Pelican Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Pelican Elementary School

3525 SW 3RD AVE, Cape Coral, FL 33914

http://pel.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.

Through the collaborative efforts of parents, staff, students, and the community, Pelican Elementary develops the emotional, social, academic, and physical potential of every student, enabling them to be respectful, responsible learners achieving their highest potentials.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pelican Elementary is a safe, secure, child-centered school which provides the foundation for a career and college readiness for every child.

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
Garlick, Clint	Principal	Oversees the school budget, hiring and scheduling of the school.
Costa, Breanne	Reading Coach	K-2 Literacy Coach
Young, Kelly	Reading Coach	Grades 3-5 Reading Coach
Nicol, Anne Marie	School Counselor	Social and Emotional Support
Wood, Courtney	Math Coach	Helping track data and support teachers
Randazzo, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Grade Level Chair
Angel, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	First Grade Level Chair
Moreno, Johanna	Teacher, K-12	2nd Grade Level Chair
Holmes, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	4th Grade Level Chair
Wetmore, Abigail	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade Level Chair
Nataren, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade Level Chair

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 SIP will be reviewed during pre-school week with staff and Sept's SAC meeting.

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))

After each testing session progress will be measured against SIP goals and adjustments made to student groups as 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)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	50%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	99%
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: A 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	41	25	32	22	31	0	0	0	151
One or more suspensions	2	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	8	0	13	2	4	0	0	0	27
Course failure in Math	0	2	0	4	1	4	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	43	24	22	0	0	0	89
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	28	21	27	0	0	0	76
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	8	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	2	1	0	3	1	4	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	9	2	18	23	4	13	0	0	0	69
Course failure in Math	1	0	7	9	6	12	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	21	31	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	15	20	19	0	0	0	54
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	3	29	49	67	0	0	0	150

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	2	1	0	3	1	4	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	9	2	18	23	4	13	0	0	0	69
Course failure in Math	1	0	7	9	6	12	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	21	31	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	15	20	19	0	0	0	54
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	3	29	49	67	0	0	0	150

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	53	48	53	61	52	56	63		
ELA Learning Gains				62			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52			43		
Math Achievement*	64	57	59	63	45	50	57		
Math Learning Gains				73			46		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				65			37		
Science Achievement*	68	53	54	62	59	59	55		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	33	51	59	48			46		

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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	267
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	486
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
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	3	1
ELL	41			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	1	
HSP	47			
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	65			

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	38	Yes	2	
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	50			
HSP	62			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	55			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	53			64			68					33
SWD	12			40			40				5	27
ELL	31			58			64				5	33
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38			38							2	
HSP	44			54			68				5	32
MUL	62			70			73				3	

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	59			72			68				4	
FRL	44			51			66				5	34

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	61	62	52	63	73	65	62					48
SWD	21	41	36	27	63	62	15					
ELL	40	52		52	68		40					48
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50			50								
HSP	57	70	63	58	73	63	68					45
MUL	65	59		68	65		62					
PAC												
WHT	63	59	50	66	74	75	63					
FRL	49	59	49	52	74	61	56					42

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	63	48	43	57	46	37	55					46
SWD	32	38		32	47		50					
ELL	51	52		43	22		38					46
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38			47								
HSP	66	58	53	53	38	26	55					47
MUL	67			52								
PAC												
WHT	60	40	40	59	53	42	59					
FRL	57	47	43	49	46	36	45					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.
<u>The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide</u>
<u>assessments</u>.

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	61%	48%	13%	54%	7%
04	2023 - Spring	60%	56%	4%	58%	2%
03	2023 - Spring	47%	42%	5%	50%	-3%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	68%	55%	13%	59%	9%
04	2023 - Spring	70%	61%	9%	61%	9%
05	2023 - Spring	65%	52%	13%	55%	10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	67%	50%	17%	51%	16%

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.

Students with Disabilities for Reading. 21-22 school year we had 21% proficient in ELA for SWDs. This year we had increased to 35% proficiency in ELA for SWDs. While we did make some growth, this is an area we need to continue to work on.

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

ELA proficiency declined by 3 points from the prior year. This year's group of 3rd grade students are the students that did not attend school or were participating in online learning at the end of their

Kindergarten year and in the beginning of their First Grade year, due to Covid. Many of these students have had to close the learning gap on phonics skills they did not receive during that time, which has affected their reading comprehension skills. Our staff has and will continue to work on closing this gap, as well as working on comprehension skills.

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.

Science Proficiency- State =51% , Pelican= 69% (18 point gap)
ELA Proficiency- State= , Pelican 58%
Math Proficiency- State= , Pelican 68%

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

Science proficiency showed the most growth; increasing by 7% from the previous year. This year, our 5th grade teachers used science based text passages during the reading block with text sets. Our Science Specials Teacher and 5th grade teachers also work together to look at the data from assessments to identify and target standards that were needed to be reviewed and provided intervention for students in those areas.

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

4th grade ELA proficiency.

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

1. Increase ELA Proficiency for Students With Disabilities from 35%-42%.
2. Increase ELA Proficiency for all 3-5 students from 58% to 63%.
3. Increase ELA Proficiency for 3rd Grade.
4. Increase ELA Proficiency for 2nd Grade.

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

#1. 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.

Students with Disabilities for Reading. 21-22 school year we had 21% proficient in ELA for SWDs. This year we had increased to 30% proficiency in ELA for SWDs. While we did make some growth, this is an area we need to continue to work on.

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

Pelican Elementary will increase the proficiency rate of SWD in ELA from 30% to 42% as measured by the ELA FAST assessment in spring of 2024.

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

SWD will be monitored at the PM1 and PM2 assessments. Changes in their interventions will be based on their individual assessments results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelly Young (kellyay@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.)

The evidence-based strategy being implemented for SWD for ELA Achievement is the use of district adopted intervention materials (Read Well, Fly Leaf, and Phonics for Instruction through Curriculum and Associates). Small group targeted instruction will also be used from the book "How to Plan Differentiated Reading Instruction" by Sharon Walpole and Michael C. McKenna.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The school district offered a book study on the differentiated reading instruction book that several teachers and all Academic Coaches took last year. This model was introduced last year with a lot of success based on data. The district-adopted materials have been given to us to use by our school district and is required.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Identify students who fall into each targeted group based on data for 3-5. Create a plan for intervention groups and SWD.

Person Responsible: Kelly Young (kellyay@leeschools.net)

By When:

#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.

3rd Grade ELA Achievement is an areas of critical need based on the School Data Review for 2022. ELA Achievement only increase from 48% to 49%.

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

Pelican Elementary will increase the 3rd Grade ELA Achievement from 49% to 62% as measured by the F.A.S.T.

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

ELA Achievement will be monitored through iReady diagnostic assessments, documented small group Reading instruction and intervention, and through F.A.S.T. state progress monitoring. Students data will monitored and group could change based on student need every 4-6 weeks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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

The evidence-based strategy being implemented for ELA Achievement is the use of district adopted intervention materials (Read Well, Fly Leaf, and Phonics for Instruction through Curriculum and Associates). Small group targeted instruction will also be used from the book "How to Plan Differentiated Reading Instruction" by Sharon Walpole and Michael C. McKenna. Student that perform between level 1 - level 3 will be assessed with Informal Decoding Inventory (IDI) and place in groups based on student needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The school district offered a book study on the differentiated reading instruction book that several teachers and all Academic Coaches took last year. This model was introduced last year with a lot of success based on data. The district-adopted materials have been given to us to use by our school district and is required.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Identify students who fall into each targeted group based on data for 3rd grade. Create a plan for intervention groups.

Person Responsible: Kelly Young (kellyay@leeschools.net)

By When: Spring 2024

#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.

2nd ELA Achievement is an areas of critical need based on the School Data Review for 2023. 2nd grade ELA Achievement for the 2023 was 66%.

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

Pelican Elementary will increase the 2nd grade ELA Achievement from 66% to 70% as measured by the F.A.S.T. in Spring 2024.

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

ELA Achievement will be monitored through iReady diagnostic assessments, documented small group Reading instruction and intervention, and through F.A.S.T. state progress monitoring. Students data will monitored and group could change based on student need every 4-6 weeks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Breanne Costa (breanneac@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.)

The evidence-based strategy being implemented for ELA Achievement is the use of district adopted intervention materials (Read Well, Fly Leaf, and Phonics for Instruction through Curriculum and Associates). Small group targeted instruction will also be used from the book "How to Plan Differentiated Reading Instruction" by Sharon Walpole and Michael C. McKenna. Student that perform between level 1 - level 3 will be assessed with Informal Decoding Inventory (IDI) and place in groups based on student needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The school district offered a book study on the differentiated reading instruction book that several teachers and all Academic Coaches took last year. This model was introduced last year with a lot of success based on data. The district-adopted materials have been given to us to use by our school district and is required.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Identify students who fall into each targeted group based on data for 2nd. Create a plan for intervention groups.

Person Responsible: Breanne Costa (breanneac@leeschools.net)

By When: Spring 2024

#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.

3rd- 5th Grade ELA Proficiency is an area of focus. We decreased from 61%-58% (down 3 points).

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

Pelican Elementary will increase the 3rd-5th grade ELA Achievement from 58% to 63% as measured by the F.A.S.T. in Spring 2024.

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

ELA Achievement will be monitored through iReady diagnostic assessments, documented small group Reading instruction and intervention, and through F.A.S.T. state progress monitoring. Students data will monitored and group could change based on student need every 4-6 weeks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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

The evidence-based strategy being implemented for ELA Achievement is the use of district adopted intervention materials (Read Well, Fly Leaf, and Phonics for Instruction through Curriculum and Associates). Small group targeted instruction will also be used from the book "How to Plan Differentiated Reading Instruction" by Sharon Walpole and Michael C. McKenna. Student that perform between level 1 - level 3 will be assessed with Informal Decoding Inventory (IDI) and place in groups based on student needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The school district offered a book study on the differentiated reading instruction book that several teachers and all Academic Coaches took last year. This model was introduced last year with a lot of success based on data. The district-adopted materials have been given to us to use by our school district and is required.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Identify students who fall into each targeted group based on data for 3-5. Create a plan for intervention groups.

Person Responsible: Kelly Young (kellyay@leeschools.net)

By When: Spring 2024

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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

Based on school discipline data, creating a positive culture and environment has been identified as a critical need.

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

Pelican Elementary will have 100% of students earning positive rewards by the end of each quarter as measured by the LiveSchool points system.

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

The PBIS Chair and administrators will monitor usage and data through the LiveSchool Points system, as well as monitor the rate of discipline referrals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Courtney Wood (courtneyw@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.)

The evidence-based strategy being implemented for Behavior is to use a token-economy reward system to encourage positive interactions and be proactive about discipline issues by creating a culture and environment which builds relationships.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Rewards systems encourage increased positive behavior and allow students to set goals for following expectations.

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.

Train new staff members on the expectations and how to use the LiveSchool program.

Person Responsible: Courtney Wood (courtneyw@leeschools.net)

By When: Spring 2024

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

Pelican needs to increased the proficiency in ELA for SWDs, moving from 35% to 40%. In addition to the ESE Resource Teachers who provide support for these students in ELA, we will also have designated support staff to work with individual students as well.

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

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

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.

N/A

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?

N/A

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?

N/A

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

N/A

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.

N/A

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$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: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes