

The School District of Lee County

# Sunshine Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

**Table of Contents**

---

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>                                   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>I. School Information</b>                                       | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>                            | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>                               | <b>14</b> |
| <b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>                       | <b>24</b> |
| <b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b> | <b>24</b> |
| <b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>                                    | <b>26</b> |
| <b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>                       | <b>29</b> |

## Sunshine Elementary School

601 SARA AVE N, Lehigh Acres, FL 33971

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

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

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

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

#### Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

#### Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

#### Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

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

## I. School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

To ensure the development of successful lifelong learners who are dedicated to bright futures.

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

Sunshine, Where Bright Futures Begin

### 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 |
|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Brandao, Erin     | Principal           |                                 |
| Eaton, Kristen    | Instructional Coach |                                 |
| Lainhart, Heather | Assistant Principal |                                 |
| Stanford, Michele | Assistant Principal |                                 |

#### 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.

Sunshine Elementary used various means to get involvement from stakeholders. A survey was sent to all parents asking for their input. We met with our business partners asking input. Teachers and administration met over the summer to make plans for student improvement.

#### 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 regularly monitored during weekly PLC meetings, monthly staff meeting, and monthly SAC meetings. Administration will also monitor adherence to the SIP during daily walkthroughs on campus.

### Demographic Data

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

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2023-24 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>   | Yes   |
| <b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>   | 90%   |
| <b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>   | 100%  |
| <b>Charter School</b>  | No  |
| <b>RAISE School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>ESSA Identification</b><br>*updated as of 3/11/2024   | ATSI  |
| <b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>  | No  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)*<br>English Language Learners (ELL)<br>Black/African American Students (BLK)<br>Hispanic Students (HSP)<br>Multiracial Students (MUL)<br>White Students (WHT)<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| <b>School Grades History</b><br>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.  | 2021-22: C<br><br>2019-20: C<br><br>2018-19: C<br><br>2017-18: C  |
| <b>School Improvement Rating History</b>   |   |
| <b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>   |   |

## Early Warning Systems

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

| Indicator   | Grade Level |    |    |     |    |    |   |   |   |     | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|-----|----|----|---|---|---|-----|-------|
|   | K           | 1  | 2  | 3   | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 |     |       |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 18          | 67 | 66 | 85  | 31 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 315 |       |
| One or more suspensions   | 1           | 3  | 6  | 13  | 9  | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39  |       |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)   | 0           | 35 | 27 | 42  | 37 | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 148 |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 10 | 13 | 29  | 23 | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 117 | 49 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 248 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 82  | 63 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 233 |       |
| 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 | 6           | 12 | 14 | 257 | 72 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 407   |

**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 | 6 | 1 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23    |

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

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

| Indicator   | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |     | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-----|-------|
|   | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 |     |       |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 35          | 92 | 90 | 75 | 49 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 410 |       |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 5  | 4  | 7  | 3  | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24  |       |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0           | 33 | 32 | 41 | 3  | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 120 |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 14 | 9  | 27 | 2  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 35 | 36 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 15 | 25 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 109 |       |
| 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           | 13 | 8 | 40 | 19 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 132   |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |    |    |   |   |   |   | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 13          | 1 | 1 | 25 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 1 | 3  | 17 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22    |

### 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   | 35          | 92 | 90 | 75 | 49 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 410 |       |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 5  | 4  | 7  | 3  | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24  |       |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0           | 33 | 32 | 41 | 3  | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 120 |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 14 | 9  | 27 | 2  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 35 | 36 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 15 | 25 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 109 |       |
| 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           | 13 | 8 | 40 | 19 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 132   |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |    |    |   |   |   |   | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 13          | 1 | 1 | 25 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 1 | 3  | 17 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22    |

## 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*            | 35     | 48       | 53    | 43     | 52       | 56    | 42     |          |       |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 54     |          |       | 45     |          |       |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 37     |          |       | 39     |          |       |
| Math Achievement*           | 41     | 57       | 59    | 49     | 45       | 50    | 39     |          |       |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 62     |          |       | 36     |          |       |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 52     |          |       | 35     |          |       |

| Accountability Component        | 2023   |          |       | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                                 | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Science Achievement*            | 40     | 53       | 54    | 42     | 59       | 59    | 35     |          |       |
| Social Studies Achievement*     |        |          |       |        | 62       | 64    |        |          |       |
| Middle School Acceleration      |        |          |       |        | 47       | 52    |        |          |       |
| Graduation Rate                 |        |          |       |        | 50       | 50    |        |          |       |
| College and Career Acceleration |        |          |       |        |          | 80    |        |          |       |
| ELP Progress                    | 46     | 51       | 59    | 52     |          |       | 44     |          |       |

\* 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           | 38   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | Yes  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 5    |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 192  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 5    |
| Percent Tested                                 | 99   |
| Graduation Rate                                |      |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index                     |      |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)               | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 49   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 1    |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 391  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 8    |
| Percent Tested                                 | 99   |
| Graduation Rate                                |      |

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**

| <b>2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY</b> |  |                           |  |  |
|---|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| <b>ESSA Subgroup</b>                      | <b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b> | <b>Subgroup Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b> |
| SWD                                       | 15                                     | Yes                       | 4  | 1  |
| ELL                                       | 35                                     | Yes                       | 1  |  |
| AMI                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| ASN                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| BLK                                       | 36                                     | Yes                       | 1  |  |
| HSP                                       | 38                                     | Yes                       | 1  |  |
| MUL                                       | 43                                     |                           |  |  |
| PAC                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| WHT                                       | 50                                     |                           |  |  |
| FRL                                       | 37                                     | Yes                       | 1  |  |

| <b>2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY</b> |  |                           |  |  |
|---|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| <b>ESSA Subgroup</b>                      | <b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b> | <b>Subgroup Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b> |
| SWD                                       | 34                                     | Yes                       | 3  |  |
| ELL                                       | 43                                     |                           |  |  |
| AMI                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| ASN                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| BLK                                       | 45                                     |                           |  |  |
| HSP                                       | 49                                     |                           |  |  |
| MUL                                       | 46                                     |                           |  |  |
| PAC                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| WHT                                       | 60                                     |                           |  |  |
| FRL                                       | 47                                     |                           |  |  |

**Accountability Components by Subgroup**

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

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups                                      | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| All Students                                   | 35       |        |             | 41        |         |              | 40       |         |           |                   |                     | 46           |
| SWD  | 9        |        |             | 13        |         |              | 23       |         |           |                   | 5                   | 32           |
| ELL  | 30       |        |             | 42        |         |              | 31       |         |           |                   | 5                   | 46           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 33       |        |             | 37        |         |              | 34       |         |           |                   | 5                   | 48           |
| HSP  | 34       |        |             | 42        |         |              | 39       |         |           |                   | 5                   | 46           |
| MUL  | 36       |        |             | 50        |         |              |          |         |           |                   | 2                   |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 45       |        |             | 42        |         |              | 69       |         |           |                   | 4                   |              |
| FRL  | 33       |        |             | 39        |         |              | 37       |         |           |                   | 5                   | 46           |

| 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                                   | 43       | 54     | 37          | 49        | 62      | 52           | 42       |         |           |                   |                     | 52           |
| SWD  | 17       | 33     | 30          | 26        | 51      | 48           | 28       |         |           |                   |                     | 41           |
| ELL  | 33       | 46     | 31          | 41        | 59      | 53           | 32       |         |           |                   |                     | 52           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 40       | 52     | 50          | 42        | 58      | 48           | 21       |         |           |                   |                     | 50           |
| HSP  | 41       | 54     | 35          | 49        | 64      | 54           | 44       |         |           |                   |                     | 52           |
| MUL  | 45       |        |             | 43        | 50      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 59       | 52     |             | 64        | 59      |              | 67       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 40       | 52     | 37          | 47        | 60      | 51           | 40       |         |           |                   |                     | 49           |

| 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                                   | 42       | 45     | 39          | 39        | 36      | 35           | 35       |         |           |                   |                     | 44           |
| SWD  | 20       | 14     | 18          | 24        | 22      | 31           | 12       |         |           |                   |                     | 46           |
| ELL  | 31       | 35     | 36          | 34        | 38      | 32           | 26       |         |           |                   |                     | 44           |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups                                      | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 | ELP Progress |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 34       | 40     |             | 30        | 23      | 33           | 23       |         |           |                   |                     | 38           |
| HSP  | 44       | 45     | 37          | 40        | 42      | 39           | 33       |         |           |                   |                     | 46           |
| MUL  | 42       |        |             | 33        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 44       | 48     |             | 50        | 41      |              | 65       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 38       | 39     | 33          | 34        | 33      | 33           | 26       |         |           |                   |                     | 45           |

### 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 | 34%    | 48%      | -14%                       | 54%   | -20%                    |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 48%    | 56%      | -8%                        | 58%   | -10%                    |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 28%    | 42%      | -14%                       | 50%   | -22%                    |

| MATH  |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 47%    | 55%      | -8%                        | 59%   | -12%                    |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 46%    | 61%      | -15%                       | 61%   | -15%                    |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 33%    | 52%      | -19%                       | 55%   | -22%                    |

| SCIENCE |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05      | 2023 - Spring | 36%    | 50%      | -14%                       | 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.**

3rd grade ELA - 30.1%  
 5th grade ELA - 36.9%  
 5th grade Math - 33.9%  
 5th grade Science - 39.3%  
 SWD - 34%

The contributing factors to last year's low performance are:

- Students with disabilities continues to be below the 41% needed. Third grade had the largest number of ESE students not in a self-contained classroom.
- Approximately 27 students in third grade had an IEP during the 22-23 school year and 22 scored a Level 1 on the 3rd FAST Progress Monitoring Assessment for ELA. 4 were a Level 2 and 1 was a Level 3.
- Due to staffing shortages, 3rd and 5th grade classrooms had split classes for a large part of the year, coupled by an assigned resource teacher to ensure effective instruction.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from last year was 3rd Grade ELA. The factors that led to this decline are staff related. coupled by the incoming proficiency of our FY22/23 27 ESE 3rd graders, as well as new benchmarks to tackle. Due to staffing shortages, 3rd grade began the year with 2 long-term substitutes, assisted by assigned resource teachers. In December, one long-term substitute resigned, causing the classroom of students to be absorbed by the remaining teachers on the grade level.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

The data component that had the greatest gap compared to the state average is 3rd grade ELA. The state average is 50% and Sunshine's average is 29%, which is a 21% gap. The factors that led to this decline are staff related. Third grade began the year with 2 long-term substitutes with supports from assigned resource teachers. In December, one long-term substitute left and the students in that class were absorbed among the other teachers in the grade level.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is 4th grade ELA. The new actions taken in this area were the addition of the Phonics for Reading materials. As students moved through the program, they were advanced to a higher intervention group allowing students to have more exposure to grade level benchmarks in order to drive proficiency. 4th grade FAST ELA proficiency began at 22% PM1, with PM3 ELA scoring 44% proficiency according to Performance Matters. PM1 proficiency was 34 students, moving to 73 student during the PM3 FAST ELA assessment.

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

A potential area of concern is the attendance percentage of our students. Of the 1354 students at Sunshine Elementary, 315 students are identified as chronically absent based on missing 10% or greater of days. Academic attendance reviews were regularly conducted with an administrator and our social worker to encourage better attendance.

Attendance Interventions\Initiatives currently in place for the FY24 school year:

Quarterly rewards- popcorn, chips, ice cream, bounce house and/or fun activities during PE blocks  
Notes are sent home on weekly newsletter to parents encouraging attendance  
Attendance celebrations led by SSW, weekly Attendance King and Queen, weekly classroom perfect celebration, weekly grade level dress down  
Attendance conferences with AP/SSW  
School bulletin board celebrating attendance and recognizing students  
Door signs for perfect attendance for each classroom  
Weekly Grade Level Attendance Averages posted and updated in front office and bulletin board  
Resources offered to parents: Connect with Lee; discussing transportation concerns; getting parents set up with launchpad and at home resources (iReady; Reflex; ETC.)  
Teacher recognition for attendance by admin team,

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

The highest priorities are: 3rd and 5th Grade ELA, 5th Grade Math, 5th Grade Science and Students with Disabilities.

#### **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.

The data component that had the greatest need for improvement is ELA achievement for SWD. ELA proficiency for SWD is 34%. This is the 3rd year that SWD have not met the 41% goal.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

ELA proficiency of students will go from 34% to 42% based on the EOY FAST Test.

**Monitoring:**

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

Administration walkthroughs, PLC meetings, data folders, and reviewing data from exemplars, iReady, and FAST Testing.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Erin Brandao (erinrb@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 Behavior Intervention class will be staffed this year by a certified teacher.

ELA Standard- Based Intervention Resource by Quarter (Grades 3-5)

Push to Proficiency

Intervention Programs (ELA)

- i-Ready Teacher Toolbox & i-Ready Student Learning Path (K-5)

- Phonics for Reading (3-5)

Magnetic Reading

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Wonders and Phonics for Intervention are proven, evidence-based program that has shown to result in student proficiency. Other programs listed are also district approved and evidence-based.

**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.

Clear Purpose-Increased proficiency on the FAST Test.

Accountability- Monthly monitoring in PLCs.

Repeatable- Using intervention programs and processes consistently and with fidelity

Desired Result- ESE ELA proficiency will go from 34% to 42% based on the EOY FAST Test.



Objectively Measure- EOY FAST Test

Documentation- Presentation during Pre-School Week, Continual review during weekly PLC meetings, teacher data collection on individual IEP goals

**Person Responsible:** Erin Brandao (erinrb@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Ongoing

Planning- based on initial assessments and test scores. Intervention Groups will be re-evaluated every 4-6 weeks. 3 groups of teachers will be departmentalized specifically into ELA and Math. Teachers who are not primarily ELA teachers will utilize the scripted intervention programs.

**Person Responsible:** Erin Brandao (erinrb@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Ongoing

Tier 1- Core Instruction

ELA Core: Wonders

- Scope and Sequence
- Instructional Guides
- Elem. ELA Website

Math Core: Savvas

- Scope and Sequence
- Instructional Guides
- Elem Math Website
- Elem Math Supports page
- Near Pod Lesson Banks

**Person Responsible:** Erin Brandao (erinrb@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Ongoing

Coaching Plan-

**Person Responsible:** Erin Brandao (erinrb@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Ongoing

## #2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

### 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.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

Sunshine Elementary will increase teacher retention from \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_ by FY 25

### Monitoring:

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

Teacher retention will be monitored based on intent forms, climate surveys

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Erin Brandao (erinrb@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.)

All staff members are also involved in various staff appreciation activities.

Some of those activities are:

The Happy Cart, which comes around periodically to deliver snacks,

Drawings for teachers and staff to win prizes for perfect attendance and handing out Suns to students for signatures.

Monthly food truck visits to campus.

Teacher and staff appreciation week.

The Sunshine Squad also celebrates staff with periodic fun extras. They also take care of organizing baby and bridal showers, plus get cards and/or flowers for those that are sick or have a death in their family.

### 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.

Desired Result-

Objectively Measure-

Repeatable-

Documentation-

**Person Responsible:** Erin Brandao (erinrb@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Ongoing

### #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 grade ELA proficiency is a priority because at this point we have to ensure students are mastering the foundational skills of ELA.

#### Measurable Outcome:

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

2nd grade ELA proficiency will go from 40% to 43% based on the EOY FAST Test.

#### Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored in PLCs using exemplars, iReady Data, and data from FAST Testing.

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Erin Brandao (erinrb@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 intervention being used in 2nd grade is Flyleaf as well as iReady Teacher Toolbox and iReady Student Learning Path

#### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

ReadWell is a proven, evidence-based program that has shown to result in student proficiency.

#### 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.

Desired Result- 2nd grade ELA proficiency will go from 40% to 43% based on the EOY FAST Test.

Objectively Measure- EOY FAST Test

Repeatable- Using intervention programs and processes consistently and with fidelity

Documentation- Presentation during Pre-School Week, Continual review during weekly PLC meetings

**Person Responsible:** Erin Brandao (erinrb@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Ongoing

ELA Tier 1-

Core: Wonders

- Scope and Sequence
- Instructional Guides
- Elem. ELA Website

**Person Responsible:** Erin Brandao (erinrb@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Ongoing

Planning System- Students will be assessed multiple times a year for intervention and ability grouped based on needs. Flexible grouping based on scores and growth

Instructional Guides

Test Item Specification

Planning Slides

**Person Responsible:** Erin Brandao (erinrb@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Ongoing

#### #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 grade ELA proficiency

##### Measurable Outcome:

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

3rd grade ELA proficiency will go from 30% to 33% based on the EOY FAST Test.

##### Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored in PLCs using exemplars, iReady Data, and data from FAST Testing.

##### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Erin Brandao (erinrb@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 intervention being used in 3rd grade are Phonics for Intervention and Wonders Intervention Materials.

Intervention Programs

- i-Ready Teacher Toolbox & i-Ready Student Learning Path (K-5)
- Phonics for Reading (3-5)

##### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Phonics for Intervention and Wonders are both proven, evidence-based program that has shown to result in student proficiency.

##### 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.

Clear Purpose-Increased proficiency on the FAST Test.

Accountability- Monthly monitoring in PLCs.

Repeatable- Using intervention programs and processes consistently and with fidelity

Desired Result- 3rd grade ELA proficiency will go from 29% to 32% based on the EOY FAST Test.

Objectively Measure- EOY FAST Test

Documentation- Presentation during Pre-School Week, Continual review during weekly PLC meetings

**Person Responsible:** Erin Brandao (erinrb@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Ongoing

Tier 1- Core Program:

Wonders

Scope and Sequence

Instructional Guides

Elementary ELA Websites

**Person Responsible:** Erin Brandao (erinrb@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Ongoing

Planning System- students will be differentiated into intervention groups based on initial assessments and test scores. Intervention Groups will be re-evaluated every 4-6 weeks. 3 groups of teachers will be departmentalized specifically into ELA and Math. Teachers who are not primarily ELA teachers will utilize the scripted intervention programs.

Instructional Guides

Test Item Specification

Planning Slides

**Person Responsible:** Erin Brandao (erinrb@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Ongoing

## #5. 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 ELA proficiency.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

3rd - 5th grade ELA proficiency will go from 39% to 42% based on the EOY FAST Test.

### Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored in PLCs using exemplars, iReady Data, and data from FAST Testing.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Erin Brandao (erinrb@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 intervention being used in 3rd - 5th grade are Phonics for Intervention , iReady B.E.S.T. Literature and Wonders Intervention Materials.

Intervention Programs

- i-Ready Teacher Toolbox & i-Ready Student Learning Path (K-5)
- Phonics for Reading (3-5)

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Phonics for Intervention and Wonders are both evidence-based programs that has shown to result in student proficiency.

### 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.

Clear Purpose-Increased proficiency on the FAST Test.

Accountability- Monthly monitoring in PLCs.

Repeatable- Using intervention programs and processes consistently and with fidelity

Desired Result- 3rd - 5th grade ELA proficiency will go from 39% to 42% based on the EOY FAST Test.

Objectively Measure- EOY FAST Test

Documentation- Presentation during Pre-School Week, Continual review during weekly PLC meetings

**Person Responsible:** Erin Brandao (erinrb@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Ongoing

Planning- based on initial assessments and test scores. Intervention Groups will be re-evaluated every 4-6 weeks. 3 groups of teachers will be departmentalized specifically into ELA and Math. Teachers who are not primarily ELA teachers will utilize the scripted intervention programs.

Instructional Guides  
Test Item Specification  
Planning Slides

**Person Responsible:** Erin Brandao (erinrb@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Ongoing

### CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

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



KG ELA Proficiency- 48%  
 1st Grade ELA Proficiency- 37%  
 2nd Grade ELA Proficiency- 39%

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

3rd Grade ELA Proficiency- 30.1%  
 4th Grade ELA Proficiency- 50.7%  
 5th Grade ELA Proficiency- 36.9%

### **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**

Reading Proficiency at the kindergarten level is currently at 48% based on end of FY 23 year data of students who have tested. Reading Proficiency at the first grade level is currently at .37% based on FY 23 PM 3 data of students who have tested. Reading Proficiency at the second grade level is 39 % based on the PM 3 FY 23 data of students who tested during the first window. Overall, the current reading proficiency in grades K, 1 and 2 is 41%. We will increase that to at least 44% by the second progress monitoring window and 50% by the third progress monitoring.

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

Reading Proficiency for grades 3-5 of students scoring a level 3, 4, or 5 was at 38% based on the FY 23 PM 3 FAST Progress Monitoring assessment. We will increase that to at least 43% by the second progress monitoring and 47% by the third progress monitoring.

## **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.

We will use our district progress monitoring, iReady Diagnostic information, Comprehensive assessments and Exemplars to determine if our students are making adequate progress toward B.E.S.T. Benchmark Standards.

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

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Brandao, Erin , erinrb@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?

K-1 will use ReadWell, 2nd will use Flyleaf, 3rd-5th level ones will use Phonics for Reading. In addition, we will be using the iReady Toolbox and Wonders Intervention curriculum. Each grade level will have 60 minutes of intervention time. PCTs, Coaches and Resource teachers will be assigned to work with a grade level to assist with intervention along with paraprofessionals. In addition, Enrichment teachers will push into classes when they have open times in their schedule.

**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?

District approved curriculum

**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        |
|--|--|
| Paraprofessionals, Coaches and PCTs will be assigned to the classroom during the Core block to assist with academic needs of the students and center rotations. In addition, staff members will be assigned in classrooms for a minimum of 45 minutes uninterrupted. | Brandao, Erin ,<br>erinrb@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.

School Newsletter

Website

Parent Messenger - Email

SAC/PTO Meetings

**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))

Parents, teachers, students, community members and business partners will participate in the comprehensive needs' assessment by attending SAC meetings, curriculum nights, and AVID night. Monthly SAC meetings, comprised of teachers, staff members, parents, community and business members, are held to disseminate information to parents from the district as well as ongoing school-wide information. SAC Meetings are held at various times throughout the school year to accommodate parents. At the end of each SAC meeting, an exit slip is provided to all parents and stakeholders. They can comment on anything they feel needs to be improved and/or changed at the school. Student group data for all student groups including regular Ed, ESE, gifted, ELLs, L25, educationally disadvantaged and historically underserved, is shared and participants are asked to help identify school needs. Stakeholders will participate as the result of invitations through the school newsletter, School Messenger, Peach Jar, personal phone calls, personal invitations, flexible meeting times, and traditional flyers sent home in advance of the event. Business and community members are involved in the SAC meetings, as well as special events held at the school. Input from stakeholders will be collected through surveys, exit tickets, open discussions, email, and Parent Messenger. These communications will be flexible in format such as online, in person or on paper, allowing for all parents to give input. Formats will be in different languages and simple terms that parents can easily understand. Information gathered from this data will be used to identify school needs and create a plan. Stakeholders are invited to planning meetings to help design schoolwide plans. Implementation of the plans happens during the school year. Evaluation of the school wide plans happen at the end of the year. The 1% set aside for parent involvement is determined with the help of parents, the parent involvement specialist, and administration

**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 strategies that need to be implemented to accelerate learning are:

PLC discussions and planning will revolve around best practices, standards based instruction, attention to the ALDs, examining what the standard is calling for, where the students are, and what steps instructional staff need to take to impact the student's current learning. Content experts among

the grade level will model, coach, and support team members when utilizing High Yield, AVID, and Kagan strategies into their daily instructional practices/routines. Backwards design to ensure the standards being taught within each Exemplar will be modeled for team members during the planning process to engage all team members.

Administration ties data chats to goals by addressing grade level SMART goals, School Improvement Goals that align with Envision 2030.

SMART Goals are discussed during PLC meetings and teachers share best practices to support SMART Goals. Documentation of Meeting Minutes are recorded within the PLC Agendas, located in Google Drive.

Students document their progress/goal alignment within their AVID Binders, as well as being able to share the information during individual student data chats.

**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))**

Full time school counselor and social worker on campus daily. LMHP 1 day per week on campus. School psychologist on campus 2.5 days per week

**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).**

MTSS Early Warning System used to identify 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))**

Weekly PLC Meetings/Monthly PD

**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))**

Head Start Coordination

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment | \$0.00 |
| 3      | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA   | \$0.00 |
| 4      | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA   | \$0.00 |
| 5      | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA   | \$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