East Lee County High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

East Lee County High School

715 THOMAS SHERWIN AVE S, Lehigh Acres, FL 33974

http://elc.leeschools.net/

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide a relevant and rigorous learning environment that prepares all students to reach their highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be a world-class provider of academic, career, and technical education.

Our Motto is:
own-engage-represent

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
Allen, Tony	Principal	
Stevens, Kristin	Assistant Principal	
Perez, Roseanne	Assistant Principal	
Morrison, Charles	Assistant Principal	
Green, Ellen	Assistant Principal	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

A survey is given during every School Advisory Council meeting to gather input and feedback from our stakeholders. We begin with a family night within the first month of school.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students through our weekly PLCs, which are focused on student achievement goals and increasing the school grade. We are also meeting weekly with instructional leaders to review

coaching and determine how to best support all teachers to increase student achievement. If, based upon feedback in PLCs and from instructional leaders, a change is necessary in order to ensure continuous improvement, we will revise our plans according to the individual needs of our students.

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)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	85%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL)* White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: D
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	

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	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	604
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	545
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	627
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	730
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	855
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in 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	

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	

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	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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*	33	47	50	30	49	51	30		
ELA Learning Gains				40			33		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				27			26		
Math Achievement*	16	34	38	22	33	38	18		
Math Learning Gains				39			18		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44			18		
Science Achievement*	43	54	64	34	35	40	33		
Social Studies Achievement*	45	58	66	49	40	48	46		
Middle School Acceleration					38	44			
Graduation Rate	86	84	89	91	49	61	91		
College and Career Acceleration	48	65	65	54	60	67	62		
ELP Progress	27	36	45	33			41		

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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	298
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	86

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	463
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	91

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	28	Yes	4	4
ELL	30	Yes	4	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	2	
HSP	41			
MUL	43			
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	42			

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	27	Yes	3	3
ELL	35	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	42			

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%
MUL	34	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	44			
FRL	41			

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	33			16			43	45		86	48	27
SWD	20			1			28	23		15	7	23
ELL	14			7			22	34		35	7	27
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	26			7			29	48		39	7	30
HSP	32			13			40	42		50	7	26
MUL	40			33			57				3	
PAC												
WHT	40			31			61	53		50	6	
FRL	31			15			42	44		47	7	29

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	30	40	27	22	39	44	34	49		91	54	33
SWD	9	21	19	4	29	32	19	29		82	19	29
ELL	15	36	27	14	37	40	20	36		89	33	33
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	30	35	11	21	41	43	26	57		97	48	32
HSP	31	42	32	22	38	42	35	44		89	54	34
MUL	38	45		20	36		33					
PAC												
WHT	26	40	13	26	41	57	40	54		88	57	
FRL	29	38	25	19	40	46	29	48		90	55	37

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	30	33	26	18	18	18	33	46		91	62	41
SWD	8	21	23	4	14	17	8	23		82	37	20
ELL	14	31	29	10	12	7	12	30		89	57	41
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25	38	32	17	19	17	32	42		86	51	44
HSP	33	34	23	17	17	19	31	44		94	65	41
MUL				25						80		
PAC												
WHT	22	17	17	25	17		38	57		82	60	
FRL	28	34	24	16	17	18	28	47		92	63	39

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
10	2023 - Spring	32%	45%	-13%	50%	-18%
09	2023 - Spring	30%	46%	-16%	48%	-18%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	9%	39%	-30%	50%	-41%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	20%	43%	-23%	48%	-28%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	40%	50%	-10%	63%	-23%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	42%	54%	-12%	63%	-21%

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 that showed the lowest performance was math achievement. The contributing factors included turnover in the math teaching staff. We had teachers who had not taught Algebra 1 and/ or Geometry before, and one who was teaching out of field. These teachers needed intensive supports to develop their craft and ensure students had the best learning opportunities to increase achievement. Our Math Coach was new to the role and was not able to adequately step in to her coaching and support role in time. We were able to get her training in the job to help increase her efficacy in supporting student achievement; however, these supports only came later in the year. We also had a Math Peer Collaborative Teacher who resigned from the position, and we had to find a replacement midyear. The replacement Math Peer Collaborative Teacher did a great job in coaching and working on intervention plans with students, but she also resigned at the end of the year and left Lee County. All the staffing factors had a negative impact on our student achievement. We continue to have turnover in the Math department, which is a negative trend we are working to remedy. We are finding that the lack of effective and highly effective staff in our Math Department, compounded with learning loss of basic mathematical fundamentals from the pandemic, is contributing to the low performance we have seen in recent years.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year and previous years was social studies achievement. We had some turnover in our US History teaching team. As such, we reorchestrated the teaching assignments of teachers within the Social Studies department to ensure our most highly effective teachers were teaching both US History and then World History. We have put an emphasis on World History to help increase proficiency in related skill sets related to the EOC, as well as complimentary benchmarks and standards. This has helped our students prepare for the US History EOC in two years instead of one, as our US History teachers are able to build on the skills and knowledge taught by our World History teachers.

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

The data component that had the largest gap was math achievement. The contributing factors included turnover in the math teaching staff. We had teachers who had not taught Algebra 1 and/or Geometry before, and one who was teaching out of field. These teachers needed intensive supports to develop their craft and ensure students had the best learning opportunities to increase achievement. Our Math Coach was new to the role and was not able to adequately step in to her coaching and support role in time. We were able to get her training in the job to help increase her efficacy in supporting student achievement; however, these supports only came later in the year. We also had a Math Peer Collaborative Teacher who resigned from the position, and we had to find a replacement midyear. The replacement Math Peer Collaborative Teacher did a great job in coaching and working on intervention plans with students, but she also resigned at the end of the year and left Lee County. All the staffing factors had a negative impact on our student achievement. We continue to have turnover in the Math department, which is a negative trend we are working to remedy. We are finding that the lack of effective and highly effective staff in our Math Department, compounded with learning loss of basic mathematical fundamentals from the pandemic, is contributing to the low performance we have seen in recent years.

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

Science achievement showed the most improvement. We reorchestrated the teaching assignments of teachers within the Science department to ensure our most highly effective teachers were teaching Biology. We have put an emphasis on Environmental Science in 9th grade to help increase proficiency in related skill sets related to the EOC, as well as complimentary benchmarks and standards. This has helped our students prepare for the EOC in two years instead of one, as our Biology teachers are able to build on the skills and knowledge taught by our Environmental Science teachers. We have a Science Coach and Science Peer Collaborative Teacher who are able to support and coach teachers, as well as work with students in interventions.

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

One area of concern is our Students with Disabilities, whose achievement and graduation rate are significantly lower than other subgroups. This subgroup will be our area of focus this year.

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

1. Students with Disabilities
2. Math Achievement
3. 10th grade ELA Achievement
4. Graduation Rate
5. 9th grade cohort tracking

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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

Our area of focus for Students with Disabilities regarding positive culture and environment will start with creating positive and purposeful connections with our CTE Career Academies so our Students with Disabilities will be exposed to many different career paths and options. Our CTE instructors will work to help these students understand the requirements of each career (which all includes reading and math proficiency, and a high school diploma) to help give purpose to the students' learning. Our goal is that our Students with Disabilities will connect and engage with their academics. We are implementing a social skills class for students with autism who are in general education classes so they have a safe and welcoming place to practice soft skills. We have a focus on engaging and monitoring our freshman class to ensure all students begin high school on track and remain on track. Our Assistant Principal who oversees our freshman class will be monitoring grades, attendance, and behavior, and then connecting with students and families to make immediate and relevant action plans. We have increased our monitoring of each senior class cohort, with weekly monitoring of grades, attendance, and testing. Our Assistant principal who oversees our senior class meets weekly with the team of counselors, social workers, and teachers to identify and support all students who need support. This team includes the ESE case managers, who are then able to meet with students who are struggling and contact families to ensure their partnership in success.

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

95% of our students with disabilities in the 20-21 cohort will graduate with a diploma on time.

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

Our grade level teams, lead by an assistant principal for each grade level, monitors grades, attendance, behavior, and any other areas of concern related to the students' ability to graduate on time. Parent meetings are held to create active partnerships with parents. Staff mentors are assigned to support students who are identified at risk. Data is monitored and updated weekly to ensure timely and relevant interventions are put into place.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ellen Green (ellenrg@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.)

For attendance, school social workers work to ensure students have positive attendance habits. Any student who begins to demonstrate attendance concerns (at 5 days absent), hold intervention meeting with parents. Students are put on attendance plan monitored daily.

For behavior, our assistant principals who oversee discipline hold early intervention meetings with parents and students whose behavior appears to be escalating.

Student placement in schedules is overseen by Assistant Principal Green. She reviews IEPs and creates schedules for students. Our students with the most need are placed with the most effective teachers, who are also our teachers most skilled at building positive working relationships with students.

Our learning strategies classes will shift focus toward helping students meet proficiency in core academic

areas, focusing primarily on reading and math proficiency.

Coaching, and feedback will be occurring for all teachers related to explicit instruction, academic vocabulary, benchmark alignment, questioning, and student collaboration.

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

These strategies have proven effective with other subgroups in the past, and we expect to see increases in student proficiency as a result. Our learning strategies teachers will be carefully adhering to the standards of the course to ensure this course is taught with fidelity. The coaching and feedback cycles were brought to the attention of our leadership team from the Bureau of School Improvement as a high-yield strategy to increase teacher efficacy.

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.

Attendance meetings and monitoring on daily basis

Person Responsible: Roseanne Perez (roseanneap@leeschools.net)

By When: By week 2 of school, at-risk students are identified. Ongoing daily monitoring and communication.

Discipline Intervention Meetings

Person Responsible: Ellen Green (ellenrg@leeschools.net)

By When: Upon receiving 5 referrals, then ongoing monitoring and check-ins.

Student placement in schedules to receive maximum support and highly effective instruction.

Person Responsible: Ellen Green (ellenrg@leeschools.net)

By When: August 10, 2023

Build positive student-teacher relationships and teacher efficacy

Person Responsible: Ellen Green (ellenrg@leeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing professional development and coaching cycles from instructional leaders. Coaching cycles are based on tiered support in two week increments.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Attendance

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.

Teacher attendance for the previous school year showed more teacher absences than in years past. Teachers are stating they are experiencing "burn out" and teacher attendance has been declining. We will work to increase morale and teacher support so their attendance improves.

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

Our goal is that there will be more than 10 teachers absent on any given day.

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

Our principal monitors teacher attendance and requires adequate documentation for absences. He works daily with his secretary to keep accurate and timely records of teacher attendance, and then meets with teachers once they have missed 5 days of school.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tony Allen (tonyaal@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 principal works daily with his secretary to keep accurate and timely records of teacher attendance, and then meets with teachers once they have missed 5 days of school. We are also working to increase teacher morale through team-building, relationship-building, and school spirit through attendance recognition and incentives.

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

This documentation will help hold teachers accountable to the professional expectations of attendance at the job.

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.

Monitor teacher attendance daily and contact absent teachers.

Person Responsible: Tony Allen (tonyaal@leeschools.net)

By When: Daily

Meet with teachers who have excessive absences.

Person Responsible: Tony Allen (tonyaal@leeschools.net)

By When: After 5 unexcused absences.

Attendance recognition and incentives

Person Responsible: Tony Allen (tonyaal@leeschools.net)

By When: Quarterly

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.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

School Advisory Council
Parent Nights
School newsletter
https://elc.leeschools.net/

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

School Advisory Council
Parent Nights

School newsletter
Social Media
Open Houses
Parent Teacher Conferences
https://elc.leeschools.net/

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

Writing, Reading, Math, and Science Coaches
Reading, ELA, Science PCT
strategic interventions and coaching
focus on 9th grade interventions and graduation rate
WICOR strategies PD

Utilization of a schoolwide instructional leadership team who will provide tiered support in two week coaching cycles.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

We work with our Title 1 Parent Involvement Specialist to comply requirements.