

The School District of Lee County

Three Oaks Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Three Oaks Elementary School

19600 CYPRESS VIEW DR, Fort Myers, FL 33967

<http://oak.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.

Our mission is to provide a fair and excellent education for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To provide all students an excellent education through a solid, specific, sequenced curriculum.

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
LeMaster, Tami	Principal	
Hill, Kelley	Assistant Principal	
Thompson, Jessica	Reading Coach	3-5 Reading Coach
Sutton, Miriam	Reading Coach	K-2 Literacy Coach

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.

Analyzing the data, we found our greatest need and created a plan to increase student achievement.

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))

We will continually look at our goals during our PLC's. When analyzing the data of our common assessments, we will determine if the plan of action needs to be revised to ensure continuous improvement.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	39%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	69%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	13	15	14	16	11	12	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	2	3	2	5	7	4	0	0	0	23
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	13	11	7	14	11	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	9	2	16	19	5	13	0	0	0	64
Course failure in ELA	0	9	5	6	5	3	0	0	0	28
Course failure in Math	0	5	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	21	14	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	15	14	9	0	0	0	38
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	9	5	6	5	3	0	0	0	28

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	13	11	7	14	11	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	9	2	16	19	5	13	0	0	0	64
Course failure in ELA	0	9	5	6	5	3	0	0	0	28
Course failure in Math	0	5	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	21	14	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	15	14	9	0	0	0	38
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	9	5	6	5	3	0	0	0	28

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	65	48	53	65	52	56	67		
ELA Learning Gains				64			53		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			25		
Math Achievement*	71	57	59	76	45	50	72		
Math Learning Gains				82			74		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				73			60		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	63	53	54	69	59	59	72		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	39	51	59	60			48		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	306
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	533
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	31	Yes	1	1
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN	61			
BLK	47			
HSP	56			
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	72			
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	44			
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN	78			
BLK	59			
HSP	63			
MUL	73			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	61			

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	65			71			63					39
SWD	29			38			24				5	36
ELL	54			61							4	39
AMI												
ASN	50			72							2	
BLK	43			50							2	
HSP	59			65			48				5	41
MUL	46			54							2	
PAC												
WHT	70			74			70				4	
FRL	57			59			57				5	36

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	65	64	44	76	82	73	69					60
SWD	22	27	19	43	70	75	50					
ELL	35	67	53	45	71	73	25					60
AMI												
ASN	58	70		83	100							
BLK	41	50		53	90							
HSP	60	69	48	66	76	69	53					63
MUL	64			64	90							
PAC												
WHT	69	64	46	81	82	71	75					
FRL	53	58	45	62	84	76	48					59

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	67	53	25	72	74	60	72					48
SWD	28	20		26	20							
ELL	42	50		42	50		40					48

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	56			72								
BLK	46			54								
HSP	51	41	33	60	67	54	52					41
MUL	86			67								
PAC												
WHT	73	57	21	77	77	65	79					
FRL	50	36	27	59	61	79	47					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	70%	48%	22%	54%	16%
04	2023 - Spring	65%	56%	9%	58%	7%
03	2023 - Spring	62%	42%	20%	50%	12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	75%	55%	20%	59%	16%
04	2023 - Spring	64%	61%	3%	61%	3%
05	2023 - Spring	74%	52%	22%	55%	19%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	62%	50%	12%	51%	11%

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: 66% Proficiency

We had 3 new teachers on the grade level. 1 first year teacher and 2 new to 3rd grade teachers. Due to a teacher leaving unexpectedly, one of our reading coaches went back into the classroom. She was a major support for that grade level. Looking and analyzing the scores, two of the three had the lowest proficiency scores on the grade level. Support was given, but looking at the results, we have a plan moving forward in regards to resource for new teachers in 3rd grade. Our reading specialist will meet with them weekly to plan for their 90 minute block. She will assist in their classrooms during whole group and plan the centers to ensure rigor. During PLC's WIN will be planned with assistance of our RS. We will buddy new teacher with another grade level teacher to assist with classroom management and expectations.

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

4th Grade Math showed the greatest decline. PY: 72% 22-23: 66%

Factors that contributed: new benchmarks and new curriculum were implemented this year. Teachers requested more PD on SAVVAS math - we already planned for the PD for the 23-24 school year. This will be during the fall half day PD. The math district team will complete the PD. We will also be departmentalizing 4/7 teachers. This will give teachers the ability to teach to their strengths.

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.

NA

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

3rd grade math showed the most improvement. Overall our math proficiency scores for grades 3-5 increased from 70% to 74%. 3rd grade increased from 61% (21-22) to 78% (22-23). During PLC's teachers shared best practices for certain benchmarks. We used one day a week to really focus on math benchmarks that were not mastered or more difficult to learn and spent time on re-teaching. We also did math boot camp to get the students excited about math.

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

NA

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

- 1- 2nd grade- more differentiation and rigor within small group
- 2- 3-5 grades- more rigor within small group and whole group lessons
- 3- Attendance for at risk students (teacher take a more active role)
- 4- Kagan- student engagement

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.

2nd grade proficiency

Measurable Outcome:

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

During the 2023-2024 school year we will increase 2nd grade proficiency in ELA by 3 percentage points from PY 87% to 90% as measured by FY24 STAR results.

Monitoring:

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

During PLC's data will be analyzed to determine mastery of the benchmarks. Grade levels will use common assessments, exemplars, as the data to collect. Also monitored: STAR assessments, Dibels, and iReady Diagnostic. Planning for instruction using backward design will happen during PLCs with reading specialist and literacy coach. Student mastery will be monitored during PLC's. Teachers and students will have data binders to monitor their learning and create a plan for mastery. Once a week, Leadership team will meet to discuss walkthroughs conducted during reading block focusing on engagement and rigor.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tami LeMaster (tamiml@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.)

Kagan structures will be implemented in all classrooms. Kagan strategies increase student engagement and students accountability for learning. Increase student engagement = increase student achievement of at least 3% as stated in goal by using rigor in whole group, small group, and during cooperative learning (Kagan structures).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Kagan strategies are used in classrooms engage students in cooperative learning. Students work in small groups and work together to support each others learning. The four elements that make cooperative learning successful are: positive interdependence, individual accountability, equal participation, and simultaneous interaction. Kagan strategies allow teachers to listen to their students during the learning process which allows them to observe areas of need to mastery for the benchmark being taught and practiced.

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.

Purpose:

During PLC, teachers and leadership team will analyze data of all students in the grade level. Groups will be determined by benchmark mastery. Teachers will take the benchmark assessment to determine if it reaches the level of rigor and if it matches the benchmark requirements. Planning for core instruction, small group, and WIN time will be completed. After common assessment is taken by students, teachers will input the data into a PLC data spreadsheet by benchmark. Teachers/leadership team will analyze student data and determine next steps for each student: reteach or enrichment. Teachers will determine the Kagan structure students will use problem-solve/answer the higher level question.

Accountability: Admin and leadership Team

Documentation/Monitor: During instruction, teachers will use exit tickets or a formative check to determine whether the lesson was understood. Teachers will re-teach before quarterly comprehension is given. PLC data spreadsheet will be completed by each teacher after every benchmark assessment.

Person Responsible: Tami LeMaster (tamiml@leeschools.net)

By When: Monthly

Core/Tier 1 system:

Purpose: 90 minute uninterrupted reading block will consist of whole group (using Kagan Structure to ensure engagement), small group, and independent work . During whole group, teachers will use Wonders, Really Great Reading, and Core Knowledge in order to implement non-fictional text to teach and practice benchmarks. Building knowledge with Wonders clips and shared reading will be practices. Kagan structure will be used to engage students in their learning. Higher level questions will be asked during the Kagan structure so students can have the opportunity to problem solve by talking out their thoughts.

Teachers will observe and listen how students are thinking and praise them for working through a tough question. Small group: this will be the teacher table where teachers have the opportunity to work with students who have similar areas of need. iReady tools will be used in small group.

Independent practice/reading time: decodable readers.

Computer: Adaptive individualized instruction-students will be accountable for RGR Playground progress. During PLC's higher level questions are planned along with the Kagan Structure. Planning will be during PLCs with Reading Specialist-determine questions that have Depth of Knowledge (DOK) that will allow students to think critically. Kagan structure will be used to engage students to problem solve the higher levels question.

Documentation/Monitor: Lesson plans, PLC plan, classroom walkthroughs, and coaching visits.

Who: Admin and RS (leadership team will meet weekly to discuss observations and next steps needed for improvement).

Person Responsible: Tami LeMaster (tamiml@leeschools.net)

By When: weekly

Intervention/Extension System

Purpose: Using common assessments, create data based groups for intervention during PLCs.

Accountability: Teachers will input student scores into grade level spreadsheet designed specifically for intervention time. This will provide data of individual student needs. During PLC, RS and grade level teachers will create instructional groups based on benchmark mastery and decide which teacher will teach which group based on performance data and best practices. 60 minute intervention block will consist of 3 center rotations: teacher table resources will be determined and used during What I Need Time. (Flyleaf), computer-iReady reading path, and independent reading-decodable readers, leveled readers, AR leveled books.

Documentation/Monitor: PLC minutes, grade level data spreadsheet, lesson plans for WIN time.

Who: Admin and RS (leadership team will meet weekly to discuss student progress). Process will be discussed and modified as needed.

Person Responsible: Tami LeMaster (tamiml@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

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

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

3rd grade proficiency

Measurable Outcome:

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

During the 2023-2024 school year we will increase 3rd grade proficiency in ELA by 3 percentage points from PY 66% to 69% as measured by FY24 FAST results.

Monitoring:

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

During PLC's data will be analyzed to determine mastery of the benchmarks. Grade levels will use common assessments, exemplars, as the data to collect. Also monitored: FAST assessments and iReady Diagnostic. Planning for instruction using backward design will happen during PLCs with reading specialist and literacy coach. Student mastery will be monitored during PLC's. Teachers and students will have data binders to monitor their learning and create a plan for mastery. Once a week, Leadership team will meet to discuss walkthroughs conducted during reading block focusing on engagement and rigor. Leadership team will discuss progress of new teachers to the grade level and plan for needs that are observed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tami LeMaster (tamiml@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.)

Kagan structures will be implemented in all classrooms. Kagan strategies increase student engagement and students accountability for learning. Implementing rigor within small group and work stations (centers) will be a focus. RS/admin will coach teachers who need more assistance as identified through walkthroughs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Kagan strategies are used in classrooms to engage students in cooperative learning. Students work in small groups and work together to support each others learning. The four elements that make cooperative learning successful are: positive interdependence, individual accountability, equal participation, and simultaneous interaction. Kagan strategies allow teachers to listen to their students during the learning process which allows them to observe areas of need to mastery for the benchmark being taught and practiced.

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.

Purpose:

During PLC, teachers and leadership team will analyze data of all students in the grade level. Groups will be determined by benchmark mastery. Teachers will take the benchmark assessment to determine if it reaches the level of rigor and if it matches the benchmark requirements. Planning for core instruction, small group, and WIN time will be completed. After common assessment is taken by students, teachers will input the data into a PLC data spreadsheet by benchmark. Teachers/leadership team will analyze student data and determine next steps for each student: reteach or enrichment. Teachers will determine the Kagan structure students will use problem-solve/answer the higher level question.

Accountability: Admin and leadership Team

Documentation/Monitor: During instruction, teachers will use exit tickets or a formative check to determine whether the lesson was understood. Teachers will re-teach before quarterly comprehension is given. PLC data spreadsheet will be completed by each teacher after every benchmark assessment.

Person Responsible: Tami LeMaster (tamiml@leeschools.net)

By When: Monthly

Core/Tier 1 system:

Purpose: 90 minute uninterrupted reading block will consist of whole group (using Kagan Structure to ensure engagement), small group, and independent work . During whole group, teachers will use Wonders, Magnetic and Core Knowledge in order to implement non-fictional text to practice benchmarks. Kagan structure will be used to engage students in their learning. Higher level questions will be asked during the Kagan structure so students can have the opportunity to problem solve by talking out their thoughts. Teachers will observe and listen how students are thinking and praise them for working through a tough question.

Teacher table: iReady resources, Independent practice/reading time: decodable readers/leveled readers.

Computer: iReady teacher planned activities.

Documentation/Monitor: Lesson plans, PLC plan, classroom walkthroughs, and coaching visits.

Who: Admin and RS (leadership team will meet weekly to discuss observations and next steps needed for improvement).

Person Responsible: Tami LeMaster (tamiml@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Intervention/Extension System

Purpose: Using common assessments, create data based groups for intervention during PLCs.

Accountability: Teachers will input student scores into grade level spreadsheet designed specifically for intervention time. This will provide data of individual student needs. During PLC, RS and grade level teachers will create instructional groups based on benchmark mastery and decide which teacher will teach which group based on performance data and best practices. 60 minute intervention block will consist of 3 center rotations: teacher table resources will be determined and used during What I Need Time. (iReady resources), computer-iReady reading path, and independent reading- leveled readers, AR leveled books.

Documentation/Monitor: PLC minutes, grade level data spreadsheet, lesson plans for WIN time.

Who: Admin and RS (leadership team will meet weekly to discuss student progress). Process will be discussed and modified as needed.

Person Responsible: Tami LeMaster (tamiml@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

#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.

3rd-5th ELA proficiency

Measurable Outcome:

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

During the 2023-2024 school year we will increase 3rd-5th grade proficiency in ELA by 3 percentage points from PY 68% to 71% as measured by FY24 FAST results.

Monitoring:

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

During PLC's data will be analyzed to determine mastery of the benchmarks. Grade levels will use common assessments, exemplars, as the data to collect. Also monitored: FAST assessment and iReady Diagnostic. Planning for instruction using backward design will happen during PLCs with reading specialist. Student mastery will be monitored during PLC's and using a visual data wall. Teachers and students will have data binders to monitor their learning and create a plan for mastery. Once a week, Leadership team will meet to discuss walkthroughs conducted during reading block focusing on engagement and rigor.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tami LeMaster (tamiml@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.)

Kagan structures will be implemented in all classrooms. Kagan strategies increase student engagement and students accountability for learning. Implementing rigor within whole group, small group and work stations will be a focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Kagan strategies are used in classrooms to engage students in cooperative learning. Students work in small groups and work together to support each others learning. The four elements that make cooperative learning successful are: positive interdependence, individual accountability, equal participation, and simultaneous interaction. Kagan strategies allow teachers to listen to their students during the learning process which allows them to observe areas of need to mastery for the benchmark being taught and practiced.

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.

Purpose: Increase student engagement = increase student achievement of at least 3% as stated in goal.
Accountability: once a month teachers will learn a new Kagan Structure by our in-house Kagan Coaching Team. Teachers will practice the structure by implementing it weekly during a whole group lesson. Structure will also be modeled and practiced before a faculty meeting and PLC's.
Documentation/Monitor: Kagan Coaches will visit classrooms to watch the structure. Admin walkthroughs and lesson plans will have planned structure.
Who: Admin

Person Responsible: Tami LeMaster (tamiml@leeschools.net)

By When: Monthly

Purpose: Embedding rigor by using high level questioning to increase student achievement.
Accountability: Higher level questions are planned and within lesson plans. Planning will be during PLCs with Reading Specialist-determine questions that have Depth of Knowledge (DOK) that will allow students to think critically. Kagan structure will be used to engage students to problem solve the higher levels question.
Documentation/Monitor: Lesson plans, PLC plan, classroom walkthroughs, and coaching visits.
Who: Admin and RS (leadership team will meet weekly to discuss observations and next steps needed for improvement).

Person Responsible: Tami LeMaster (tamiml@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Purpose: Using common assessments, create data based groups for intervention during PLCs.
Accountability: Teachers will input student scores into grade level spreadsheet designed specifically for intervention time. This will provide data of each grade level and individual student needs. During PLC, RS and grade level teachers will create instructional groups based on standards mastery and decide which teacher will teach which group based on performance data and best practices.
Documentation/Monitor: PLC minutes, grade level data spreadsheet
Who: Admin and RS (leadership team will meet weekly to discuss student progress). Process will be discussed and modified as needed.

Person Responsible: Tami LeMaster (tamiml@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

NA

Measurable Outcome:

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

NA

Monitoring:

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

NA

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

NA

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

NA

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

NA

Measurable Outcome:

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

NA

Monitoring:

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

NA

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

NA

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

NA

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus