Dr Carrie D Robinson Littleton Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Dr Carrie D Robinson Littleton Elementary School

700 HUTTO RD, North Fort Myers, FL 33903

http://lit.leeschools.net//

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The Robinson Littleton Elementary staff, students, parents, and community believe that the education provided should meet the various needs of the people served. The curriculum will change as required to fulfill this responsibility by providing for the implementation of educational programs, instructional techniques, and classroom management systems. Our mission will be accomplished within the framework of the local and state educational goals.

Provide the school's vision statement.

There is a consensus that the education provided for students who attend Dr. Carrie D. Robinson Littleton Elementary School will determine our future role in the community, the character of our society, and the quality of lives of our children. Our students will be provided a structured education stressing strong foundational skills, as well as, a shared responsibility with parents and teachers.

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
Broughton, Monica	Principal	Review and analyze the data collected. Facilitate the Leadership Team to utilize the information collected through the data analysis and develop a plan for improvement. Budget the necessary funds in a way that supports the plan for improvement Oversee the implementation and evaluation of the plan for improvement Communicate the plan to all stakeholders Provide individualized feedback to teachers and support staff member responsible for implementing the plan Provide professional development opportunities and support to staff needing that support Provide organizational leadership to ensure a safe and secure learning environment.
Sanders, Jeff	Assistant Principal	Review and analyze the data collected. Facilitate the Leadership Team to utilize the information collected through the data analysis and develop a plan for improvement. Oversee the implementation and evaluation of the plan for improvement Communicate the plan to all stakeholders Provide individualized feedback to teachers and support staff member responsible for implementing the plan Provide professional development opportunities and support to staff needing that support
Cauceglia, Elissa	Teacher, K-12	Review and analyze the data collected for ELA in grade 3-5; Collaborate with the Leadership Team to develop an improvement plan focusing on the area of ELA and providing input and knowledge of appropriate resources Communicate the plans for improvement in ELA to all stakeholders, including the K-2 Reading Coach; Oversee the implementation and evaluation of the plan for improvement; Provide individualized feedback to teachers and support staff members; Facilitate professional development and peer coaching in reading strategies; Evaluate the implementation of the improvement plan
Patel, Dharmistha	Other	Review and analyze the data collected for Math; Collaborate with the Leadership Team to develop an improvement plan focusing on the area of Math and providing input and knowledge of appropriate resources Communicate the plans for improvement in Math to all stakeholders; Oversee the implementation and evaluation of the plan for improvement; Provide individualized feedback to teachers and support staff members Facilitate professional development in Math; Evaluate the implementation of the improvement plan
Howard, Julie	Reading Coach	Review and analyze the data collected for ELA with a focus in grades K-2; Collaborate with the Leadership Team to develop an improvement plan focusing on the area of ELA and providing input and knowledge of appropriate resources Communicate the plans for improvement in ELA to all stakeholders, including the 3-5 Reading Contact; Oversee the implementation and evaluation of the

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		plan for improvement; Provide individualized feedback to teachers and support staff members; Facilitate professional development and peer coaching in reading strategies; Evaluate the implementation of the improvement plan
Moore, Lindsey	Other	

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.

Leadership Team will work with grade level teams to establish goals. Goals will be analyzed by school based Goal Teams whose feedback will be used to adjust as needed. The goals will also be presented to community stakeholders and parents through School Advisory Council meetings.

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 Leadership Team, Grade Level Teams, and Goal teams will work to monitor for effective implementation. Grade level groups will meet weekly and follow the PLC Four Questions format using all available academic data to determine student growth toward achievement of SIP goals. Special consideration during these meetings will be given to students with the greatest achievement gaps. Grade levels will ensure intervention time is enacted effectively and remains fluid to meet the needs of students in the focus academic areas. School based Goal Teams will meet following state mandated Progress Monitoring assessment periods to monitor for effective implementation and impact on increasing achievement of students. Both teams will work to increase the effectiveness of instruction with the aim of student achievement in meeting the Sate's academic standards.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	54%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes

ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) 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: C 2018-19: C 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	3	30	26	17	17	24	0	0	0	117
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	2	12	10	5	15	2	0	0	0	46
Course failure in Math	2	5	1	2	16	3	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	40	23	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	19	29	0	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	59	52	0	0	0	111

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Students with two or more indicators	2	6	2	3	26	16	0	0	0	55

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	2	2	4	0	0	0	9

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	5	7	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	12	9	24	10	7	2	0	0	0	64
Course failure in Math	5	7	6	2	2	5	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	32	19	20	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	33	18	13	0	0	0	64
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	36	43	48	65	37	30	0	0	0	259
	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	1	1	3	10	30	32	0	0	0	77

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	2	2	12	0	0	0	0	0	19
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	5	7	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	12	9	24	10	7	2	0	0	0	64
Course failure in Math	5	7	6	2	2	5	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	32	19	20	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	33	18	13	0	0	0	64
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	36	43	48	65	37	30	0	0	0	259
	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	1	1	3	10	30	32	0	0	0	77

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	2	2	12	0	0	0	0	0	19
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*	44	48	53	41	52	56	53		
ELA Learning Gains				54			66		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50			44		
Math Achievement*	50	57	59	52	45	50	51		
Math Learning Gains				67			69		

Accountability Component	2023 School	District	State	2022 School	District	State	2021 School	District	State
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58			73		
Science Achievement*	58	53	54	54	59	59	42		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	60	51	59	44			45		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	253
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	420
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
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	17	Yes	1	1
ELL	39	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	1	
HSP	53			
MUL	59			
PAC				
WHT	49			
FRL	47			

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	47			
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	58			
HSP	54			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	51			
FRL	47			

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)

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	44			50			58					60
SWD	17			19			8				4	
ELL	26			42			27				4	60
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33			40							2	
HSP	47			52			58				5	63
MUL	50			67							2	
PAC												
WHT	44			47			64				4	
FRL	41			46			56				5	56

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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	41	54	50	52	67	58	54					44
SWD	13	55	55	44	67		50					
ELL	20	41		53	69		27					44
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	55	67		53	57							
HSP	39	54	55	57	69	67	50					42
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	40	50	47	45	66	53	55					
FRL	35	47	42	48	65	56	49					37

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

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	53	66	44	51	69	73	42					45
SWD	34	67		49	77		29					
ELL	38			56								45
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40			35								
HSP	51	60		53	63		52					45
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	57	72		52	71		38					
FRL	52	69	45	47	62		38					46

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	57%	48%	9%	54%	3%
04	2023 - Spring	46%	56%	-10%	58%	-12%
03	2023 - Spring	36%	42%	-6%	50%	-14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	58%	55%	3%	59%	-1%
04	2023 - Spring	52%	61%	-9%	61%	-9%
05	2023 - Spring	47%	52%	-5%	55%	-8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	61%	50%	11%	51%	10%

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 the EOY F.A.S.T. assessment, ELA was the component with the lowest performance. However, proficiency improved from 41% proficiency to 47% proficiency. Possible contributing factors: weak vocabulary and low comprehension skills.

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

Based on the EOY F.A.S.T. assessment, math was the component that showed no growth. However, proficiency remained at 52%. Possible contributing factors: low math vocabulary, non-mastery of computational skills, little assistance at home to support and assist with homework practice

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.

Based on the EOY F.A.S.T assessment, math was the component with the greatest gap between the school's 52% against the state's 58%. Possible contributing factors: mort focus on ELA to improve the proficient rate and low math vocabulary along with non-mastery of computational skills.

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

The component in which the most growth made compared from FY22 to FY23 was ELA by 6 points. A sense of urgency was held throughout the entire school year. Ongoing progress monitoring and adjustment of student groups and strategies throughout the school year helped with the improved scores.

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

Based on the EWS data the two areas of concerns
1. Course failures in ELA or Math
2. Students with 2 or more indicators

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

All subject areas below will focus on all subgroups to include any that may fall below the federal index.
1.) Math
2.) ELA

3.) Science
4.) Discipline
5.) 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.

n/a

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

2nd grade ELA proficiency will increase from 36% to 42% based on EOY STAR data.

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

Data will be monitored based on exemplars, quarterly comprehensive assessments, iReady, and F.A.S.T. progress monitoring assessments throughout the school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Howard (julielh@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 receive 60 minutes of intervention each day. During the intervention block, students will receive differentiated instruction in which students will rotate through different centers. The centers will consist of: teacher direct instruction, computer station in which students will receive enrichment or additional intervention, and Independent reading or independent practice. Phonics will also occur during intervention.

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

Strategies will include: High-Yield Instructional Strategies, Numbered Heads Collaborative Pairs, Distributed Summarizing, Text-Dependent Questioning, Writing to Raise Achievement, and Higher-Order Thinking.

High-Yield Strategies are researched-based instructional practices linked to increased student achievement. The strategies support students' higher-level thinking with the goal of using level 3 or 4 question on Webb's Depth of Knowledge. High-Yield Strategies are instructional based. They can be applied across all content
areas and enable teachers to focus on improving the quality of instruction students will receive to fill phonics gaps, build student vocabulary, and ensure students are using these newly acquired skills to build comprehension of grade level texts. As a bonus, these strategies can also be used to improve student retention and understanding across all other content areas. A focus on instructional practices allows for greater impact in student learning.

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 students will have a 90 minute ELA block daily. Within the block of time, students will receive instruction that covers Foundational Skills (15 min); Whole group instruction (30 min); small group instruction (45 min). Instruction will be differentiated for students during small group instruction. Students may work independently on their Chromebook, work directly with the teacher and have an independent reading center with focus on practicing and reviewing skills for mastery.

Person Responsible: Julie Howard (julielh@leeschools.net)

By When: The 90 minute reading block will be done daily throughout the school year, starting in August and ending in May.

Planning (PLC) meets weekly and is monitored by the PCT/Literacy Coach, and AP. PLCs are documented by PLC agenda and are uploaded in a Google folder. Resources used during interventions will be as follows: iReady Standards Mastery tools, instructional guides, Wonders activities, Nearpod, Flocabulary, Imagine Learning, use of novels/chapter books, and writing across all subject areas. Teachers will also utilize Stairway to Success and the Decision Tree to assist in planning and delivery of instruction.

Person Responsible: Julie Howard (julielh@leeschools.net)

By When: Throughout the school year, August 2023 - May 2024

#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.

NA

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

3rd grade proficiency will increase from 36% to 42% based on the FY24 EOY F.A.S.T. assessment

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

Data will be monitored based on exemplars, quarterly comprehensive assessments, iReady, and F.A.S.T. progress monitoring assessments throughout the school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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

Students will receive 60 minutes of intervention each day. During the intervention block, students will receive differentiated instruction in which students will rotate through different centers. The centers will consist of: teacher direct instruction, computer station in which will receive enrichment or additional intervention, and Independent reading or independent practice. Phonics for Reading will be used during intervention. Monitored by classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans, and open communication other than during PLC times.

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

Strategies will include: High-Yield Instructional Strategies, Numbered Heads Collaborative Pairs, Distributed Summarizing, Text-Dependent Questioning, Writing to Raise Achievement, and Higher-Order Thinking.

High-Yield Strategies are researched-based instructional practices linked to increased student achievement. The strategies support students' higher-level thinking with the goal of using level 3 or 4 question on Webb's Depth of Knowledge. High-Yield Strategies are instructional based. They can be applied across all content
areas and enable teachers to focus on improving the quality of instruction students will receive to fill phonics gaps, build student vocabulary, and ensure students are using these newly acquired skills to build comprehension of grade level texts. As a bonus, these strategies can also be used to improve student retention and understanding across all other content areas. A focus on instructional practices allows for greater impact in student learning.

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 students will have a 90 minute ELA block daily. Within the block of time, students will receive instruction that covers Foundational Skills (15 min); Whole group instruction (30 min); small group instruction (45 min). Instruction will be differentiated for students during small group instruction. Students may work independently on their Chromebook, work directly with the teacher and have an independent reading center with focus on practicing and reviewing skills for mastery.

Person Responsible: Dharmistha Patel (dharmistharp@leeschools.net)

By When: The 90 minute reading block will be done daily throughout the school year, starting in August and ending in May.

Planning (PLC) meets weekly and is monitored by the PCT/Literacy Coach, and AP. PLCs are documented by PLC agenda and are uploaded in a Google folder. Resources used during interventions will be as follows: iReady Standards Mastery tools, instructional guides, Wonders activities, Nearpod, Flocabulary, Imagine Learning, use of novels/chapter books, and writing across all subject areas. Teachers will also utilize Stairway to Success and the Decision Tree to assist in planning and delivery of instruction. 3rd-5th grade test item specs will be utilized by teachers as they plan.

Person Responsible: Dharmistha Patel (dharmistharp@leeschools.net)

By When: Throughout the school year, August 2023 - May 2024

#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.

n/a

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

3rd-5th grade ELA proficiency will increase from 47% to 52% based on the FY24 EOY F.A.S.T. assessment.

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

Data will be monitored based on exemplars, quarterly comprehensive assessments, iReady, and F.A.S.T. progress monitoring assessments throughout the school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Monica Broughton (monicatb@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 receive 60 minutes of intervention each day. During the intervention block, students will receive differentiated instruction in which students will rotate through different centers. The centers will consist of: teacher direct instruction, computer station in which will receive enrichment or additional intervention, and Independent reading or independent practice. Phonics for Reading will be done during intervention. Monitored by classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans, and open communication other than during PLC times.

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

Strategies will include: High-Yield Instructional Strategies, Numbered Heads Collaborative Pairs, Distributed Summarizing, Text-Dependent Questioning, Writing to Raise Achievement, and Higher-Order Thinking.

High-Yield Strategies are researched-based instructional practices linked to increased student achievement. The strategies support students' higher-level thinking with the goal of using level 3 or 4 question on Webb's Depth of Knowledge. High-Yield Strategies are instructional based. They can be applied across all content
areas and enable teachers to focus on improving the quality of instruction students will receive to fill phonics gaps, build student vocabulary, and ensure students are using these newly acquired skills to build comprehension of grade level texts. As a bonus, these strategies can also be used to improve student retention and understanding across all other content areas. A focus on instructional practices allows for greater impact in student learning.

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

All students will have a 90 minute ELA block daily. Within the block of time, students will receive instruction that covers Foundational Skills (15 min); Whole group instruction (30 min); small group instruction (45 min). Instruction will be differentiated for students during small group instruction. Students may work independently on their Chromebook, work directly with the teacher and have an independent reading center with focus on practicing and reviewing skills for mastery.

Person Responsible: Monica Broughton (monicatb@leeschools.net)

By When: The 90 minute reading block will be done daily throughout the school year, starting in August and ending in May.

Planning (PLC) meets weekly and is monitored by the PCT/Literacy Coach, and AP. PLCs are documented by PLC agenda and are uploaded in a Google folder. Resources used during interventions will be as follows: iReady Standards Mastery tools, instructional guides, Wonders activities, Nearpod, Flocabulary, Imagine Learning, use of novels/chapter books, and writing across all subject areas. Teachers will also utilize Stairway to Success and the Decision Tree to assist in planning and delivery of instruction. 3rd-5th grade test item specs will be utilized by all teachers as they plan.

Person Responsible: Monica Broughton (monicatb@leeschools.net)

By When: Throughout the school year, August 2023 - May 2024

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.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

64% of students in grades 1 and 2 scored below level 3 on the end of year STAR Reading assessment. When students are reading below grade level, the achievement gap increases, students are retained in 3rd grade, and there is an increase in the number of students not graduating from high school with a standard diploma

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

54% of grade 4 students and 64% of grade 3 students scored below level 3 on the FY23 ELA F.A.S.T. assessment. Students scoring below level three show significant deficits in vocabulary and comprehension. Additional progress monitoring data has identified basic and advanced phonics deficiencies that must be addressed explicitly. Since the direct instruction of these phonics concepts is not included in the fourth grade standards, we feel this is a prudent area of focus for this group of students. If they cannot accurately get the words off the page, they cannot comprehend the author's message. Low level performance increases the risk of students not graduating.

Measurable Outcomes
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

1st and 2nd grade ELA proficiency will increase from 36% to 42% based on FY24 EOY STAR data.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

3rd-5th grade ELA proficiency will increase from 47% to 52% based on FY24 EOY F.A.S.T. assessment.

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Progress monitoring data from exemplars, quarterly comprehensive assessments, STAR, i-Ready Reading Diagnostic, and F.A.S.T. will be used to gauge students' overall progress. We will also use the screening tools within Phonics for Reading and the DIBELS assessment to determine student growth within the Phonics for Reading program.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Patel, Dharmistha, dharmistharp@leeschools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Phonics for Reading is an evidence based program and meets Florida's definition of evidence based. The
program aligns with Lee County's Comprehensive Evidence based Reading Plan and it aligned to the BEST
ELA Standards.

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Teachers will provide explicit instruction and supported practice using Phonics for Reading. This is a systematic, research-based intervention program that accelerates instruction for struggling readers by equipping them with the tools necessary to decode with confidence. By providing a consistent routine that
allows students to apply each concept in increasingly challenging situations, students will build accuracy,

automaticity, and fluency. Students engaged in Phonics for Reading will also work with scaffolded comprehension strategies within the scope of the decodable passages for the phonics lessons.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
1. Complete Phonics for Reading webinar training for all fourth and fifth grade teachers and Intervention support. 2. Maintain fidelity to the intervention schedule and lessons; monitor student learning with continued screening. Adjust intervention groups as needed to match student need.	Patel, Dharmistha, dharmistharp@leeschools.net

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

Parents are informed via the school's newsletter of the location of the School Improvement Plan, which can be viewed at lit.leeschools.net. SAC members provide input on the development of the SIP and student performance data will be shared with stakeholders. A copy of the SIP will be available in the front office for stakeholders to view.

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

Parents, families, and community stakeholders are invited to participate in our School Advisory Committee (SAC) each school year. Dates and time are published monthly in our newsletter and displayed on our marquee several days before each meeting date.

Curriculum nights are scheduled for October to provide parents with information about their students' progress. Each parent will be provided their child's progress monitoring report and strategies for parents to use to help their student be successful. Littleton administration ensures that relationship-building is a clear priority for all faculty and staff members. During the first days of school teachers use a variety of methods to set a positive tone and clarify the values that will guide interpersonal interaction between students and between the teacher and students such as Kagan class- building and team-building activities, student interest surveys, generating mission and vision statements at the classroom level, etc. This positive relationship building continues throughout the school year by providing opportunities for students to participate in a variety of extra-curricular activities, school wide Parent Involvement events, and grade level specific functions and assemblies, recognition activities for students that focus on student learning gains and behavior improvement. In addition, students are greeted each day at the door which helps to start a student's day with a positive tone.

The Family Engagement Plan can be viewed at lit.leeschools.net.

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

The School Leadership Team continually conducts monthly analyses of school, classroom, and student level data in order to identify areas for school improvement. Additionally, the team assists with the evaluation of the student response to current interventions, curricula, and school systems.

At the classroom level, teachers work in PLC groups to analyze data and plan intervention, reteaching, and enrichment activities for students. Our daily schedule provides time each day for grade levels to work with small groups of students on intervention or reteaching while enrichment students participate in activities that deepen and broaden the scope of the identified standard.

Littleton teachers work in PLC groups to plan for instruction using state approved curricular materials and a county academic plan that is in alignment with Florida B.E.S.T. Standards. Teachers routinely work to
clarify the intention of the B.E.S.T. Standards and utilize sample questions and item specs to ensure they are teaching each standard to an appropriate level of depth and complexity.

Littleton encourages positive working relationships with teachers by participation in PLC meetings. The master schedule has been designed to provide consistent time for teachers to meet by grade level. Research-based protocols are utilized to focus the meetings on students' academic needs and how students might be assessed. Student improvement is monitored and instruction is modified as needed based on decisions made through collaboration.

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

Title I, Title II and other programs coordinate through the SIP process. Each school completes a needs assessment before writing goals for the year. School improvement plans are written to ensure compliance with all state and national regulations. All school improvement plans are reviewed at the district level for appropriate use of funds and effective use of resources. The district level review

prevents duplication of services and
facilitates coordination between schools and departments. This collaboration ensures that all programs support schools.

Title I, Part A coordinates with Title I, Part C to provide expanded academic enrichment opportunities to Migrant students. Services include after school tutorials in reading and math; health services; and literacy workshops for parents as a result of the coordination of these funds.

The facilities and schools coordinate with health services (mental and physical) and other social services to meet the need of students returning back to their assigned educational facility. The district Health Services, Student Services, Title I, Title III and ESE departments are all a part of the collaborative effort. For example: social workers from student services have processes and procedures in place to assist students and their
families in need of services; the ESE Department has established a memorandum of understanding for assistance with housing and counseling services through Ruth Cooper and the Lutheran Service; vocational instructors establish partnership with businesses so students will have an opportunity to continue to develop their vocational skill.

All school improvement plans are reviewed at the district level for appropriate use of funds and effectiveness. This district level review prevents duplication of services and facilitates coordination between agencies. Each school's SIP is reviewed by all stakeholders and submitted to the Board for approval. Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under NCLB also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

In addition to the supports provided through the school wide PBIS structure, a full-time school counselor provides one on one and small group topic-based support groups for students. Mentoring is available for our highest need students with faculty/staff members or trained volunteers. Blessings in a Backpack provides food to students in need over weekends and school breaks. An additional support person used to help our students' social
emotional needs is the social worker. She works to see that students are present each day, arrive on time, and see that families have their needs met.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

na

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports is embedded in the school's culture. Tier 1 covers all students. Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions are put in place for academic and/or behavioral reasons.

Parents, teachers, administration work together to devise a plan to help with student success and improved behavior.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Our school participates in recruiting activities by attending our in-county job fair to recruit highly qualified teachers. We also provide monthly professional development activities to further enhance the skills of beginning and highly- effective teachers so they are better prepared for challenges they may incur throughout the school year.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

na