
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	23

Gulf Elementary School

3400 SW 17TH PL, Cape Coral, FL 33914

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To create a community of learners who are equipped with the knowledge, strength of character, and desire to reflect on the past, achieve in the present, and build for the future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be a World Class School.

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
Verblaauw, Kim	Principal	Ensuring continuous improvement in measurable student performance and achievement, customer satisfaction, performance management and compliance.
Thomas, Brooke	Assistant Principal	Assist the principal in ensuring continuous improvement in measurable student performance and achievement, customer satisfaction, performance management, and compliance.
Resendes, Rachelle	Instructional Coach	Assist in the coordination of all services and program elements in the Florida Primary Education Program. Provide inservice and technical assistance to primary teachers, support personnel, and parents in a team approach to instruction.
Pink, Ashley	Behavior Specialist	Facilitate regular department meeting and professional learning communities. Serve as liaison for the ESE department with the school administration and District staff.

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.

Teachers

All interested teachers were presented the opportunity to serve on SAC and each grade level was asked

to have a representative attend SAC meeting. From the grade level groups, two were selected to be a member of SAC. No willing teachers were excluded. All interested teachers are welcome to attend any and all SAC meetings.

Support Staff

Support persons were offered the opportunity to serve on the School Advisory Council. One was chosen to be a voting member from those that volunteered to be representatives on the SAC. No willing support person was excluded. All interested support staff are welcomed to attend any and all SAC meetings.

Parents

Parents received information at the beginning of the school year via our School Messenger, Newsletter, and social media sites. All interested parents were welcomed – none were excluded. Appointments were made to fill the membership slot via SAC membership requirements. All interested parents are welcome to attend any and all SAC Meetings.

Business and Community Members

Business and Community leaders who are interested in working with Gulf Elementary were asked to serve on this committee. No interested business partner or community was excluded. One business community member and community leader were elected to serve on SAC.

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))

- An administrator is assigned to each grade level and attends PLC meetings.
- After each Florida Assessment of Student Thinking , PLC teams will meet with administration to complete a data study, analyze current levels of achievement, review common assessment data, share strategies, and research based best practices.
- PLC facilitators work in collaboration with grade level chairs, administration and Leading and Learning representatives to determine which part of the PLC cycle that will be the focus area. *Every PLC is focused around the 4 critical questions*
- PLC agenda, meeting minutes and a calendar mapping out the PLC cycle aligned with grade level common assessments and progress monitoring assessments.
- Teachers will use instructional guides to identify their focus standards.
- Teachers will participate in school-wide professional development that will focus on utilizing the instructional guides to guide instruction, answer the PLC critical questions, and resources for each cycle of the PLC to raise student achievement.
- Data chats review FAST data, progress, growth, and specific subgroup data (ESE, ESOL, MTSS)

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	45%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	45%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	37	46	33	37	36	43	0	0	0	232
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	20	16	10	28	7	4	0	0	0	85
Course failure in Math	5	6	5	15	7	11	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	63	31	43	0	0	0	137
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	26	31	31	0	0	0	88
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	5	48	39	40	42	40	0	0	0	214
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	12	9	14	13	8	0	0	0	56
Course failure in Math	0	1	5	9	7	14	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	19	30	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	12	24	0	0	0	44
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

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	1	4	17	18	24	0	0	0	64

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	17	0	3	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	1	8	1	5	0	0	0	0	15

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	5	48	39	40	42	40	0	0	0	214
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	12	9	14	13	8	0	0	0	56
Course failure in Math	0	1	5	9	7	14	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	19	30	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	12	24	0	0	0	44
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	1	4	17	18	24	0	0	0	64

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	17	0	3	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	1	8	1	5	0	0	0	0	15

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*	60	48	53	69	52	56	65		
ELA Learning Gains				58			55		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45			35		
Math Achievement*	69	57	59	72	45	50	71		
Math Learning Gains				68			55		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54			35		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	65	53	54	60	59	59	53		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	68	51	59	44			50		

* 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	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	316
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	470
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97
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	28	Yes	4	1
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	60			
MUL	69			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	57			

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	35	Yes	3	
ELL	60			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	57			
HSP	58			
MUL	72			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	51			

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	60			69			65					68
SWD	29			39			16				4	
ELL	48			59			53				5	68
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35			45							2	
HSP	54			65			60				5	72
MUL	65			71			70				4	
PAC												
WHT	65			72			70				4	
FRL	53			61			56				5	74

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	69	58	45	72	68	54	60					44
SWD	33	42	41	36	42	35	19					
ELL	55	45		60	75	83						44
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	57	58	36	52	61		77					
HSP	68	60	46	69	68	48	53					50
MUL	71	47		81	87							
PAC												
WHT	71	57	46	75	68	57	63					
FRL	60	53	37	61	61	46	51					41

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	65	55	35	71	55	35	53					50
SWD	22	43		34	38	30	32					
ELL	58			58								50

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	53	67		61	50		29					
HSP	62	50	46	67	54	53	35					50
MUL	67	58		78	58		58					
PAC												
WHT	67	57	27	72	55	24	62					
FRL	53	49	36	60	49	32	41					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	60%	48%	12%	54%	6%
04	2023 - Spring	72%	56%	16%	58%	14%
03	2023 - Spring	51%	42%	9%	50%	1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	72%	55%	17%	59%	13%
04	2023 - Spring	67%	61%	6%	61%	6%
05	2023 - Spring	70%	52%	18%	55%	15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	66%	50%	16%	51%	15%

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 showed the lowest performance in ELA, Mathematics, and Science achievement. According to the 2021-2022 data listed at the EDU data.

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

SWD fell under the 41% in ELA, Math, Math learning gains, Math L25 learning gains and Science.

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.

Our students with disabilities are overcoming obstacles that impact their school performance. In addition, they often have gaps in their learning. Therefore, their instruction has less room for error. In order to catch them up to their non-disabled peers, we have to help students with disabilities overcome their obstacles and actually learn more in a year than their non-disabled peers. We have to fill instructional gaps while also teaching grade-level standards.

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

Multiracial students improved in overall Math achievement from 58% to 87%. All but one subgroup (ELL) increased in ELA achievement. Out of the 36 subgroup data 28 subgroups improved. 8 subgroups dropped slightly.

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

Students being good caused promoted to grade 4 for ELA.

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

1. Improved ELA achievement in grade 4.
2. Students with disabilities
3. Closing the gap for our students in grade 4.

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.

SWD fell below the Federal Index and is identified for Targeted support and improvement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

SWD will increase ELA achievement from 33% to 42%.

Monitoring:

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

Reviewing the data after each progress monitoring assessment and common assessments guides us in making decisions about small group instruction, understanding how to best support all students, and which priority skills that need to be taught to master the standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kim Verblaauw (kimberlyav@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Intervention Programs
Phonics for Reading
i-Ready Tools
Wonders Test Prep
Best Literature Lessons and Writing

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Lee County School District provided the evidence based curriculum to be used.

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.

Based on performance on i-ready diagnostic placement groups will be formed to meet the needs of the students.

View student Diagnostic placement data in the Reading Comprehension domains (Informational Text and Literature).

Create small groups of students within intensive support groups by students showing red (two or more grade levels below) in both domains, a combination of red and yellow, by red in Info Text and then by red

in Literature, or yellow in both domains.

Each Tools for Scaffolding Comprehension provides two lesson plans with pathways for differentiated instruction for each priority skill that prepare students for upcoming grade-level instruction. For each priority skill, age-appropriate texts are provided.

Scaffold A is designed for students working 2 or more grade levels below.

Scaffold B is designed for students working one grade level below.

Teachers will complete the station rotation planning worksheet

Person Responsible: Kim Verblauw (kimberlyav@leeschools.net)

By When: Data will be reviewed after each progress monitoring during PLC time.

#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.

An increase in ELA proficiency in grade 2 will provide a stronger foundation for students proficiency in grade 3.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students in grade 2 will increase ELA Proficiency from 63% to 66% as measured by the FY24 ELA STAR Progress Monitoring Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

After each District Progress Monitoring Window, data will be analyzed and groups will be adjusted to support students based on the most current concepts and skills they are ready to learn.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brooke Thomas (brooket@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.)

Flyleaf
UFLI
Wonders Test Prep
BEST Literature and Writing

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Lee County School District determines and provides Evidence-based Intervention.

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.

Instruction will be explicit and engaging:
Instruction where students play with and manipulate sounds
Explicit instruction in sound-spelling patterns that includes spelling(encoding)
Daily practice with decodable text that matches the scope and sequence
Sight recognition (connecting the sounds of language to print)
Instruction focuses on a topic for 2-3 weeks

Person Responsible: Kim Verblaauw (kimberlyav@leeschools.net)

By When: BEST Progress Monitoring Assessment window 3. (April 17-May25)

#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.

Students in grade 3 fell below school proficiency from the 2021-2022 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students in grade 3 will increase ELA proficiency from 63% to 66% as measured by the FY24 FAST Progress Monitoring Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

After each Progress Monitoring Window, data will be analyzed and groups will be adjusted to support students based on the most current concepts and skills they are ready to learn.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kim Verblauw (kimberlyav@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.)

Phonics for Reading
i-Ready Tools
Wonders Test Prep

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Lee County School District provides research based intervention curriculum.

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. 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.

Students overall ELA proficiency is below previous years proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students in grades 3- 5 will increase ELA proficiency from 65% to 68% as measured by the FAST Progress Monitoring Assessment window 3.

Monitoring:

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

After each Progress Monitoring Window, data will be analyzed and groups will be adjusted to support students based on the most current concepts and skills they are ready to learn.

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.)

Phonics for Reading
i-Ready Tools
Wonders Test Prep

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Lee County School District determine and provides Evidence-based Intervention.

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.

Based on performance on i-ready diagnostic placement groups will be formed to meet the needs of the students.

View student Diagnostic placement data in the Reading Comprehension domains (Informational Text and Literature).

Create small groups of students within intensive support groups by students showing red (two or more grade levels below) in both domains, a combination of red and yellow, by red in Info Text and then by red in Literature, or yellow in both domains.

Each Tools for Scaffolding Comprehension provides two lesson plans with pathways for differentiated instruction for each priority skill that prepare students for upcoming grade-level instruction. For each priority skill, age-appropriate texts are provided.

Scaffold A is designed for students working 2 or more grade levels below.

Scaffold B is designed for students working one grade level below.

Teachers will complete the station rotation planning worksheet

Person Responsible: Kim Verblauw (kimberlyav@leeschools.net)

By When: BEST Progress Monitoring Assessment window 3. (April 17-May 25)

#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.

SWD fell below the threshold of 41%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of quarter 1, 95% of staff will have provided positive reinforcement to every student in their class as measured by the LiveSchool database.

Monitoring:

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

Each administrator is responsible for specific grade level discipline data. While our school tends to not have a large number of discipline issues, we believe that having an administrator in charge of each grade will help better communication and build stronger relationships.

When a teacher does have disruptive behavior in their classroom, they will contact the office and the office will contact the Administrator in charge of that grade. That administrator will then work with that student, teacher, and family to help the student be successful in class. Following the Code of Conduct, we will address specific disruptive behaviors accordingly.

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.)

PBIS

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PBIS Increases Student Engagement and Instructional Time

Establishing school-wide expectations with your students sets the tone for the classroom. When you spend time getting to know your students and use strategies to deepen connections every day, you are building a healthy classroom environment. When students have clear expectations, are regularly acknowledged for the things they do well, and receive instructional consequences more often than exclusionary ones, they are going to spend more time in class than out of it.

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.

LiveSchool is a school-wide point system that GES has adapted to encourage positive behaviors. Our PBIS team has aligned each point to reflect our vision/mission & EAGLE Expectations. Our PBIS Posters

are hung around the school in classrooms and common areas to remind students of the positive behaviors expected on our GES campus. All school staff are provided with the LiveSchool app for their phone, to encourage all staff members to recognize positive behaviors being seen around the school. When a staff member recognizes a student following the Eagle expectations anywhere in our school, the student will receive a LiveSchool point for that positive behavior.

Person Responsible: Brooke Thomas (brooket@leeschools.net)

By When: The end of Quarter 1.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

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

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: 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.

No