly PLC Meetings for Common Planning

Monthly Leadership Meetings

Person Responsible: Andrew Miller (andrewjm@leeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the 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.

Our second area of focus will be 3rd grade ELA. Since we have mandatory retentions at the conclusion of 3rd grade, we are going to focus on keeping our students on track to master benchmarks to pass by the end of the year progress monitoring.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our 3rd grade ELA Proficiency goal for the 23/24 school year is to increase the percentage of students at Level 3 or higher from 67%-73% as measured by the State Progress Monitoring III Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Students will take the district created Exemplars and teacher common formatives. Additionally, students will take the State Progress Monitoring 1 and 2 Assessments.

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.)

Teachers will be utilizing high yield instructional strategies. The school K-5 has a pre-scheduled 60 minute intervention block in the master schedule. The schedule is staggered to allow our ESE co-teachers/ resource teachers to attend several blocks throughout the day to attend to our SLD population. Intervention times will be walk to WIN (what I need) so that the teachers can focus in on skills and benchmarks that small groups of students need. PLC teams will be focused heavily on the benchmark alignment regarding instruction, questioning, and student tasks. Walk throughs by ADMIN will be looking for these items and coaching will be provided by ADMIN since we currently do not have any literacy coaches.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Benchmarks/Standards are set by the FLDOE, so it is incredibly important to align our instruction to the outcomes necessary to meet our goals. Providing structured time, resources, and training will set the stage for the most robust achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Weekly PLC Meetings for Common Planning
Monthly Leadership Meetings

Person Responsible: Andrew Miller (andrewjm@leeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

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

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

Our 3rd area of focus is ELA Proficiency in Grades 3-5.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In 22/23 our 3-5 grade students performed at 55% proficient. Our goal would be to get them to 60% performing at a Level 3 or higher as measured by the FAST State Progress Monitoring Assessment III.

Monitoring:

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

Students will take the district created Exemplars and teacher common formatives. Additionally, students will take the State Progress Monitoring 1 and 2 Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Andrew Miller (andrewjm@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Teachers will be utilizing high yield instructional strategies. The school K-5 has a pre-scheduled 60 minute intervention block in the master schedule. The schedule is staggered to allow our ESE co-teachers/ resource teachers to attend several blocks throughout the day to attend to our SLD population. Intervention times will be walk to WIN (what I need) so that the teachers can focus in on skills and benchmarks that small groups of students need. PLC teams will be focused heavily on the benchmark alignment regarding instruction, questioning, and student tasks. Walk throughs by ADMIN will be looking for these items and coaching will be provided by ADMIN since we currently do not have any literacy coaches.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Benchmarks/Standards are set by the FLDOE, so it is incredibly important to align our instruction to the outcomes necessary to meet our goals. Providing structured time, resources, and training will set the stage for the most robust achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Weekly PLC Meetings

Monthly Leadership Meetings

Person Responsible: Andrew Miller (andrewjm@leeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

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

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

Our Area of Focus 4 is regarding our 6-8 grade students and their ELA proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our middle school ELA proficiency in 22/23 was 47% proficiency and we would like that to increase to 52% performing at a Level 3 or higher as measured by the FAST State Progress Monitoring III.

Monitoring:

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

Students performance will be monitored by teacher common assessments, the district exemplars, and the state progress monitoring assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Andrew Miller (andrewjm@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.)

Our middle school students have been scheduled based on the prior year ELA scores. Classes are ability grouped 1-2 together, and 3-5 together as per the district guidance. All students have ELA every day for 54 minutes. Level 1 and 2 students also have reading every day, 3-5 every other day. Level 1 students are also scheduled into the Critical Thinking Reading class. Teachers will plan together with backwards design in PLCs. PLC will be heavily focused on benchmark alignment- the instruction, questions, and student tasks. Walk throughs by ADMIN will be looking for these items and coaching will be provided by ADMIN since we currently do not have any literacy coaches.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Benchmarks/Standards are set by the FLDOE, so it is incredibly important to align our instruction to the outcomes necessary to meet our goals. Providing structured time, resources, and training will set the stage for the most robust achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Weekly PLC focusing on Benchmark Alignment

Monthly Leadership Meetings

Person Responsible: Andrew Miller (andrewjm@leeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**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.

Our 5th area of focus is on 8th grade science. We recognize that it is a culmination of standards mastery from Earth Space Science, Life Science, and Physical Science.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students in 8th grade science will increase in proficiency from 41% in 22/23 to 46% proficient in 23/24.

Monitoring:

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

Students will be taking the teacher/ team created common assessments and the district formatives.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Andrew Miller (andrewjm@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.)

Our APC who has a science coaching background will be leading the team through a rigorous 5 day planning cycle with the primary benchmarks. Additionally her coaching will be guiding PLC teams to create benchmark aligned spiral review to cover 6th and 7th grade benchmarks in an effective way. Teachers will be creating common formative assessments as well. We offer a STEM Lab as an elective class to help students learn by doing. Students in all classes will be focusing on literacy and it will translate into students ability to perform on the science assessment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers will build on their experience and strength with the guidance of an experienced science coach and admin who will take PLCs to the next level. With thoughtful backwards design planning, data analysis, and targeted intervention, students will be prepared for the end of year assessment.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Weekly PLC meetings

Monthly Leadership Meetings

Person Responsible: Andrew Miller (andrewjm@leeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**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.

Our 6th area of focus relates to 7th grade math. 7th grade math is our lowest performing area. We want our level 1 and 2 students who primarily take 7th grade math become proficient in math to be prepared to take Pre Algebra in 8th grade having mastered the appropriate standards.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We would like to see the percentage of students proficient in 7th Grade Math increase from 29% to 35% in 23/24.

Monitoring:

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

Our 7th grade students will take the common assessments created by the teachers, the district created exemplars, and the FAST progress monitoring.

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.)

Our 7th grade math students have math for 54 minutes scheduled every day. Based on our ESE Flexible scheduling, our SLD students will get all of the appropriate support to ensure success. We would like to bring on an Intervention teacher if possible to support both ELA and Math if we receive an applicant. PLCs will be highly focused on benchmark alignment- the instruction, questioning, and student tasks. Mr. Miller-Principal who has a math background will be attending regular PLC and helping coach the math department to do what is necessary for success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Benchmarks/Standards are set by the FLDOE, so it is incredibly important to align our instruction to the outcomes necessary to meet our goals. Providing structured time, resources, and training will set the stage for the most robust achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Weekly PLC meetings

Monthly Leadership Meetings

Person Responsible: Andrew Miller (andrewjm@leeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

Weekly PLC meetings

Monthly Leadership Meetings

Person Responsible: Andrew Miller (andrewjm@leeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

#7. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Our 7th Area of Focus is our ESSA subgroups- Students with Disabilities and our Black Students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We would like to see both of these students meet the required 41% Federal Index by the end of the year. Specifically, we would like SLD- Reading Proficiency to increase from 26% to 31% and Black to increase from 31% to 36% as measured by the ELA FAST Assessment at the end of the year.

Monitoring:

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

Students will take the teacher created formatives, district created exemplars, and the state FAST test.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Andrew Miller (andrewjm@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.)

This year our school wide focus is on getting High Quality Instruction and Effective Teaching in every classroom- Marzano HRS Level 2. We will rejuvenize the PLC process at our school, focusing on the 4 questions of DuFor to dive into backwards design Benchmark Aligned planning. We will create a new schoolwide focus on data to drive instruction and intervention for all students, but specifically our SLD and Black students who need our support the most. As another level of focus and intervention, regular MTSS and ESE PLC meetings will be held with the classroom teachers to monitor our subgroups and focus on their progress and needs. Our ESE Team will provide required push in and pull out support. Lastly, we offer a Learning Strategies for small group ESE students to get support, get additional tutoring, and take assessments in a calm and quiet environment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We recognized that we needed to center our energy and focus around instruction. As a high performing Arts school, it can sometimes get overly busy and the focus shift from what is truly important. By marrying the two together, we will utilize our teacher experiences and strength to create a positive culture for learning where everyone wants to be. Many small tweaks and the tightening of procedures will help us achieve our goal.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Weekly PLC

Monthly Leadership

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: Ongoing

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).

This year, NFMAA is an ATSI identified school. As principal, I will be monitoring the staffing of our most needed areas. We are working to fill our last few instructional positions. Our interventions and plan for supporting our ESSA subgroups are incorporated into our DRA budget and do not currently require additional allocated funds.

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

NA

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

nA

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

nA

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

nA

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.

NA

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

NA

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?

NA

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

NA

Title I Requirements

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))

NA

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))

NA

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).

NA

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))

NA

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))

NA

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

| | | | |
|--------|--------|---|--------|
| 1 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 5 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science | \$0.00 |
| 6 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | \$0.00 |
| 7 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |

Budget Approval

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

No