

The School District of Lee County

# Trafalgar Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>                                   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>I. School Information</b>                                       | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>                            | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>                               | <b>14</b> |
| <b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>                       | <b>21</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>21</b> |

# Trafalgar Middle School

2120 TRAFALGAR PKWY, Cape Coral, FL 33991

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

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

### Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

### Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

### Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

# I. School Information

## School Mission and Vision

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

The mission of Trafalgar Middle School is to provide all students relevant educational opportunities that develop skills, knowledge, attitudes and character to be productive responsible citizens.

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

Trafalgar Middle School vision is to be a world-class school system.

## 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 |
|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Cain, Leigh Ann | Principal           |                                 |
| Kunz, Kerri     | Assistant Principal |                                 |
| Beckman, Dawn   | Assistant Principal |                                 |
| Graf, Marti     | Teacher, K-12       |                                 |
| Callis, Maria   | Reading Coach       |                                 |
| Cauble, Rachel  | Teacher, K-12       |                                 |
| Griffin, Sean   | Teacher, K-12       |                                 |
|                 |                     |                                 |

**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.

School Administration will meet with the School Leadership Team during Preschool Week (Aug. 2-9) to review goals, action plans, and systems to achieve/monitor goals. School Administration will also engage the School Advisory Council to seek their input on August 17, 2023. The SAC Meeting is open to all staff, students, parents, and community members and is posted on the school's website. Input, feedback, and suggestions will be incorporated into the SIP and reflected in the final version that is submitted to the District for approval.

**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 using FAST data from PM1, PM2, and PM3. It will also be monitored using data from Read180's Reading Inventory, iReady's checkpoints, and STAR Math data for Algebra Honors. Quarterly Progress Monitoring data will be analyzed, disaggregated, and reported to teachers, staff, the Reading Coach, and SAC stakeholders within 2 weeks of the obtaining the data. Stakeholder feedback will be used to revise the action plan and update the systemic response to support continuous improvement.

**Demographic Data**

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

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2023-24 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>6-8  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>   | No  |
| <b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>   | 52%   |
| <b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>   | 85%   |
| <b>Charter School</b>  | No  |
| <b>RAISE School</b>  | No  |
| <b>ESSA Identification</b><br>*updated as of 3/11/2024   | ATSI  |
| <b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>  | No  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)*<br>English Language Learners (ELL)<br>Asian Students (ASN)<br>Black/African American Students (BLK)<br>Hispanic Students (HSP)<br>Multiracial Students (MUL)<br>White Students (WHT)<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| <b>School Grades History</b><br>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.  | 2021-22: A<br>2019-20: A<br>2018-19: A<br>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   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 60 | 66 | 159   |
| 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 | 52 | 61 | 70 | 183   |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 47 | 41 | 141   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 61 | 70 | 183   |

**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 | 45 | 73 | 79 | 197   |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 2  | 4  | 7     |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 0  | 1     |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 5  | 0  | 5     |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 60 | 51 | 153   |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 49 | 54 | 151   |
| 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 | 36 | 41 | 45 | 122   |



**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) 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 | 45 | 73 | 79 | 197   |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 2  | 4  | 7     |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 0  | 1     |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 5  | 0  | 5     |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 60 | 51 | 153   |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 49 | 54 | 151   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7  | 8  |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 41 | 45 | 122   |

**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     |

**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*                | 61     | 48       | 49    | 63     | 48       | 50    | 65     |          |       |
| ELA Learning Gains              |        |          |       | 57     |          |       | 59     |          |       |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile      |        |          |       | 44     |          |       | 35     |          |       |
| Math Achievement*               | 67     | 56       | 56    | 64     | 32       | 36    | 68     |          |       |
| Math Learning Gains             |        |          |       | 57     |          |       | 54     |          |       |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile     |        |          |       | 52     |          |       | 39     |          |       |
| Science Achievement*            | 59     | 45       | 49    | 64     | 51       | 53    | 65     |          |       |
| Social Studies Achievement*     | 83     | 64       | 68    | 85     | 53       | 58    | 86     |          |       |
| Middle School Acceleration      | 75     | 80       | 73    | 78     | 45       | 49    | 62     |          |       |
| Graduation Rate                 |        |          |       |        | 44       | 49    |        |          |       |
| College and Career Acceleration |        |          |       |        | 66       | 70    |        |          |       |
| ELP Progress                    | 32     | 29       | 40    | 65     | 78       | 76    | 52     |          |       |

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

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

**ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)**

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index                     |      |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)               | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 63   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 1    |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 377  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 6    |
| Percent Tested                                 | 99   |
| Graduation Rate                                |      |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index           |      |
|--------------------------------------|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)     | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 63   |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index                     |     |
|--|-----|
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 1   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 629 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 10  |
| 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                                | 29                              | Yes                | 4   | 1   |
| ELL                                | 53                              |                    |   |   |
| AMI                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| ASN                                | 91                              |                    |   |   |
| BLK                                | 50                              |                    |   |   |
| HSP                                | 60                              |                    |   |   |
| MUL                                | 60                              |                    |   |   |
| PAC                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| WHT                                | 73                              |                    |   |   |
| FRL                                | 58                              |                    |   |   |

| 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                                | 36                              | Yes                | 3   |   |
| ELL                                | 53                              |                    |   |   |
| AMI                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| ASN                                | 67                              |                    |   |   |
| BLK                                | 58                              |                    |   |   |
| HSP                                | 59                              |                    |   |   |

| 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                                | 56                              |                    |   |   |
| PAC                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| WHT                                | 66                              |                    |   |   |
| FRL                                | 57                              |                    |   |   |

**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                                   | 61       |        |             | 67        |         |              | 59       | 83      | 75        |                   |                     | 32           |
| SWD  | 21       |        |             | 22        |         |              | 25       | 46      |           |                   | 4                   |              |
| ELL  | 44       |        |             | 56        |         |              | 48       | 85      |           |                   | 5                   | 32           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  | 82       |        |             | 100       |         |              |          |         |           |                   | 2                   |              |
| BLK  | 43       |        |             | 46        |         |              | 33       | 79      |           |                   | 4                   |              |
| HSP  | 55       |        |             | 61        |         |              | 54       | 81      | 76        |                   | 6                   | 31           |
| MUL  | 47       |        |             | 59        |         |              |          | 75      |           |                   | 3                   |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 68       |        |             | 73        |         |              | 66       | 86      | 73        |                   | 5                   |              |
| FRL  | 55       |        |             | 60        |         |              | 53       | 79      | 76        |                   | 6                   | 27           |

| 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                                   | 63       | 57     | 44          | 64        | 57      | 52           | 64       | 85      | 78        |                   |                     | 65           |
| SWD  | 24       | 41     | 38          | 29        | 41      | 39           | 27       | 45      |           |                   |                     |              |
| ELL  | 47       | 62     | 57          | 49        | 52      | 35           | 26       | 82      |           |                   |                     | 65           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  | 89       | 53     |             | 83        | 59      |              | 50       |         |           |                   |                     |              |

| 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  | 59       | 51     | 18          | 62        | 57      | 67           | 58       | 67      | 82        |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 57       | 57     | 48          | 58        | 56      | 45           | 50       | 83      | 74        |                   |                     | 60           |
| MUL  | 50       | 42     |             | 62        | 60      |              | 64       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 68       | 58     | 44          | 69        | 58      | 61           | 74       | 86      | 79        |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 53       | 51     | 39          | 58        | 56      | 53           | 51       | 84      | 69        |                   |                     | 56           |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups                                      | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 | ELP Progress |
| All Students                                   | 65       | 59     | 35          | 68        | 54      | 39           | 65       | 86      | 62        |                   |                     | 52           |
| SWD  | 23       | 29     | 20          | 27        | 35      | 26           | 18       | 53      | 30        |                   |                     |              |
| ELL  | 39       | 49     | 45          | 44        | 56      | 45           |          | 80      |           |                   |                     | 52           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  | 60       | 72     |             | 70        | 67      |              |          | 80      |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 54       | 56     | 28          | 58        | 60      |              | 60       | 89      |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 60       | 57     | 34          | 61        | 48      | 38           | 59       | 81      | 53        |                   |                     | 48           |
| MUL  | 74       | 58     |             | 81        | 69      |              | 73       | 90      | 62        |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 68       | 60     | 36          | 72        | 56      | 38           | 67       | 88      | 67        |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 53       | 49     | 30          | 55        | 46      | 37           | 55       | 76      | 48        |                   |                     | 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 |
| 07    | 2023 - Spring | 58%    | 44%      | 14%                        | 47%   | 11%                     |
| 08    | 2023 - Spring | 58%    | 44%      | 14%                        | 47%   | 11%                     |

| ELA   |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06    | 2023 - Spring | 61%    | 44%      | 17%                        | 47%   | 14%                     |

| MATH  |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06    | 2023 - Spring | 68%    | 52%      | 16%                        | 54%   | 14%                     |
| 07    | 2023 - Spring | 41%    | 37%      | 4%                         | 48%   | -7%                     |
| 08    | 2023 - Spring | 79%    | 60%      | 19%                        | 55%   | 24%                     |

| SCIENCE |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08      | 2023 - Spring | 60%    | 43%      | 17%                        | 44%   | 16%                     |

| ALGEBRA |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A     | 2023 - Spring | 80%    | 39%      | 41%                        | 50%   | 30%                     |

| CIVICS |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|--------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade  | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A    | 2023 - Spring | 84%    | 59%      | 25%                        | 66%   | 18%                     |

### 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 last year was 7th grade math with 42% proficiency. The only students who participated in the 7th grade F.A.S.T. assessment were nonproficient Level 1 and 2 students. Students were deficient in number sense, computation, and multi-step problem-solving skills.

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

Science showed the greatest decline from 64% proficiency to 60%. The most significant contributing factor was the addition of a first-year science teacher (career changer) in 8th grade. The new teacher was mentored by an 8th grade veteran science teacher (APPLES). He grasped concepts quickly, adopted the interactive science notebook system, and delivered engaging lessons/labs. As a career changer without guest teaching or curriculum experience, he exhibited the typical challenges of a first-year teacher, including standards mastery, pacing, and data-driven instruction.

**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.**

Math showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The state scored 53.1% proficient and TMS achieved 72% proficiency, which is a difference of 18.9%. We added more ESE Resource support in 6th, 7th, and 8th grade classrooms and used PLCs to break down the standards, analyze PM data, and deliver small group/pull out interventions.

**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 math proficiency, which increased from 64% to 72%. We added more ESE Resource support in 6th, 7th, and 8th grade classrooms and used PLCs to break down the standards, analyze PM data, and deliver small group/pull out interventions.

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

An area of concern is Attendance Below 90 Percent. More than 16% of our student population is below this threshold.

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

- Priority #1: 6th - 8th ELA Proficiency
- Priority #2: 8th Gr. Science Proficiency
- Priority #3: SWD Subgroup Proficiency
- Priority #4: Student Attendance

**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.

According to FY23 FAST data, an area of critical need is 6th - 8th ELA Proficiency. The percentage of students achieving proficiency decreased from 63% in FY22 to 61% in FY23. The team identified this as an area of focus to provide students with the necessary tools and skills to be successful in middle school, high school, and beyond.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The percentage of students achieving proficiency will increase from 61% to 66% as measured by the FY24 FAST PM3 ELA assessment.

**Monitoring:**

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

The area of focus will be monitored using Exemplars, PM1, PM2, and PM3 FAST ELA data. Read180 "Reading Inventory" and iReady data will also be used to monitor progress toward the desired outcome.

ESE Case Managers will actively engage in data analysis to identify and respond to trends for their Students with Disabilities subgroup.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Leigh Ann Cain (leighac@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.)

Evidenced-based interventions for all subgroups include intensive reading classes for Level 1 students (R180), Level 2 (iReady), and L25's (iReady). Teachers will incorporate Close Reads and High-Yield Strategies into their lessons as identified by the District: Numbered Heads Together, Writing to Raise Achievement, Distributed Summarizing, Higher Order Questioning, and Text Dependent Questioning. Instructional staff will use a common Model of Instruction as defined in the New Art & Science of Teaching. MTSS will be provided for students who need Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions based on course performance, test data, and teacher observation.

The Students with Disabilities Subgroups (ATSI) will receive support from an ESE Resource teacher to ensure accommodations are provided and progress is monitored.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These interventions support the District's Envision 2030 goal for Student Success. They provide a rigorous engaging, consistent, and supportive instructional setting where learning is personalized for each student.

**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.

#### Planning

Teachers will receive ongoing Professional Development on how to access data in FOCUS and Performance Matters. They will also receive PD on High Yield Strategies, ELA B.E.S.T. benchmarks, instructional guides, a common model of instruction (NASOT), and MTSS intervention strategies. Quarterly surveys will be sent to staff to collect input on PD that supports this goal. These trainings will equip all teachers to plan standards-based lessons that are scaffolded and aligned to the instructional guides.

**Person Responsible:** Leigh Ann Cain (leighac@leeschools.net)

**By When:** PD will begin during Preschool week and continue monthly throughout the school year. Optional technology, drill-down data, ELL, and ESE strategies PDs will be available on Thursday mornings. PD that results from teacher surveys will also be provided.

#### Core/Tier 1

The School Leadership Team, Testing Coordinator, and Reading Coach will review, analyze, and disaggregate progress monitoring data within one week of receiving the data. At least one member of the Leadership Team will be present in each weekly PLC to help facilitate the 4 questions and plan next steps. Communication is key to achieve a cycle of continuous improvement.

**Person Responsible:** Leigh Ann Cain (leighac@leeschools.net)

**By When:** The School Leadership Team meets monthly beginning August 4th and the first Friday of the month thereafter.

#### Intervention/Extension

PLCs will respond to questions 3 and 4 to provide differentiated instruction that meets individual student needs. PLCs will collaborate with the Reading Coach, MTSS Intervention Specialist, ESOL paraprofessional, APPLES mentors, ESE Resource Teachers, ESE Case Managers, and the Gifted Team to identify high-yield strategies to support student success. Level 1 ELA students will be scheduled into an additional period of Reading with an individualized learning path. The Bell Schedule was changed this year to include 20 minutes of homeroom time. During this time, students will review grades with their teacher/mentor in FOCUS, make up assignments, work in their iReady learning path, and develop study habits for academic success.

**Person Responsible:** Leigh Ann Cain (leighac@leeschools.net)

**By When:** PLCs will meet during Preschool week and weekly thereafter. Students attend Homeroom/ Intervention/Extension periods every day.

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science****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.

According to FY23 FAST data, an area of critical need is 8th Science Proficiency. The percentage of students achieving proficiency decreased from 64% in FY22 to 60% in FY23. The team identified this as an area of focus to provide students with the necessary tools and skills to be successful in middle school, high school, and beyond.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The percentage of students achieving proficiency will increase from 60% to 67% as measured by the FY24 FCAT 2.0 Science assessment.

**Monitoring:**

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

Science proficiency will be monitored using Exemplar data, quarterly progress monitoring data, grades, observation, and tests/quizzes.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kerri Kunz (kerrik@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.)

Evidenced-based interventions for all students, including the SWD subgroup, include using Close Reads, Tier 3 vocabulary instruction (content specific), small group instruction, interactive notebooks, reteaching/labs, High-Yield Strategies (Numbered Heads Together, Writing to Raise Achievement, Distributed Summarizing, Higher Order Questioning, and Text Dependent Questioning). Instructional staff will use a common Model of Instruction as defined in the New Art & Science of Teaching. MTSS will be provided for students who need Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions based on course performance, test data, and teacher observation.

Students with Disabilities (ATSI) will receive support from an ESE Resource teacher to ensure accommodations are provided and progress is monitored.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These interventions support the District's Envision 2030 goal for Student Success. They provide a rigorous engaging, consistent, and supportive instructional setting where learning is personalized for each student.

**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.

#### Planning

The Science Department has common planning to create lessons that align with the instructional guide provided by the District. Teachers use PLC time to address the 4 questions, disaggregate progress monitoring data, and determine which evidence-based interventions best support individual student learning. 6th and 7th grade teachers plan closely with 8th grade to vertically align standards in preparation for the 8th grade assessment.

**Person Responsible:** Kerri Kunz (kerrick@leeschools.net)

**By When:** The Science Department will meet during Preschool week to disaggregate FCAT 2.0 Science assessment data and weekly thereafter.

#### Core/Tier 1

Teachers will document evidence-based interventions in their lesson plans. Administration will review lesson plans weekly, conduct classroom walkthroughs with immediate feedback, and host quarterly data chats.

Students will track their standards mastery in a data folder using progress monitoring data, weekly quizzes, and interactive notebook checkpoints.

**Person Responsible:** Kerri Kunz (kerrick@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Students will create their data folder by August 31st. The first entry will be their F.A.S.T. ELA PM3 score.

#### Intervention/Extension

Teachers will follow the District's Failing Grades process document to support academic achievement for all students, including the SWD subgroup. Teachers will collaborate in their grade level and implement a "walk to read" intervention/extension to reteach standards and extend learning through labs. Students who are not making adequate progress will be referred to the Intervention Specialist for additional support and communication with parents.

**Person Responsible:** Kerri Kunz (kerrick@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Teachers will monitor student progress during weekly PLCs and collaborate with Administration and Counselors on failing students. Data chats will occur quarterly.

**#3. 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.

Student attendance positively impacts school culture and environment. This is an Area of Focus as TMS seeks to decrease the number of students with attendance below 90 percent, including the SWD Subgroup. In 22-23, 33 (3%) of 6th grade students were below 90 percent, 60 (6%) of 7th graders, and 66 (7%) of 8th graders for a total of 16% percent of the student population.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The percentage of students with attendance below 90 percent will decrease from 16% to 13% as measured by FOCUS attendance records.

**Monitoring:**

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

The Administration Team will consult with the Information Specialist and the Social Worker weekly to monitor attendance reports.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Dawn Beckman (dawndb@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.)

PBIS interventions will be implemented for this Area of Focus.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PBIS is a research-based strategy that recognizes and rewards positive behaviors and choices. The PBIS team meets monthly to plan at least 4 rewards per quarter for positive choices, including attendance celebrations. The team also seeks quarterly input from students to identify desirable rewards.

**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.

**Planning**

During Preschool week and monthly thereafter, Administration will set clear expectations for teachers to take accurate attendance for every child, every period, every day. This message is also shared during morning announcements. Guest teacher folders include information about the importance of taking accurate attendance as well as a process document. Administration will meet with the Information Specialist and Social Worker on Mondays to review the previous week's attendance. This team will then contact students, parents, and families about unexcused absences and the importance of being in school every day.

**Person Responsible:** Dawn Beckman (dawndb@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Expectations will be shared during Preschool week. Attendance will be monitored weekly for the remainder of the school year with an emphasis on the first 10 days of school.

#### Core/Tier 1

Administration will share attendance data with the PBIS team monthly. The team will promote attendance challenges to all students throughout the year. All students, including the SWD subgroup, will participate in surveys during lunch to identify desirable rewards for challenges. Administration will also meet regularly with Student Focus Groups (by grade level) to obtain their feedback on PBIS rewards and celebrations.

**Person Responsible:** Dawn Beckman (dawndb@leeschools.net)

**By When:** The first Attendance Challenge will be from Sept. 1 - 29. The second Attendance Challenge will be from Oct. 9 - Nov. 17 (FTE) The third Attendance Challenge will be from February 1 - March 14 (FTE) The fourth Attendance Challenge will be from May 1 - May 17 Students will earn Field Day outdoor fun at the Oak Trees with music, a photo booth, and social time (by grade level).

#### Intervention/Extension

**Intervention:** Administration, Counselors, and Social Worker with students and families individually to identify attendance barriers and determine strategies to help students improve attendance. Refer students to school-based mental health team as needed based on conversation with parents.

**Extension:** Increase student recognition in the cafeteria, during morning announcements, on the news, and by grade level. Implement contests between grade levels, classes, etc. to create more hype around attendance.

**Person Responsible:** Dawn Beckman (dawndb@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Schedule conversations with parents following Monday morning attendance meetings. Implement extensions with every Attendance Challenge.

### 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 school funding. The schools are budgeted in multi-faceted methods based on the student's needs. Initially, the schools are tiered based on the following criteria: student proficiency, learning gains, struggling schools, % of new teachers, % of ELL students, and % of ESE students for academic support and 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. Principal supervisors provide ongoing monitoring of student data and underperforming subgroups through monthly visits and data chats.

### Budget to Support Areas of Focus

#### Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

|               |        |   |               |
|---------------|--------|---|---------------|
| 1             | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA                            | \$0.00        |
| 2             | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science                        | \$0.00        |
| 3             | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System | \$0.00        |
| <b>Total:</b> |        |   | <b>\$0.00</b> |

**Budget Approval**

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes