

The School District of Lee County

Gateway Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	24
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Gateway Elementary School

13280 GRIFFIN DR, Fort Myers, FL 33913

<http://gty.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.

We will lead with greatness and become contributing members of the global community.

AVID's Mission:

To close the opportunity gap by preparing all students for college/career readiness and success in a global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To create the leaders of tomorrow.

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
Gibson, Cherry	Principal	Implementation and monitoring of School Improvement Plan. Creating an instructional strategies model for continuous improvement.

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.

The School Advisory Council amends and approves the School Improvement Plan.

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))

Professional Development

Progress Monitoring

Intervention

Professional Learning Communities

Small Group Instruction

Resource and paraprofessional push-in support

ReadWell, Really Great Reading (curriculum support)

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	66%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	99%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 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	31	10	19	23	7	21	0	0	0	111	
One or more suspensions	2	3	10	11	4	18	0	0	0	48	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	27	14	28	19	3	0	0	0	0	91	
Course failure in Math	8	7	14	18	9	0	0	0	0	56	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	21	16	30	55	37	61	0	0	0	220	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	16	6	21	36	32	61	0	0	0	172	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	221	16	30	55	37	61	0	0	0	420	

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	3	3	4	12	40	48	0	0	0	110

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	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	41	41	31	34	28	28	0	0	0	203	
One or more suspensions	0	4	6	2	3	5	0	0	0	20	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	36	40	0	0	0	102	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	24	44	50	0	0	0	118	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	19	31	41	26	36	40	0	0	0	193	

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	4	10	45	62	0	0	0	125

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	41	41	31	34	28	28	0	0	0	203	
One or more suspensions	0	4	6	2	3	5	0	0	0	20	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	36	40	0	0	0	102	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	24	44	50	0	0	0	118	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	19	31	41	26	36	40	0	0	0	193	

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	4	10	45	62	0	0	0	125

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	5
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*	48	48	53	54	52	56	50		
ELA Learning Gains				54			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43			42		
Math Achievement*	58	57	59	58	45	50	59		
Math Learning Gains				49			56		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				29			38		
Science Achievement*	49	53	54	43	59	59	48		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	53	51	59	58			60		

* 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	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	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	388
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
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	19	Yes	4	2
ELL	31	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN	69			
BLK	34	Yes	2	
HSP	41			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	42			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	14	Yes	3	1
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN	78			
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	45			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	58			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	43			

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	48			58			49					53
SWD	9			23			18				5	36
ELL	21			37			30				5	53
AMI												
ASN	55			82							2	
BLK	35			42			35				4	
HSP	34			49			35				5	53
MUL	67			73							2	
PAC												
WHT	67			72			70				4	
FRL	36			49			34				5	51

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	54	54	43	58	49	29	43					58
SWD	9	20	16	17	23	9	6					
ELL	27	50	58	39	44	33	26					58
AMI												
ASN	73			82								

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK	43	44	43	47	40	25	33					
HSP	43	52	40	47	45	28	41					60
MUL	54			62								
PAC												
WHT	69	59		73	55	42	57					
FRL	41	49	42	44	40	33	38					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	50	48	42	59	56	38	48					60
SWD	11	25		26	50		23					
ELL	15	14		39	64		15					60
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37	35		44	35		28					
HSP	35	38	20	51	43	33	30					57
MUL	75			58								
PAC												
WHT	70	62		76	79		76					
FRL	37	37	39	46	43	33	28					52

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	41%	48%	-7%	54%	-13%
04	2023 - Spring	64%	56%	8%	58%	6%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	43%	42%	1%	50%	-7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	66%	55%	11%	59%	7%
04	2023 - Spring	65%	61%	4%	61%	4%
05	2023 - Spring	46%	52%	-6%	55%	-9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	44%	50%	-6%	51%	-7%

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.

Although science proficiency has improved, from 43% in FY22 to 44% in FY23 it is still our lowest-performing area.

5th Grade Science Lowest Standards:

SC.5.E.7.1 (47%) Create a model to explain the parts of the water cycle. Water can be a gas, a liquid, or a solid and can go back and forth from one state to another.

SC.5.E.7.4 (55%) Distinguish among the various forms of precipitation (rain, snow, sleet, and hail), making connections to the weather in a particular place and time.

****Students scored lower on two 4th-grade standards:**

SC.4.E.6.2 (46%) Identify the physical properties of common earth-forming minerals, including hardness, color, luster, cleavage, and streak color, and recognize the role of minerals in the formation of rocks.

SC.4.L.16.2 (41%) Explain that although characteristics of plants and animals are inherited, some characteristics can be affected by the environment.

Why are there low-performance trends?

Students not mastering the 3rd and 4th grade standards, professional development, teachers not having knowledge of the standards, spiral review, time to spiral review, science special, K-3 not consistently

devoting time to science, lack of ELA improvement (reading scores dipped), increased focused on new reading and math benchmarks, school disruptions

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

Our lowest-performing area is ELA proficiency. In the last testing periods, Gateway Elementary decreased from 54% in FY22 to 49% in FY23.

ELA Proficiency has fluctuated from the last four testing periods:

- * 2019 - 60%
- * 2021 - 50%
- * 2022 - 54%
- * 2023 - 49%

5th Grade ELA Lowest Standards:

ELA.5.R.1.4 (35%) Explain how figurative language and other poetic elements work together in a poem
ELA.5.R.2.2 (47%) Explain how relevant details support the central idea(s), implied or explicit
ELA.5.R.3.2 (34%) Summarize a text to enhance comprehension: a. Include plot and theme for a literary text; b. Include the central idea and relevant details for an informational text

Factors:

New benchmarks, new reading curriculum, school disruptions, lack of skills needed to be successful (phonics, critical thinking, comprehension, etc), split classes/no substitutes, not knowing what to target in intervention, lack of differentiation, vocabulary skills are lacking, the need for consistent small groups, depth of knowledge/questioning, practicing test taking strategies

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.

Compared to the District

ELA

District 3rd - 41% Gateway - 43%

District 4th - 56% Gateway - 64%

District 5th - 49% Gateway 41%

5th grade ELA is 8% below the district's average

5th Grade ELA Lowest Standards:

ELA.5.R.1.4 (35%) Explain how figurative language and other poetic elements work together in a poem
ELA.5.R.2.2 (47%) Explain how relevant details support the central idea(s), implied or explicit
ELA.5.R.3.2 (34%) Summarize a text to enhance comprehension: a. Include plot and theme for a literary text; b. Include the central idea and relevant details for an informational text

Overall for grades 3-5 Lowest Standards:

R.2.2 Central Idea

R.1.4 Poetry

R.1.1 Literary Elements

Math

District 3rd - 56% Gateway - 66%

District 4th - 60% Gateway - 65%

District 5th - 53% Gateway - 46%

5th grade Math is 7% below the district's average

5th Grade Math Lowest Standards:

MA.5.NSO.1.1 (42%) Express how the value of a digit in a multi-digit number with decimals to the thousandths changes if the digit moves one or more places to the left or right.

MA.5.AR.1.2 (37%) Solve real-world problems involving the addition, subtraction or multiplication of fractions, including mixed numbers and fractions greater than 1.

MA.5.AR.2.3 (46%) Determine and explain whether an equation involving any of the four operations is true or false.

District - 48% Gateway - 44%

Science is 4% below the district's average

5th Grade Science Lowest Standards:

SC.5.E.7.1 (47%) Create a model to explain the parts of the water cycle. Water can be a gas, a liquid, or a solid and can go back and forth from one state to another.

SC.5.E.7.4 (55%) Distinguish among the various forms of precipitation (rain, snow, sleet, and hail), making connections to the weather in a particular place and time.

**Students scored lower on two 4th-grade standards:

SC.4.E.6.2 (46%) Identify the physical properties of common earth-forming minerals, including hardness, color, luster, cleavage, and streak color, and recognize the role of minerals in the formation of rocks.

SC.4.L.16.2 (41%) Explain that although characteristics of plants and animals are inherited, some characteristics can be affected by the environment.

Why is there a gap?

ELA: New benchmarks, new reading curriculum, school disruptions, lack of skills needed to be successful (phonics, critical thinking, comprehension, etc), not knowing what to target in intervention, lack of differentiation, vocabulary skills lacking, small groups, depth of knowledge/questioning, practicing test-taking strategies.

Math: New benchmarks, new reading curriculum, school disruptions, lack of skills needed to be successful (phonics, critical thinking, comprehension, etc), not knowing what to target in intervention, lack of differentiation, vocabulary skills are lacking, small groups, depth of knowledge/questioning, practicing test-taking strategies, math fact fluency/automaticity, need to move from concrete to abstract

Science: Students not mastering the 3rd and 4th grade standards, professional development, teachers not having knowledge of the standards, spiral review, time to spiral review, science special, K-3 not consistently devoting time to science, lack of ELA improvement (reading scores dipped), increased focus on new reading and math benchmarks, school disruptions

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

Math Proficiency has improved from the last four testing periods:

* 2019 - 73%

* 2021 - 59%

* 2022 - 58%

* 2023 - 60%

New curriculum encouraged more small groups, and targeted focus on benchmark mastery through the use of

i-Ready, ALDs, and exemplar data. Increased intervention time by 15 minutes, backwards design from exemplars in PLCs, focused on test limitations, discussed benchmark clarification in PLCs, and provided

school-wide professional development to promote collaboration, critical thinking skills, and higher-order questioning.

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

One potential area of concern is the SWD subgroup since they have performed below 41% for three consecutive years.

The second area of concern is the black student subgroup since they have performed below 41% for one consecutive year.

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

- * 2nd grade ELA proficiency
- * 3rd grade ELA proficiency
- * 3rd-5th grade ELA proficiency
- * ESSA

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Students with Disabilities (SWD)

Based on school-wide data, SWD has been below 41% for three consecutive years.

Currently at what percent

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June 2024, K-5 students in EWS will improve reading proficiency at or above 41% as measured by the May 2024 FAST.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring, interventions, exemplar data, comprehensives, standards mastery/data tracking, classroom walk throughs, lesson plans, gradebooks

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cherry Gibson (cherrymg@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.)

Following the district guidelines, following district approved curriculum, 60 minutes uninterrupted time everyday, Really Great Reading, Flyleaf, Read Well, differentiate the groups based on need and skills

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Proven effective evidence/research based, provides consistent intervention and is specific to student need, provides sequential and systemic approach

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.

We will monitor through progress monitoring, interventions, exemplar data, comprehensives, standards mastery/data tracking, exit tickets specific to the skill, classroom walk throughs, lesson plans, gradebooks and PLCs.

Person Responsible: Cherry Gibson (cherrymg@leeschools.net)

By When: May 2024 FAST

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

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.

Black/African-American

Based on school-wide data, Black/African-American students have been below 41% for one consecutive year.

Currently at what percent

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June 2024, K-5 students in EWS will improve reading proficiency at or above 41% as measured by the May 2024 FAST.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring, interventions, exemplar data, comprehensives, standards mastery/data tracking, classroom walk throughs, lesson plans, gradebooks

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cherry Gibson (cherrymg@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.)

Following the district guidelines, following district approved curriculum, 60 minutes uninterrupted time everyday, Really Great Reading, Flyleaf, Read Well, differentiate the groups based on need and skills

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Proven effective evidence/research based, provides consistent intervention and is specific to student need, provides sequential and systemic approach

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.

We will monitor through progress monitoring, interventions, exemplar data, comprehensives, standards mastery/data tracking, exit tickets specific to the skill, classroom walk throughs, lesson plans, gradebooks and PLCs.

Person Responsible: Cherry Gibson (cherrymg@leeschools.net)

By When: May 2024 FAST

#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.

2nd Grade ELA Proficiency: 2nd grade ELA is a priority because at this point we have to ensure students are mastering the foundational skills of ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, current second graders will increase their ELA proficiency from their 1st grade proficiency of 70% to 73% as measured by STAR FAST.

Monitoring:

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

Assessments that we will monitor include progress monitoring, Dibels, exemplars, iReady assessments. Walk throughs will be conducted to also monitor instruction, best practices and high yield strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cherry Gibson (cherrymg@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.)

2nd grade will have daily intervention of 60 minutes. Student groups will be differentiated and focus on what that group needs for intervention or extension.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This will ensure every student receives the instruction they need individually.

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.

- Students will attend intervention/extension daily for 60 minutes.
- Students will receive targeted intervention/extension during small group instruction within the classroom.
- Walk throughs will be conducted to ensure best practices and high yield strategies are being used.

Person Responsible: Cherry Gibson (cherrymg@leeschools.net)

By When: May 2024

#4. 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.

Third grade ELA Proficiency: 3rd grade will have its own school grade component this next year and we will be tracking student by student for the mastery of benchmarks.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, current third graders will increase their ELA proficiency from their 2nd grade proficiency of 59% to 62% as measured by FAST.

Monitoring:

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

Assessments that we will monitor include progress monitoring, exemplars, iReady. Walk throughs will be conducted to also monitor instruction, best practices and high yield strategies. 60 minute uninterrupted intervention block with specific instruction in phonics, comprehension, grammar and vocabulary.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cherry Gibson (cherrymg@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.)

3rd grade will have daily intervention of 60 minutes. Student groups will be differentiated and focus on what that group needs for intervention or extension. Small groups within the classroom will ensure students are instructed on grade level benchmarks with scaffolding as needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This will ensure every student receives the instruction they need.

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.

- Students will attend intervention/extension daily for 60 minutes.
- Students will receive targeted intervention/extension during small group instruction within the classroom.
- Walk throughs will be conducted to ensure best practices and high yield strategies are being used.

Person Responsible: Cherry Gibson (cherrymg@leeschools.net)

By When: May 2024.

#5. 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.

ELA Proficiency 3-5: Students in grades 3-5 will need to increase proficiency in ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, current students in grades 3-5 will increase their ELA proficiency from last year's (grades 2-4) proficiency of 55% to 58% as measured by FAST.

Monitoring:

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

Assessments that we will monitor include progress monitoring, exemplars, iReady. In addition, walk throughs will be conducted to ensure best teaching practices and strategies are used.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cherry Gibson (cherrymg@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 in grades 3-5 will have daily intervention of 60 minutes. Student groups will be differentiated and focus on what that group needs for intervention or extension.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This will ensure every student receives the instruction they need.

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.

- Students will attend intervention/extension daily for 60 minutes.
- Students will receive targeted intervention/extension during small group instruction within the classroom.
- Walk throughs will be conducted to ensure best practices and high yield strategies are being used.

Person Responsible: Cherry Gibson (cherrymg@leeschools.net)

By When: May 2024.

#6. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**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.

It is crucial that every student be taught by a highly effective teacher. Teacher and substitute shortages cause a significant impact on student learning and achievement. Students miss learning opportunities when there isn't a consistent, high qualified teacher. This also causes a strain on teammates, the climate, and the culture of the school.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June 2024, we will retain 90% of our new teaching staff for the 2024-2025 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Strong induction and mentoring program, monthly APPLES meetings, offer PLC support, admin support and communication, surveys and feedback to gauge teacher needs, clear expectations and procedures, parental/community support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tracy Lorenzini (tracylor@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.)

APPLES, district onboarding procedures

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Lack of retaining highly qualified teachers has a direct impact on student achievement. This also is associated with increased behavior problems, social-emotional adjustment, self esteem, and student attendance.

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 for monthly APPLES meetings, weekly staff communication, walk throughs, onboarding for new teachers, surveys

Person Responsible: Tracy Lorenzini (tracylor@leeschools.net)

By When: June 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

More than 50% of students in K-2 scored above 50% proficient.

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

The following data from PM 3 (FAST May 2023) was used to determine the grade levels with a critical need in ELA.

Grade 3: 57% scored below level 3

Grade 5: 58% scored below level 3

Based on this data, students currently in Grade 4 will be our area of focus. Grade 4 has many phonics gaps.

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

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By May 2024, 50% of students in 4th grade will score a level 3 or higher as measured by the FAST 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.

Assessments that we will monitor include progress monitoring, exemplars, iReady. Walk throughs will be conducted to also monitor instruction, best practices and high yield strategies. 60 minute uninterrupted intervention block with specific instruction in phonics, comprehension, grammar and vocabulary.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Gibson, Cherry , cherrymg@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?

Student is Grade 4 with phonics needs will participate in "Phonics for Reading". Students with comprehension and vocabulary will participate in "Magnetic Reading" and "iReady Scaffolding" lessons. Wonders Best Literature will be used to extend student learning.

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?

These programs are proven effective evidence/research based, provides consistent intervention and is specific to student need, provides sequential and systemic approach.

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
<p>To address the school's areas of focus related to literacy leadership, literacy coaching, assessment, and professional learning, it's essential to create a comprehensive plan involving multiple stakeholders and following best practices in education. Here are two to three action steps for each of these categories, along with detailed explanations:</p> <p>1. Literacy Leadership: a. Establish a Literacy Leadership Team: Form a dedicated team of administrators, teachers, and literacy specialists. This team should be responsible for setting the vision, goals, and strategies related to literacy improvement. The team will meet regularly to review progress and make informed decisions.</p> <p>b. Develop a Literacy Action Plan: Collaboratively create a literacy action plan that outlines specific goals, objectives, and timelines for improving literacy outcomes. This plan should align with state standards and the school's unique needs. Ensure the program includes measures to monitor progress and adjust strategies as needed.</p> <p>c. Promote a Culture of Literacy: Encourage and support a school-wide literacy culture by fostering a love for reading and writing among students and staff. Implement initiatives such as school-wide reading challenges, book clubs, and author visits to engage students and make literacy enjoyable.</p>	<p>Gibson, Cherry , cherrymg@leeschools.net</p>
<p>2. Literacy Coaching: a. Hire and Train Literacy Coaches: Recruit experienced educators or literacy specialists to serve as literacy coaches. These coaches should provide teachers with ongoing, job-embedded professional development, focusing on effective literacy instruction strategies and best practices.</p> <p>b. Individualized Teacher Support: Pair literacy coaches with teachers to provide personalized coaching sessions. These sessions should include observations, feedback, and modeling of effective instructional strategies. Ensure that coaching is non-evaluative and focused on professional growth.</p> <p>c. Collaborative Professional Learning Communities: Facilitate the formation of grade-level or subject-specific professional learning communities (PLCs). These PLCs should meet regularly to discuss literacy instruction, share resources, and problem-solve together. Literacy coaches can play a vital role in guiding these discussions.</p>	<p>Gibson, Cherry , cherrymg@leeschools.net</p>
<p>3. Assessment: a. Assessment Alignment: Review and align assessment tools and practices with the school's literacy goals and curriculum. Ensure that assessments are both formative and summative, providing valuable data to inform instruction. Explore the use of literacy-specific assessments such as running records, fluency checks, and comprehension assessments.</p> <p>b. Data Analysis and Response: Implement a systematic approach to data analysis. Regularly examine assessment data to identify students who may be struggling with literacy skills. Create data-driven intervention plans that include targeted support and resources for these students. Monitor their progress and adjust interventions as needed. Students track their own data in their AVID binders for goal setting.</p> <p>c. Professional Development on Assessment Literacy: Provide teachers with professional development on assessment literacy. Educators should understand the purpose of assessments, how to administer them effectively, and how to interpret results to inform instruction. This training can be led by literacy coaches or external experts.</p>	<p>Gibson, Cherry , cherrymg@leeschools.net</p>
<p>4. Professional Learning: a. Diverse Professional Development Opportunities: Offer a range of professional development opportunities that cater to teachers' diverse needs and preferences. These may include workshops, conferences, online courses, peer observations, and book studies. Ensure that professional learning is ongoing and accessible.</p> <p>b. Embed Literacy in Curriculum Work: Integrate literacy development into curriculum planning and development. Encourage teachers to collaborate on creating literacy-rich</p>	<p>Gibson, Cherry , cherrymg@leeschools.net</p>

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<p>units and lessons that align with content standards. This ensures that literacy is not seen as a separate skill but as an integral part of all subjects.</p> <p>c. Peer Learning Communities: Establish peer learning communities within the school, where teachers can share successful literacy practices and collaborate on solving challenges. These communities can meet regularly to discuss strategies, share resources, and provide support to one another.</p> <p>By implementing these action steps, the school can create a comprehensive approach to addressing its areas of focus related to literacy leadership, coaching, assessment, and professional learning. This holistic approach ensures that all aspects of the school's literacy program are aligned and contribute to improved literacy outcomes for students</p>	