

The School District of Lee County

# Rayma C. Page 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>11</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

# Rayma C. Page Elementary School

17000 S TAMIAMI TRL, Ft Myers, FL 33908

<http://rcp.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.**

The mission of Rayma C. Page Elementary is to achieve excellence through setting high expectations and building a positive, safe environment that meets the needs of all learners.

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

To be a world class school system.

Excellence for All...Whatever It Takes! Every Student, Every Family, Every Teacher, Every Day!

### 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
Sheckler, Valerie	Principal	Provide instructional leadership at Rayma C. Page that will ensure continuous improvement in measurable student performance and achievement. Provide organizational leadership to include personnel, budget, purchasing safety, public relations, plant operations, food services, and transportation that will support high performance expectations for all stakeholders.
Bulanda , Theresa	Assistant Principal	Assist the Principal in ensuring continuous improvement in measurable student performance and achievement, customer satisfaction, performance management, and compliance. Assist the Principal in the overall administration and operation of the school. Assume full responsibility of the school when the Principal is absent from the building.
Foy, Dennette	Curriculum Resource Teacher	To provide curriculum support for teachers in grades PK-5 to ensure that curriculum resources are supplied and utilized in accordance with established district instructional guides. Duties also include hands-on instructional support and guidance in curriculum and instructional needs to enhance lesson delivery for optimal student growth.
Lavariega, Kaleena	Instructional Coach	Provide assistance and ongoing professional development to K-2 teachers, including training, coaching, and mentoring in the use of materials, assessment strategies, and best practices to generate improvement in reading/literacy instruction and student achievement.
Straka, Robert	Curriculum Resource Teacher	To provide curriculum support for teachers in grades 3-5 to ensure that curriculum resources are supplied and utilized in accordance with established district instructional guides. Duties also include hands-on instructional support and guidance in curriculum and instructional needs to enhance lesson delivery for optimal student growth.

**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.

Our School Advisory Council which consists of school staff, parents, business partners and community leaders provide input at monthly School Advisory Council meetings regarding school academic goals and the development of our School Improvement Plan processes and implemenatation.

**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))

School administrators and teachers meet weekly to review individual student data based on current standards-based assessments during PLC meetings. Individual teachers monitor individual student data through progress monitoring, formal and informal assessments. To ensure continuous improvement, individual student progress is overseen by the leadership team and the Intervention Specialist. The intervention specialist meets weekly with teachers to review individual student progress and adjust levels of support through a tiered approach as needed. Administration meets with grade level teams monthly to review recent and historic student data to plan for effective resource and adjustments as needed which includes professional development, reassigning of support and mentoring of teachers. Data reviews are performed by the leadership team and admin to reveal areas of strength and opportunities for growth in individual teachers. Professional development is planned based on the results of monthly reviews. Administration will perform frequent classroom walkthroughs and formal observations to identify areas of strength and need in individual classrooms. The leadership team will provide model lessons for observation by teachers and individual teacher support through mentoring.

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	46%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	75%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A



	2017-18: A
<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	33	19	16	20	23	14	0	0	0	125
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	1	7	4	0	0	0	13
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	18	14	12	23	10	17	0	0	0	94
Course failure in Math	9	2	2	3	4	5	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	19	33	18	35	20	29	0	0	0	154
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	31	13	15	21	21	19	0	0	0	120
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	37	47	42	60	44	43	0	0	0	273

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	2	0	1	11	41	36	0	0	0	91

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	1	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	31	25	23	18	26	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	1	1	5	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	1	12	12	22	1	9	0	0	0	57
Course failure in Math	0	9	3	7	0	10	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	9	25	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	10	12	0	0	0	28
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	9	31	59	43	42	0	0	0	184
	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	6	3	16	2	13	0	0	0	40

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	2	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	11

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	31	25	23	18	26	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	1	1	5	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	1	12	12	22	1	9	0	0	0	57
Course failure in Math	0	9	3	7	0	10	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	9	25	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	10	12	0	0	0	28
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	9	31	59	43	42	0	0	0	184
	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	6	3	16	2	13	0	0	0	40

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	2	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	11

**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*	63	48	53	66	52	56	68		
ELA Learning Gains				64			67		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40			54		
Math Achievement*	74	57	59	79	45	50	80		
Math Learning Gains				69			70		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62			65		
Science Achievement*	68	53	54	58	59	59	57		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	48	51	59	41			56		

\* 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	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	311
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	479
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

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

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	26	Yes	2	1
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN	84			
BLK	65			
HSP	49			
MUL	87			
PAC				

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%
WHT	74			
FRL	53			

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	34	Yes	1	
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN	79			
BLK	71			
HSP	52			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	56			

**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	63			74			68					48
SWD	16			33			30				5	42
ELL	33			52			43				5	48
AMI												
ASN	79			89							2	
BLK	63			67							2	
HSP	45			61			55				5	46

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
MUL	82			91							2	
PAC												
WHT	71			80			79				4	
FRL	51			67			57				5	41

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	66	64	40	79	69	62	58					41
SWD	17	11	6	55	71	71	0					38
ELL	29	40	23	62	65	69	42					41
AMI												
ASN	56			100	82							
BLK	67			75								
HSP	55	57	33	67	65	56	44					40
MUL	70			60								
PAC												
WHT	74	68	50	86	72	69	68					
FRL	56	60	32	68	68	69	52					39

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	68	67	54	80	70	65	57					56
SWD	32	50	45	56	69	64	29					40
ELL	43	48		66	67		16					56
AMI												
ASN	86			95			90					
BLK	64			55								
HSP	50	56	50	67	62	57	33					58
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	80	77		88	74		73					

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
FRL	58	54	45	69	62	64	31					54

**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	71%	56%	15%	58%	13%
03	2023 - Spring	56%	42%	14%	50%	6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	76%	55%	21%	59%	17%
04	2023 - Spring	72%	61%	11%	61%	11%
05	2023 - Spring	75%	52%	23%	55%	20%

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.**

The data component showing the lowest performance at Rayma C. Page Elementary was third grade ELA scores which showed 58%. One of the contributing factors to last year's low performance was the low performance of our 2nd grade students in 2021/2022. Although students made gains throughout the year, 42% of the students did not meet proficiency. Another contributing factor was the focus on phonics for our identified level one students. This focus should have been paired with more rigorous standards-based intervention. One noted trend was that current third grade proficiency scores correlated with prior year's second grade proficiency scores.

Third grade students were not sufficiently prepared for the stamina required for the new FAST test. Students took too long to complete the test which possibly resulted in students choosing answers in an attempt to quickly finish the testing.

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

The data component showing the greatest decline from the prior year was 3rd grade ELA. In 2021/2022 the proficiency rate in third grade was 65% which was 7% higher than the current year (2023) proficiency score of 58%. One of the contributing factors to last year's low performance was the low performance of our 2nd grade students in 2021/2022. Although students made gains throughout the year, 42% of the students did not meet proficiency. Another contributing factor was the focus on phonics for our identified level one students. This focus should have been paired with more rigorous standards-based intervention. One noted trend was that current third grade proficiency scores correlated with prior year's second grade proficiency scores.

Third grade students were not sufficiently prepared for the stamina required for the new FAST test. Students took too long to complete the test which possibly resulted in students choosing answers in an attempt to quickly finish the testing.

**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.**

All data identified a higher score compared to state average in all data components.

**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 was 5th grade science. In Spring of 2022, our Science proficiency scores were 58%. For the current year 2023, our Science proficiency scores increased by 8% for a proficiency score of 66%.

This year our 3rd, 4th & 5th grade teachers fully utilized the district Science curriculum and resources. Administration closely monitored the pacing, rigor and fidelity of the Science curriculum. Science assessments were monitored for mastery and students were provided intervention and reteaching of Science standards based on current assessments.

Another action we took was to utilize our STEM Resource teacher to support teaching of standards during Specials. The STEM resource teacher provided hands-on learning to support the teaching of standards. Science lessons were co-taught with 5th grade teachers and STEM resource teacher to provide optimal learning in small group and whole group learning.

In the weeks prior to Science NGSSS testing, students were grouped into standards based intervention groups and we retaught standards that were identified as a deficiency. All components of Science were reviewed in a spiral schedule to ensure that students were provided a refresher in all standards.

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

The number of 4th grade students with two or more EWS was 41 students. An area of concern was the number of students in 4th grade with 10% or more absences which was 23 students. Another area of concern for students identified as having 2 or more components on the EWS were our 5th grade



students. The number of 5th grade students with the EWS of being absent 10% or more was 14 student and number of students showing a deficiency in reading was 43 students.

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

The highest priorities for school improvement in the upcoming school year are;

- 3rd grade ELA proficiency scores
- 5th grade ELA proficiency scores
- 2nd grade ELA proficiency scores
- 5th Grade Science proficiency scores
- Overall Attendance - to reduce the number of students absent 10% or more days per school year

**Area of Focus**

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

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

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

Our third grade students dropped from 66% proficiency on the 2022 ELA FSA to 56% 2023 ELA FAST. While the test did change this is a significant drop and is concerning. Third grade ELA scores will be held accountable for a larger portion of our School Grade achievement and set students up for success in 4th and 5th grade.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

At Rayma C Page, students in third grade will increase the proficiency in ELA from 56% (2023 ELA FAST) to 65% as measured by the May 2024 ELA FAST Assessment.

**Monitoring:**

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

We will monitor student progress by analyzing data from the 3rd grade FAST progress monitoring assessments, exemplar data, teacher made assessments, formative assessments, and intervention growth.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Theresa Bulanda (theresadb@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.)

Students will be grouped according to their areas of need and will receive targeted reading instruction through small group instruction, school wide designated intervention block with all staff providing targeted skills through Phonics for Reading and Magnetic Reading curriculum to fill foundational gaps.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Evidence shows that in order to increase student achievement in reading you must identify the root of each learners deficiency. Using the Florida Reading Model, FAST Data from Progress monitoring and iReady diagnostics we will determine and pinpoint gaps, Teams will create fluid groups based on student need.

We have created a master schedule with school wide intervention block each day. All available staff (Resource teachers, Special Area teachers, para-professional) are being utilized to assist with intervention. By creating a schoolwide block of time and pouring all support into that intervention time, we can fill that gaps through reteach/reassess .

Third grade Tier 3 MTSS and retainees are scheduled with Highly effective and reading endorsed teachers in order to provide them with every opportunity for success.

**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.

Admin will review expectations regarding 90 minute Reading Block, 60 minute enrichment and intervention during pre-school week.

**Person Responsible:** Valerie Sheckler (valeriees@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Pre-School

Common planning time built into Master Schedule to allow teams time to plan, analyze data, create assessments. This also allows time for PLC.

**Person Responsible:** Theresa Bulanda (theresadb@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Completed during preschool

Data tracking:

Data is tracked and monitored by administration and PLC teams.

Teachers track data on Data wall in their classroom and share results with students. Students track their data in data folders.

Data chats occur during PLC's during the PLC cycle and student data is tracked to ensure both the teacher and student know where they are with benchmarks.

**Person Responsible:** Theresa Bulanda (theresadb@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Continuously monitor; Weekly PLC time

Intervention for targeted remediation instruction. Reassess students to show standards/benchmark mastery.

**Person Responsible:** Valerie Sheckler (valeriees@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Continuously throughout the year

**#2. 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.

SWD scores were identified as an Area of Focus due to a significant decrease in prior year data as measured by 2021-22 FSA ELA scores. After reviewing and analyzing the growth of our SWD it was determined that our score of 34% is significantly lower than the overall ELA proficiency of 62%.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

At Rayma C. Page Elementary, our subgroup of ESE students in grades 3 thru 5 will increase the proficiency from 34% (2022)FSA) to 45% as measured by the May 2023 FAST Assessment.

**Monitoring:**

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

Monitor bi-weekly progress of our SWD as a routine item of grade level data chats and weekly grade level PLCs. It is noted that ESE teachers attend associated grade level weekly PLCs.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Valerie Sheckler (valeriees@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.)

SWD subgroups identified on the 21-22 FS ELA in grades 4 and 5 will receive intensive reading instruction through small group instruction, school-wide designated intervention block with all staff providing targeted skills and Phonics for Reading and Magnetic Reading curriculum to fill foundational gaps.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Evidence shows that in order to increase student achievement in reading one must first identify the root of each learners deficiency. Using the Florida Reading Model and iReady diagnostics to determine and pinpoint gaps, teachers will create fluid groups based on student need. We have created a daily "sacred" school wide intervention block. All available staff (resource and special areas) are being utilized to assist with intervention. By creating the block of time where all additional staff including specials teachers, resource teachers, paras, etc.. we have scheduled the time necessary to reteach/assess. Additional reading support will be provided by reading support personnel and identified students will receive additional instruction through extended day tutoring program.

**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.

1. Implement Magnetic Reading and Phonics for Reading curriculum for 3rd-5th grades.

**Person Responsible:** Theresa Bulanda (theresadb@leeschools.net)

**By When:** By September 15

Implement SIOP strategies in which all teachers have been trained.

**Person Responsible:** Dennette Foy (dennetteff@leeschools.net)

**By When:** SIOP strategies should be documented in lesson plans

Develop small groups for ESOL and MTSS support.

**Person Responsible:** Theresa Bulanda (theresadb@leeschools.net)

**By When:** By end of September

Track all students with an emphasis on L25% through our data walls and data dashboards concentrating on the target group during weekly PLCs.

**Person Responsible:** Valerie Sheckler (valeriees@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Continuous and first review of data first week of school and then weekly PLCs

Teacher led small group centers homogeneously grouped based on achievement levels using the Florida Reading Model and progress monitoring.

**Person Responsible:** Valerie Sheckler (valeriees@leeschools.net)

**By When:** By end of September

Provide additional resource support for our students to ensure small group instruction.

**Person Responsible:** Theresa Bulanda (theresadb@leeschools.net)

**By When:** By September

Students will track their progress on ELA standards by grade level.

**Person Responsible:** Valerie Sheckler (valeriees@leeschools.net)

**By When:** First PLC and continuous

Monitor bi-weekly progress of our ELA L25% during data chats and PLCs.

**Person Responsible:** Valerie Sheckler (valeriees@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Every PLC

**#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.

We have determined that there is a significant increase in the difficulty of the ELA standards between 2nd grade and 3rd grade. In order for our students to be prepared for the rigor and expectations of the ELA 3rd grade, we must do a better job with our 2nd grade students. In looking at the third grade data from our Quarter 1 FAST over 50% of our students were a level 1. We believe that this is due to the lack of preparing the students for the high level expectations in the third grade.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

At Rayma C. Page Elementary, students in second grade will increase the proficiency in ELA from 78% (2023 ELA FAST) to 82% as measured by the May 2024 ELA Fast Assessment.

**Monitoring:**

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

Student data is tracked by all teachers and students. We have Schoolwide intervention and students are placed in groups based on their Standards based assessment data. Data is pulled from District assessments, school based assessments, and formatively assessing students.

Every weekly PLC, teachers discuss the data, determine if students need to move within the groups and changes are made as needed.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Theresa Bulanda (theresadb@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.)

Rayma C Page will use the following evidence-based intervention to implement second grade desired outcomes:

Both teachers and students tracking data

We will provide targeted benchmark based instruction during Schoolwide intervention block with extra supports in place for Grade 2.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Evidence shows that when both teachers and students are held accountable for their data they perform at a higher level. Also, providing students small group, targeted standards based instruction will allow students to work on their areas to fill the gaps necessary for them to be successful in ELA.

**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.

Implement Phonics for Reading for Tier 2 and 3 instruction through MTSS support. (Tina Bryan, MTSS coordinator)

**Person Responsible:** Kaleena Lavariega (kaleenall@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Prior to May, 2024 FAST testing

Track all students ELA standards through Data Walls, Data Dashboards during weekly team PLC time.

**Person Responsible:** Jennifer Smith (jenniferds@leeschools.net)

**By When:** This will be continuous throughout the year.

Teacher led small group centers homogeneously grouped based on achievement levels using the Florida Reading Model, FAST baseline, and I-Ready data.

**Person Responsible:** Theresa Bulanda (theresadb@leeschools.net)

**By When:** This will be monitored continuously throughout the year.

Implement SIOP strategies and create small groups for both ESOL and MTSS support.

**Person Responsible:** Dennette Foy (dennettef@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Monthly Monitoring of student progress. Offer SIOP training as needed.

Providing targeted skills through Phonics for Reading, Wonders Decodable Readers, Strategically monitoring student progress on I-Ready, and through formatively assessing students in the classroom and during intervention.

**Person Responsible:** Theresa Bulanda (theresadb@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Continuously throughout the year

**#4. Instructional Practice 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.

We have determined that this will be an Area of Focus as our overall score for grades 3 thru 5 decreased from 66% on the 21-22 ELA FSA to 65% on the 22-23 ELA FAST. While this is not a significant decrease it is concerning that the score has declined.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

At Rayma C Page, students in grades 3 thru 5 will increase the proficiency in ELA from 65% 2023 ELA FAST to 70% as measured by the May 2024 FAST Assessment.

**Monitoring:**

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored by tracking student data on ELA FAST progress monitoring, Exemplar data, Teacher assessments, and Comprehensive assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Valerie Sheckler (valeriees@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.)

Schoolwide intervention as well as additional small group targeted. Afterschool, Before school, and PE Waivers for additional tutoring.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Evidence shows that in order to increase student achievement in reading one must first identify the root of each learners deficiency. Using the Florida Reading Model and iReady diagnostics to determine and pinpoint gaps, teachers will create fluid groups based on student need. We have created a daily "sacred" school wide intervention block. All available staff (resource and special areas) are being utilized to assist with intervention. By creating the block of time where all additional staff including specials teachers, resource teachers, paras, etc.. we have scheduled the time necessary to reteach/assess. Additional reading support will be provided by reading support personnel and identified students will receive additional instruction through extended day tutoring program.

**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.

After each standards based assessment, data is entered into standards based tracker for both students and teachers. Teachers meet during PLC to analyze data, make adjustments to intervention as needed, and adjust groups as needed.



**Person Responsible:** Theresa Bulanda (theresadb@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Weekly throughout the year

Students track individual data in data folders based on assessment data. Data chats occur with the teachers bi-weekly.

**Person Responsible:** Valerie Sheckler (valeriees@leeschools.net)

**By When:** This is continuous throughout the year.

Small group instruction during the 90 minute Reading Block following the LCSD academic plan. Rotations consist of struggling learners, on-grade level, enrichment. These are fluid groups.(Monitored by classroom teachers and admin through the walk throughs and lesson planning.)

**Person Responsible:** Valerie Sheckler (valeriees@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Continuous throughout the year.

During PLC cycle, data is analyzed to create fluid intervention groups. This data is pulled from exemplars, teacher made assessments, formative assessments, and FAST Progress monitoring.

**Person Responsible:** Valerie Sheckler (valeriees@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Continuous throughout the year.

## #5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Students cannot learn if they do not attend school. Our data shows that 96 students (11%) were chronically absent from school.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

Rayma C. Page will decrease the percentage of chronically absent students (below 90%) from 11% (96 students) to 7% (60 students) as measured by the Early Warning System.

### Monitoring:

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

Continue to create a positive learning environment where students feel safe. We are a PBS school that focuses on creating positive relationships between students and staff. There are schoolwide 'SWIM rules' that focus on a school culture and environment where students feel welcome, safe, and understand that the staff care about them as a student and a person. Rayma has high expectations and we celebrate student success in both academics and behavior through classroom and school awards and quarterly PBS parties. Teachers have a designated time daily in their class where they 'Circle up' to discuss real life issues. Students are presented with a question or topic where they can share or not, discuss issues in a safe environment, and know that they have an adult that they can trust and talk to. This has been a big positive at building relationships with our students through a restorative learning environment.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Valerie Sheckler (valeriees@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 following process will be followed to identify specific students and apply intervention:

- Attendance is pulled by our information specialist and provided to the principal.
- Meet with school counselor at beginning of each month to review students that still have excessive absences
- Admin will schedule conferences with parent of students that continue to have excessive absences/tardies
- Stress the importance of attendance and being on time and the negative impact absences/tardies have on student achievement.
- Provide support, ideas for parent to enable them to have students arrive on time.
- Have Social Worker schedule a home visit

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research shows that missing 2 days per month equals 108 hours per year of missing instruction. Missing excessive instruction results in lowered student achievement and negative impact on graduation.

Research also

indicates that by 6th grade chronic absence becomes a leading indicator that a student will drop out of high school. Poor attendance can influence whether children read proficiently by the end of 3rd grade or be held back. (Lee County School District Parent Portal on the Attendance web-site).

### **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.

1. Identify chronically absent students from prior year. - Admin & Info Specialist
2. Implement system for weekly monitoring of chronically absents students and identify new students through FOCUS.- Admin, Counselor, Social Worker, & Mentor.
3. Assign individual students to adult mentor. - Admin & counselor.
4. Establish individual goals for identified students & teach purpose/advantage of consistent attendance. - Mentor, counselor
5. Implement motivation strategies and schedule weekly meetings to review progress.- Mentor, PBiS Team
6. Schedule meeting with parents of chronically absent students to address implications of absenteeism.- Admin
7. Continue to monitor progress on a weekly basis.- make adjustments as needed - Mentor, counselor, social worker and admin.

**Person Responsible:** Valerie Sheckler (valeriees@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Reports will be run monthly. Counselor and Mentor will meet daily with attendance club students via check in and check out process.

### **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.