

The School District of Lee County

San Carlos Park Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	24
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	26

San Carlos Park Elementary School

17282 LEE RD, Fort Myers, FL 33967

<http://sac.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.

San Carlos Park Elementary's School Mission Statement to ensure excellence in a safe, creative, and nurturing environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

San Carlos Park Elementary's School Vision Statement is to actively engage students as lifelong learners and 21st Century world-class leaders.

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
Stevens, Monica	Principal	
Bode, Tara	Assistant Principal	
Russo, Brittney	Instructional Coach	
Lister, Margaret	Reading Coach	
Williams, Teresa	Instructional Coach	
Allevato, Anthony	Math Coach	
Parker, Jack	Other	

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.

Stakeholders are involved in the SIP development process through

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP will be monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing student achievement towards meeting the State's academic standards through data analysis of district benchmark and exemplar tests. Leadership meetings will be held monthly throughout the school year to review data, discuss progress, plan for intervention, and adjust as needed to ensure growth for all students. The

leadership team will work with teachers to revise the plan as needed through professional learning communities.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	66%
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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	8	19	21	19	15	15	0	0	0	97	
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	2	1	3	0	0	0	9	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	5	14	23	7	4	0	0	0	53	
Course failure in Math	0	0	5	7	4	2	0	0	0	18	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	45	17	0	0	0	65	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	37	13	0	0	0	53	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	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	6	10	33	10	0	0	0	59

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	2	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	3

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	49	38	42	42	35	0	0	0	206	
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	10	1	2	0	0	0	17	
Course failure in ELA	2	11	13	16	14	25	0	0	0	81	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	4	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	22	10	37	0	0	0	69	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	19	14	35	0	0	0	68	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	20	29	23	30	0	0	0	105	

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	1	27	23	52	0	0	0	106

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	23	3	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	49	38	42	42	35	0	0	0	206	
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	10	1	2	0	0	0	17	
Course failure in ELA	2	11	13	16	14	25	0	0	0	81	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	4	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	22	10	37	0	0	0	69	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	19	14	35	0	0	0	68	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	20	29	23	30	0	0	0	105	

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	1	27	23	52	0	0	0	106

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	23	3	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	43	48	53	42	52	56	45		
ELA Learning Gains				53			40		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48			38		
Math Achievement*	47	57	59	50	45	50	47		
Math Learning Gains				65			49		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45			33		
Science Achievement*	41	53	54	51	59	59	46		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	47	51	59	48			48		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	214
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	402
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

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

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	17	Yes	4	2
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	32	Yes	3	
HSP	38	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	51			
FRL	39	Yes	1	

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	27	Yes	3	1
ELL	41			
AMI				
ASN	41			
BLK	32	Yes	2	
HSP	51			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	45			

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	43			47			41					47
SWD	16			22			29				5	8
ELL	31			46			33				5	47
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32			32							2	
HSP	36			47			30				5	47
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	54			51			53				4	
FRL	39			44			36				5	45

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	42	53	48	50	65	45	51					48
SWD	14	33	33	20	30	15						42
ELL	24	42	55	34	55	50	23					48
AMI												
ASN	36			45								
BLK	22	38		27	42							
HSP	39	53	54	51	66	52	47					49
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	50	56		54	69	50	71					
FRL	40	48	41	46	57	40	44					43

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	45	40	38	47	49	33	46					48
SWD	9	25		12	30		10					25
ELL	37	44	45	31	55		40					48
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40			40								
HSP	39	44	50	44	53	41	33					46
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	56	38		53	50		61					
FRL	42	35	29	41	33	13	44					47

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	48%	48%	0%	54%	-6%
04	2023 - Spring	56%	56%	0%	58%	-2%
03	2023 - Spring	33%	42%	-9%	50%	-17%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	40%	55%	-15%	59%	-19%
04	2023 - Spring	67%	61%	6%	61%	6%
05	2023 - Spring	46%	52%	-6%	55%	-9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	41%	50%	-9%	51%	-10%

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.

Based on three data components, Science scores showed the lowest performance at 43% proficient. Contributing factors to last year's low performance include:

1. Retirement of Science Coach in February 2023. No replacement was hired.
2. 4th & 5th grade students were switched out of their science elective as of January 2023 in preparation for teacher retirement.

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

The Science data component has the greatest decline from 51% in 2022 to 43% in 2023. Factors that contributed to this decline include:

1. PCT assigned to 5th grade was pulled to assist a teacher in a different grade level.
2. Retirement of Science Coach in February 2023. No replacement was hired.
3. 4th & 5th grade students were not able to participate in the once a day Science club offered the previous year because it was not offered during 2022-2023 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.

3rd grade Math scores had the greatest gap when compared to the state average (SCPE 42% proficient compared to State 59% proficient).

Factors that contributed to this gap include:

1. 3rd, 4th, 5th, Math tutoring ran from January 30th – April 24th on Mondays. 3rd grade had the lowest students registered, 32 students, compared to 37 for 4th and 46 for 5th.

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

The data component with the most improvement is the ELA Proficiency from 42% in 2022 to 47% in 2023. Factors that contributed to the increase include:

1. 4th-5th grade Seminar – Teachers used the first 20 minutes of the student's special block to intensely reteach/instruct small groups or 1:1 on identified needs.
2. For Quarters 3 & 4, there was a strong push to focus on identified Level 2 and low Level 3 students.
3. 4th & 5th grade Reading Intervention – Identified Level 1 students participated in intense foundational reading instruction using Magnetic Reading, Phonics for Reading, and B.E.S.T.
4. Literature/B.E.S.T. Benchmarks 2 or 3 times a week every other day for 60 minutes.
5. 3rd, 4th, 5th grade ELA tutoring – Identified Level 2 students were targeted for small group tutoring two days a week from January 31st – May 4th utilizing Magnetic Reading
6. Quarters 3 & 4 – Teachers were encouraged to shift instructional focus away from Wonders shared reads/read aloud/anchor texts to a deeper dive into B.E.S.T. Literature books that aligned with the benchmark standards presented in the scope and sequences.

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

Based on EWS data, two potential areas of concern are the following:

1. Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency:
Grade 2- 20 students
Grade 3- 29 students
Grade 4- 23 students
2. Math course failures compared to students scoring Level 1 of the FAST test do not align:
3rd grade- 0 students failed while 19 students scored Level 1
4th grade- 1 student failed while 14 students scored Level 1
5th grade- 3 students failed while 35 students scored Level 1

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

1. Increase ELA proficiency in grades 2-5.
2. Increase proficiency to 41% or higher for subgroups SWD and BLK while maintaining other subgroups at a level of 41% or higher.
3. Ensure SCPE has a positive culture and environment to 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.

In 2022-2023, 49% of our 2nd grade students were proficient in ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In 2023-2024, we will increase the ELA proficiency of our 2nd grade students to 55% as measured by the ELA FAST.

Monitoring:

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored through standards based assessments, exemplars, and diagnostic test results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Monica Stevens (monicalst@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.)

1. Teachers will meet in PLCs to plan for instruction focused on grade level standards and activities with higher order thinking skills and questioning techniques that are engaging and rigorous.
2. The leadership team will continuously progress monitor all student data and specifically ESSA subgroups SWD and BLK and will use a data collection tool in the school Google drive.
3. Teachers will use data protocols to analyze data and plan for differentiated instruction to remediate and enrich areas of need for each student.
4. The team will track standards for individual student intervention plans.
5. The team will develop of highly engaging, rigorous classroom activities aligned with grade level standards.
6. The team will develop and discuss tasks using higher order thinking skills and questions.
7. PCTs will provide professional development and coaching opportunities for teachers as needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#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.

In 2022-2023, 32% of our 3rd grade students were proficient in ELA, 10% lower than the district average (42%), and 18% lower than the state average (50%).

Measurable Outcome:

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

In 2023- 2024, 42% of our 3rd grade students will score proficient on the ELA FAST assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The school's area of focus will be monitored through progress monitoring data and exemplar data. Student achievement will be impacted through interventions provided based on progress monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Monica Stevens (monicalst@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.)

1. Teachers will meet in PLCs to plan for instruction focused on grade level standards and activities with higher order thinking skills and questioning techniques that are engaging and rigorous.
2. The leadership team will continuously progress monitor all student data and specifically ESSA subgroups SWD and BLK and will use a data collection tool in the school Google drive.
3. Teachers will use data protocols to analyze data and plan for differentiated instruction to remediate and enrich areas of need for each student.
4. The team will track standards for individual student intervention plans.
5. The team will develop of highly engaging, rigorous classroom activities aligned with grade level standards.
6. The team will develop and discuss tasks using higher order thinking skills and questions.
7. PCTs will provide professional development and coaching opportunities for teachers as needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#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.

In 2022-2023, 44% of our 3rd- 5th grade students were proficient in ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In 2023- 2024, 54% of our 3rd- 5th grade students will score proficient on the ELA FAST assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The school's area of focus will be monitored through progress monitoring data and exemplar data. Student achievement will be impacted through interventions provided based on progress monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Monica Stevens (monicalst@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.)

1. Teachers will meet in PLCs to plan for instruction focused on grade level standards and activities with higher order thinking skills and questioning techniques that are engaging and rigorous.
2. The leadership team will continuously progress monitor all student data and specifically ESSA subgroups SWD and BLK and will use a data collection tool in the school Google drive.
3. Teachers will use data protocols to analyze data and plan for differentiated instruction to remediate and enrich areas of need for each student.
4. The team will track standards for individual student intervention plans.
5. The team will develop of highly engaging, rigorous classroom activities aligned with grade level standards.
6. The team will develop and discuss tasks using higher order thinking skills and questions.
7. PCTs will provide professional development and coaching opportunities for teachers as needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#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.

The subgroup, Students with Disabilities, was identified as an ESSA group falling below the 41% threshold.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In 2023- 2024, 41% of our students with disabilities will score proficient on the ELA FAST test.

Monitoring:

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

The school's area of focus will be monitored through progress monitoring data and exemplar data. Student achievement will be impacted through interventions provided based on progress monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Monica Stevens (monicalst@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.)

Collaborative Structures

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To increase student engagement.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#5. 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.

The subgroup, Black, was identified as an ESSA group falling below the 41% threshold.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In 2023- 2024, 41% of our Black subgroup of students will score proficient on the ELA FAST test.

Monitoring:

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

The school's area of focus will be monitored through progress monitoring data and exemplar data. Student achievement will be impacted through interventions provided based on progress monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Monica Stevens (monicalst@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.)

Collaborative Structures

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To increase student engagement.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#6. 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.

We currently have 59 students with 2 or more early warning signs in grades K-5

Measurable Outcome:

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

In 2023- 2024 school year, we will reduce the number of students with 2 or more early warning signs by 10% by June 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Leadership team members will be assigned students to monitor progress in attendance, behaviors, and classroom success.

LEadership team members will work as a liaison between student, teacher, and parent and helping to link supports and support personal to the needs of the child/ family.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Monica Stevens (monicalst@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.)

Mentoring

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To provide a mentor to students to help motivate students and monitor student progress.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

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

51% of our 1st grade students scored below the 40th percentile on the state assessment.
50% of our 2nd grade students scored below the 40th percentile on the state assessment.

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

65% of our 3rd grade students scored below a level 3 on the state assessment.
53% of our 5th grade students scored below a level 3 on the state assessment.

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

75% of our students in Kindergarten will score above the 40th percentile on the state assessment.
55% of our students in 1st grade will score above the 40th percentile on the state assessment.
55% of our students in 2nd grade will score above the 40th percentile on the state assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

55% of our 3rd grade students will score above a level 3 on the state assessment.
50% of our 4th grade students will score above a level 3 on the state assessment.
55% of our 5th grade students will score above a level 3 on the state assessment.

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.

The school's area of focus will be monitored through progress monitoring data and exemplar data. Student achievement will be impacted through interventions provided based on progress monitoring.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Stevens, Monica, monicalst@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?

Reading Workshop
-Interactive Read Alouds
-Shared Reads
Collaborative Structures
Integration of Writing
Question Stems

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The practices and programs were selected based on research and development from district content leaders.

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
Our K-2 Literacy Coach will work with teachers to determine professional learning opportunities to help teachers support student goals.	Stevens, Monica, monicalst@leeschools.net
Our PCTs are assigned grade levels and specific teachers to work alongside teachers providing coaching, mentoring, and modeling opportunities. Our PCTs also work directly with our students to provide intervention for our students.	Stevens, Monica, monicalst@leeschools.net

Title I Requirements**Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Information regarding the SIP and budget will be shared with stakeholders through SAC meetings, parent involvement events, school newsletters, and the school website in English and Spanish.

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))

The Family Engagement Plan will be available at sac.leeschools.net

The school personnel plans to build positive relationships by inviting families in for academic activities as well as fun activities. We will also ask for input and feedback regarding our plans and activities.

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)

The school plans to strengthen the academic programs by surveying the teachers every quarter to determine their needs for professional learning and then providing time for teachers to learn from and observe their peers. The school leaders developed schedules to maximize the amount of time for instruction and intervention and minimize transition times.

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))

NA

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))

Our mental health team meets weekly to review the needs of our students and take action steps towards meeting the needs of our students and families.

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).

Our school is a PBIS school. We focus on teaching and recognizing students for positive behaviors. We work with teachers to develop plans for students who are Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.

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))

Professional learning occurs weekly through PLCs, walkabouts, and quarterly Professional Learning Opportunities. To recruit and retain effective teachers, our school focuses on building relationships and mentoring new teachers and teachers who are new to the building.

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))

Our school social worker works with families.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	\$0.00
6	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