Trafalgar Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Trafalgar Elementary School

1850 SW 20TH AVE, Cape Coral, FL 33991

http://tfe.leeschools.net/

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to inspire our students to think and learn.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to provide a quality education in a safe and well-managed environment.

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
Murphy, Lisa	Principal	Overseas: Curriculum, safety, staff.

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.

Lisa murphy, Principal
Dr. Williamson, AP
Donna Bennett, Reading Specialist
Amanda Sweeney, 5th grade teacher/SAC Chair/parent
Crystal Engelhart, School Counselor
Darlene Martin, Administrative Assistant/grandparent

Reviewed data and previous SIP goals to complete current SIP

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

School administration and leadership team will monitor goals quarterly based on FAST data, district based assessments and MTSS data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	53%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	90%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
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: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: C
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	9	39	23	26	11	24	0	0	0	132
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	2	2	0	0	0	7
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	16	9	21	6	2	0	0	0	54
Course failure in Math	0	5	4	14	5	4	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	34	23	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	21	36	0	0	0	57
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	6	5	9	20	26	0	0	0	66

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	5

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	22	21	11	13	16	10	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	3	0	0	4	0	2	0	0	0	9
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	11	44	41	12	20	0	0	0	128
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	31	51	35	13	31	0	0	0	161
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	15	22	30	20	30	38	0	0	0	155

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	2	2	3	8	37	56	0	0	0	108

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	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	22	21	11	13	16	10	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	3	0	0	4	0	2	0	0	0	9
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	11	44	41	12	20	0	0	0	128
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	31	51	35	13	31	0	0	0	161
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	15	22	30	20	30	38	0	0	0	155

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	2	2	3	8	37	56	0	0	0	108

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
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*	62	48	53	64	52	56	63		
ELA Learning Gains				64			57		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54			41		
Math Achievement*	65	57	59	66	45	50	68		
Math Learning Gains				61			49		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49			37		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	67	53	54	64	59	59	62		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	45	51	59	68			47		

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	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	296
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	490
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

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	21	Yes	4	1
ELL	39	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	1	
HSP	55			
MUL	78			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	50			

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	40	Yes	3	
ELL	63			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	51			
HSP	65			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	53			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

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	62			65			67					45
SWD	23			27			18				5	30
ELL	44			46			52				5	45
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37			52			25				3	
HSP	58			59			64				5	45
MUL	82			73							2	
PAC												
WHT	67			70			76				4	
FRL	53			58			54				5	43

| 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	64	64	54	66	61	49	64					68
SWD	23	43	36	34	44	35	41					63
ELL	50	57	70	57	64		73					68
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	47	55		57	50		45					
HSP	66	66	63	64	65	58	66					68
MUL	67			67								
PAC												
WHT	66	65	50	67	59	50	64					
FRL	55	57	50	52	54	48	50					57

| 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	63	57	41	68	49	37	62					47
SWD	27	32	26	34	40	39	35					25
ELL	52			53								47

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	48			44								
HSP	60	67		61	43	25	59					48
MUL	50			60								
PAC												
WHT	68	55	42	75	54	53	66					
FRL	47	45	27	52	44	50	48					44

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

ELA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	64%	48%	16%	54%	10%
04	2023 - Spring	70%	56%	14%	58%	12%
03	2023 - Spring	53%	42%	11%	50%	3%

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	64%	55%	9%	59%	5%
04	2023 - Spring	68%	61%	7%	61%	7%
05	2023 - Spring	65%	52%	13%	55%	10%

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	66%	50%	16%	51%	15%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Based on preliminary FAST PM3 data, 3rd grade proficiency decreased from 66% on the 2022 FSA to 55% on the FAST PM3.

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

3rd Grade ELA proficiency -11% from 2022-23 FSA to the FAST PM3 data.

Inefficient use of PLCs, interventions and use of vetted materials.

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.

Trafalgar Elementary is above the state and district averages in all tested categories. The greatest gap for Trafalgar was a +20 in 4th grade ELA proficiency. This can be attributed to the following: Teacher placement, PLCs, Intervention planning and strong collaboration.

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

4th grade proficiency increased proficiency from 66% based on the 2022 FSA to 77% on the FAST preliminary PM3 data. Strategically place teachers in 4th grade ELA. Strong PLCs and collaboration among team. Schoolwide homework was on-level weekly fluency passages.

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

High number of students scoring Level 1 on either math or ELA in self-contained SF classrooms. SWD in GE classrooms are making gains within levels but not moving levels.

Plans are addressed in action steps under Area of Focus.

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

1. Move SWD subgroup to at least 41 on FPPI
2. Closely monitor Good Caused students in 4th grade for ELA proficiency gains
3. Proficiency in ELA, especially for students in Grades 2 and 3
4. Maintain ELA and Science proficiency for 5th Grade (incoming 5th grades 77% ELA proficiency)
5. Maximize PLCs to monitor, plan and increase schoolwide ELA proficiency

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.

Grade 2 proficiency in ELA will be at or greater than 75%. For the 22-23 school year as Grade 1 students, this cohort was 69% at/above benchmark and 10% on watch.

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

By the end of year assessment for Grade 2 in the 2023-24 school year, 75% of students will be proficient in ELA as measured by the FAST Star ELA assessment.

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

FAST Star ELA has three progress monitoring periods. One baseline, one midyear, and one end of year assessment. Progress will be monitored by analyzing the results of these assessments. Additionally, progress will also be monitored through District Exemplars. Teachers use individual and grade level Google Drive Data Dashboards to track mastery of Benchmarks. Dashboards are used for sorting students by Benchmark for Intervention grouping.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Beth Williamson (bethew@leeschools.net)

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

Students will be given an additional 60 minutes intervention as well as receiving additional instruction from a certified ESE teacher. Instructional materials have been vetted and are provided by our Curriculum Department. Resources for intervention: 2 Flyleaf Resources for extension: BEST Literature and Writing Workshop

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

Our master schedule and intervention schedule provides students opportunities in the smaller group setting, time, and supports they need to become proficient or make significant progress towards proficiency. Students will be closely monitored by a specific staff member. Students will work with staff member to monitor progress and discuss ways to be successful. Assistant principal will monitor grade level and individual Google Drive Data Dashboards to track mastery of Benchmarks. Dashboards are used for sorting students by Benchmark for Intervention grouping.

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.

All 2nd graders who were "On Watch" will be listed for monitoring. Class placement as well as prior year scores and attendance records will be recorded for baseline purposes. Assistant principal and staff member will be assigned to this cohort of students for specific monitoring of progress using FAST STAR ELA progress monitoring periods, i-Ready data and district Exemplar data.

Person Responsible: Beth Williamson (bethew@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly PLC meetings, after assessment cycles, and prior to intervention planning.

Planning System:
Weekly PLCs: PLC facilitator will share agenda in Folder to be reviewed by administrator a minimum of 1 day prior to PLC meeting.
During the PLC meeting teachers will review relevant data and use the following for planning next steps: Instructional Guides, Test Item Specification and planning slides.
Intervention Schedule was developed with an administrator and additional personal to support each grade level in facilitating and monitoring PLCS.

Person Responsible: Beth Williamson (bethew@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly PLC meetings, after assessment cycles, and prior to intervention planning.

Tier I/Core instruction System daily will include the following:
1. 90 minute uninterrupted Reading Block
2. This block will include both Whole group and Small group instruction.
3. Scientifically based reading instruction including explicit and systematic instruction in the following areas: Oral Language, Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Fluency, Vocabulary, Comprehension.
4. Writing in Response to Reading.
For Planning teachers will use the following materials: Instructional Guides, Test Item Specification and Planning Slides

Person Responsible: Beth Williamson (bethew@leeschools.net)

By When: Daily

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

Grade 3 proficiency in ELA will be at or greater than 72%. For the 22-23 school year as Grade 2 students, this cohort was 65% at/above benchmark and 9% On Watch.

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

By the end of year assessment period for Grade 3 in the 2023-24 school year, 72% of students will be proficient in ELA as measured by the FAST ELA assessment.

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

This will be monitored for growth from previous year scores as well as how close students are to proficiency using PM1 and PM2 FAST assessments and correlations from District Exemplars. In addition, a variety of formative assessments will be used to monitor for standards mastery. Principal will monitor grade level and individual Google Drive Data Dashboards to track mastery of Benchmarks. Dashboards are used for sorting students by Benchmark for Intervention grouping.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Murphy (lisajm@leeschools.net)

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

Students will be given an additional 60 minutes of interventions Instructional materials have been vetted and provided by our Curriculum Department. Grade 3 students will also be included in small group interventions with supports provided by reading resource teacher and ESE Resource teachers. Principal will monitor grade level and individual Google Drive Data Dashboards to track mastery of Benchmarks. Dashboards are used for sorting students by Benchmark for Intervention grouping.

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

Our master schedule and intervention schedule provides students with opportunities, time and supports they need to become proficient or make significant progress towards proficiency. Students will be closely monitored by specific staff members and principal to monitor progress and discuss ways to be successful. Resources for intervention will include the following: 3-5 Phonics for Reading Resources for Extension will include the following: BEST Literature and Writing Workshop Grades 2-5.

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.

All 3rd graders who were "On Watch" at the end of 2nd grade will be listed for monitoring. Class placement as well as prior year scores and attendance records will be recorded for baseline purposes. Students will be monitored as a cohort and assigned a staff member and principal for specific progress monitoring of FAST PM1 and PM2, District Exemplars and i-Ready.

Person Responsible: Lisa Murphy (lisajm@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly PLC meetings, after assessment cycles, and prior to intervention planning.

Planning System:
Weekly PLCs: PLC facilitator will share agenda in Folder to be reviewed by administrator a minimum of 1 day prior to PLC meeting.
During the PLC meeting teachers will review relevant data and use the following for planning next steps: Instructional Guides, Test Item Specification and planning slides.
Intervention Schedule was developed with an administrator and additional personal to support each grade level in facilitating and monitoring PLCS.

Person Responsible: Lisa Murphy (lisajm@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly PLC meetings, after assessment cycles, and prior to intervention planning.

Tier I/Core instruction System daily will include the following:
1. 90 minute uninterrupted Reading Block
2. This block will include both Whole group and Small group instruction.
3. Scientifically based reading instruction including explicit and systematic instruction in the following areas: Oral Language, Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Fluency, Vocabulary, Comprehension.
4. Writing in Response to Reading.
For Planning teachers will use the following materials: Instructional Guides, Test Item Specification and Planning Slides

Person Responsible: Lisa Murphy (lisajm@leeschools.net)

By When: Daily

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

Grades 3-5 proficiency in ELA will be at or greater than 77%. This specific goal was determined by looking at the students in grades 2-4 from the 22-23 school year and calculating what percentage was proficient and adding the students who were one level below proficiency. Through intensive instruction interventions, and progress monitoring, the goal is to keep every student who was proficient at/above the proficiency level while also moving all students who were one level below up to the level of proficiency.

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

By the end of year assessment period for Grades 3-5 in the 2023-24 school year, 77% of students will be proficient in ELA as measured by the FAST ELA assessment.

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

This will be monitored for growth from previous year scores as well as how close students are to proficiency using PM1 and PM2 FAST assessments and correlations from District Exemplars. Additionally a variety of formatives will be used to monitor standards mastery. Teachers use individual and grade level Google Drive Data Dashboards to track mastery of Benchmarks. Dashboards are used for sorting students by Benchmark for Intervention grouping.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Murphy (lisajm@leeschools.net)

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

Students are given an additional 60 minutes of interventions. Instructional materials have been vetted and are provided by Curriculum Department. Intervention materials include: 3-5 Phonics for Reading Extension includes: BEST Literature and Writing Workshop Grades 2-5.

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

Our master schedule and intervention schedule provides students with opportunities, time, and supports they need to become proficient or make significant progress towards proficiency. Students will be closely monitored by a specific staff and member as well as the principal. They will meet with students to monitor progress and discuss ways to be successful. Principal will monitor grade level and individual Google Drive Data Dashboards to track mastery of Benchmarks. Dashboards are used for sorting students by Benchmark for Intervention grouping.

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.

All 3rd-5th graders who were "On Watch" (or Level 2) at the end of last year will be listed for monitoring. Class placement as well as prior year scores will be recorded for baseline purposes. Students will be monitored as a cohort and assigned a staff member and principal for specific progress monitoring of FAST PM1 and PM2, District Exemplars and i-Ready.

Person Responsible: Lisa Murphy (lisajm@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly PLC meetings, after assessment cycles, and prior to intervention planning.

Planning System:
Weekly PLCs: PLC facilitator will share agenda in Folder to be reviewed by administrator a minimum of 1 day prior to PLC meeting.
During the PLC meeting teachers will review relevant data and use the following for planning next steps: Instructional Guides, Test Item Specification and planning slides.
Intervention Schedule was developed with an administrator and additional personal to support each grade level in facilitating and monitoring PLCS.

Person Responsible: Lisa Murphy (lisajm@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly PLC meetings, after assessment cycles, and prior to intervention planning.

Tier I/Core instruction System daily will include the following:
1. 90 minute uninterrupted Reading Block
2. This block will include both Whole group and Small group instruction.
3. Scientifically based reading instruction including explicit and systematic instruction in the following areas: Oral Language, Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Fluency, Vocabulary, Comprehension.
4. Writing in Response to Reading.
For Planning teachers will use the following materials: Instructional Guides, Test Item Specification and Planning Slides

Person Responsible: Lisa Murphy (lisajm@leeschools.net)

By When: Daily

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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

SWD for the past 3 years have scored 37% in reading proficiency which is below the goal of 41%.

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

SWD will score 41% or greater in reading proficiency based on the PM3 FAST.

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

This will be monitored for growth from previous year scores as well as how close students are to proficiency using PM1 and PM2 FAST assessments and correlations from District Exemplars. In addition, a variety of formative assessments will be used to monitor for standards mastery. Principal will monitor ESE Resource and self-contained SF students using grade level and individual Google Drive Data Dashboards to track mastery of Benchmarks. Dashboards are used for sorting students by Benchmark for Intervention grouping.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Murphy (lisajm@leeschools.net)

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

Students will be given an additional 60 minutes of interventions Instructional materials have been vetted and provided by our Curriculum Department. Grade 3 students will also be included in small group interventions with supports provided by reading resource teacher and ESE Resource teachers. Principal will monitor grade level and individual Google Drive Data Dashboards to track mastery of Benchmarks. Dashboards are used for sorting students by Benchmark for Intervention grouping.
In addition, TES is a model PBIS Platinum School. Students will be instructed with positive behavior interventions to meet the needs of social emotional goals to support academic growth.

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

Our master schedule and intervention schedule provides students with opportunities, time and supports they need to become proficient or make significant progress towards proficiency. Students will be closely monitored by specific staff members and principal to monitor progress and discuss ways to be successful. Resources for intervention will include the following: 3-5 Phonics for Reading Resources for Extension will include the following: BEST Literature and Writing Workshop Grades 2-5.

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 System:

Weekly PLCs: PLC facilitator will share agenda in Folder to be reviewed by administrator a minimum of 1 day prior to PLC meeting.

During the PLC meeting teachers will review relevant data and use the following for planning next steps: Instructional Guides, Test Item Specification and planning slides.

Intervention Schedule was developed with an administrator and additional personal to support each grade level in facilitating and monitoring PLCS.

Person Responsible: Lisa Murphy (lisajm@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly PLC meetings, after assessment cycles, and prior to intervention planning.

Tier I/Core instruction System daily will include the following:

1. 90 minute uninterrupted Reading Block

2. This block will include both Whole group and Small group instruction.

3. Scientifically based reading instruction including explicit and systematic instruction in the following areas: Oral Language, Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Fluency, Vocabulary, Comprehension.

4. Writing in Response to Reading.

For Planning teachers will use the following materials: Instructional Guides, Test Item Specification and Planning Slides

Person Responsible: Lisa Murphy (lisajm@leeschools.net)

By When: Daily

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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

SWD subgroup is at 37 on the Federal Percent of Points Index. This needs to increase to a least 41. This ESSA subgroup has been below 41 for three consecutive years. We need to move this group to at least 41 to move out of ATSI.

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

For the 2023-24 school year, the SWD ESSA subgroup will increase on the FPPI to at least 41% as measured by proficiency and learning gains using FAST ELA and Math assessments as well as the FSA Science assessment.

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

This will be monitored for growth from past year scores as well as how close students are to proficiency using PM1 and PM2 FAST assessments, progress monitoring assessments for Science, and correlations form District Exemplars.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Murphy (lisajm@leeschools.net)

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

Students will be given an additional 60 minutes of intervention as well as receiving additional instruction from a certified ESE teacher. Instructional materials have been vetted and are provided by our Curriculum Department. SWD who are placed in general education classrooms will receive additional in class support as well small group instruction from an ESE Resource teacher. Materials used for intervention: K-1 Read Well, 2 FlyLeaf, and 3-5 Phonics for Reading

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

SWD need additional time and supports to learn. Our master schedule and intervention schedules provide students with what they need to make learning gains and improve towards proficiency. Students will be closely monitored by ESE Resource teacher assigned to grade level. The ESE Resource teacher will monitor progress, build rapport, and discuss ways to be successful with SWD in general education classroom. Additionally, SF students in self-contained classrooms with be monitored by specific staff member.

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.

All SWD will be listed for monitoring. Class placement as well as previous year scores will be recorded for baseline purposes. SWD students in GE classrooms are grouped in cohorts between two classrooms. The ESE Resource assigned to grade level will monitor for academic improvement.

Person Responsible: Lisa Murphy (lisajm@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly PLC meetings, after assessment cycles, and prior to intervention planning.

Planning System:
Weekly PLCs: PLC facilitator will share agenda in Folder to be reviewed by administrator a minimum of 1 day prior to PLC meeting.
During the PLC meeting teachers will review relevant data and use the following for planning next steps: Instructional Guides, Test Item Specification and planning slides.
Intervention Schedule was developed with an administrator and additional personal to support each grade level in facilitating and monitoring PLCS.

Person Responsible: Lisa Murphy (lisajm@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly PLC meetings, after assessment cycles, and prior to intervention planning.

Tier I/Core instruction System daily will include the following:
1. 90 minute uninterrupted Reading Block
2. This block will include both Whole group and Small group instruction.
3. Scientifically based reading instruction including explicit and systematic instruction in the following areas: Oral Language, Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Fluency, Vocabulary, Comprehension.
4. Writing in Response to Reading.
For Planning teachers will use the following materials: Instructional Guides, Test Item Specification and Planning Slides

Person Responsible: Lisa Murphy (lisajm@leeschools.net)

By When: Daily

ESE Resource and SF self-contained teachers will support individual IEP Goals.

Person Responsible: Lisa Murphy (lisajm@leeschools.net)

By When: Quarterly and documented on IEP Progress monitoring reports

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.