



---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

# Athenian Academy Charter School

18851 OAK CENTER DRIVE, Fort Myers, FL 33967

<http://www.athenianacademy.org/ft-myers/>

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lee County School Board on 8/28/2023.

## 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.**

Athenian Academy's mission is to cultivate resilient learners through a culture of equity, growth, trust, and academic discovery.

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

Our vision is for our students to embody a diverse, multifaceted education to become impactful Global Citizens.

### 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
Cuveron, Douglas	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Oversee the operational management of the school facility, including the safety and security of the campus, and aligns the mission, vision, motto, and goals based on data and expected outcomes.</li> <li>*Ensures shared decision-making and accountability by developing and empowering school leaders</li> <li>*Enhances the culture and climate of the school by focusing on the mission and vision.</li> <li>*Develop and build student rapport and model positive relationships with teachers and students.</li> <li>*Supporting classroom management practices in the classroom. ( Created a school-wide Positive Behavior Program and digital system to encourage fidelity and data support)</li> <li>*Cultivate daily a positive yet academically driven school culture with all staff and the student body.</li> <li>*Supports and collaborates with the Administrative team to design professional learning activities that will enhance teacher effectiveness and student learning</li> </ul>
Anderson, Stacey	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Assist in the development of school-wide student services procedures for guidance, attendance, and discipline; including monitoring and accountability measures</li> <li>*Guide instruction and curriculum planning with Department leads and monitoring and ensuring fidelity</li> <li>*Supporting classroom management practices in the classroom.</li> <li>*Monitor and Intervene with Early Warning Systems.</li> <li>*Ensure the safety and security of the campus and students daily</li> <li>*Provide targeted instructional coaching with all teachers and a focus on new teachers in the Florida BEST Standards and school goals.</li> <li>*Works to plan and implement all district and state assessments.</li> <li>* Analyze school data with the Principal and data team leads to make instructional decisions.</li> <li>*Serves as an instructional leader for Algebra 1 and the K-2 Reading initiative</li> </ul>
Vavlas, Carianne	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Develop and implement with school leadership a student services team that provides links to community mental health resources and targeted support and intervention.</li> <li>*Exceptional Student Education and ESOL liaison with School ESOL and ESE teachers</li> <li>*Assist with curriculum planning with managing the newly adopted standards and state-adopted curriculum</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Monitor multi-tiered services of support for the fidelity of implementation.</li> <li>*Provide targeted academic and behavioral support and documentation through the framework of a Multitiered Support System or MTSS /RTI process.</li> <li>*Assist in the facilitation of student eligibility meetings.</li> <li>*Provide leadership and coaching to empower critical thinkers, enthusiastic readers, and ethical use of information.</li> </ul>

**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 leadership team members meet weekly, formally and informally. As this is a new school, leadership team meetings were held throughout the summer to review the vision and mission of the school and its implementation in the day-to-day operations. While maintaining this objective, a shift to accomplishing this began with ensuring qualified teachers and staff members understood and retained their stake in the school's success. Data team leads, department heads, and other school leads assisted in analyzing district and state assessments, providing input and perspective to our common goal.

**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 School Improvement Plan will be reviewed after each state's progress monitoring assessments, if not sooner. The goal is to use this past school year's school data to utilize the gains made over 2020-21 and 2021-22 SY (current SIP is based on) as the starting point for best practices used and which were effective. Although the population has fluctuated in student count and demographics, the same group(s) demonstrate the most significant achievement gap. Therefore, when we have our formal school leadership meetings to review our progress with new data, we will revisit this plan and be prepared to review and adjust, as needed, our goals and implementation strategies outlined in this plan.

<b>Demographic Data</b> Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	56%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	45%
<b>Charter School</b>	Yes
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT)
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: C



*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**Early Warning Systems**

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	10	8	11	7	16	12	6	11	14	95
One or more suspensions	3	7	4	4	3	1	10	8	5	45
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	3	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	6	25	11	13	11	16	14	8	8	112
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	9	15	5	3	3	49
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	6	25	11	13	11	16	14	8	8	112

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	12	11	9	9	10	14	8	76

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Absent 10% or more school days		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

**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 school days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

### ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

**On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.**

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	45	45	53	53	48	55	51		
ELA Learning Gains				50			56		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43			53		
Math Achievement*	57	48	55	51	37	42	53		
Math Learning Gains				44			50		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37			53		
Science Achievement*	48	47	52	27	47	54	41		
Social Studies Achievement*	78	60	68	74	51	59	69		
Middle School Acceleration	89	77	70	40	42	51			
Graduation Rate		51	74		43	50			
College and Career Acceleration		33	53		66	70			
ELP Progress	24	47	55	57	69	70	65		

*\* 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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	374
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	476
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	16	Yes	2	2
ELL	16	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
HSP	46			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	68			

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%
FRL	52			

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	28	Yes	1	1
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	44			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL				

**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	45			57			48	78	89			24
SWD	11			21							2	
ELL	9			24			8				4	24
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	43			43							2	
HSP	31			50			37	60	92		7	20
MUL												

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
PAC												
WHT	59			66			60	94	91		6	
FRL	42			56			38	80	85		7	30

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	53	50	43	51	44	37	27	74	40			57
SWD	27	36		20	29							
ELL	26	52	40	29	48	46		50				57
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	37	46	46	46	44	32	20	68				56
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	70	60		58	42		37	80				
FRL												

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	51	56	53	53	50	53	41	69				65
SWD	40			30								
ELL	25	55		38	45							65
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	38	48	46	41	42	36	28					63
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	67	64		66	59							
FRL	50			63								

**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	50%	48%	2%	54%	-4%
07	2023 - Spring	55%	44%	11%	47%	8%
08	2023 - Spring	49%	44%	5%	47%	2%
04	2023 - Spring	49%	56%	-7%	58%	-9%
06	2023 - Spring	41%	44%	-3%	47%	-6%
03	2023 - Spring	33%	42%	-9%	50%	-17%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	39%	52%	-13%	54%	-15%
07	2023 - Spring	76%	37%	39%	48%	28%
03	2023 - Spring	33%	55%	-22%	59%	-26%
04	2023 - Spring	59%	61%	-2%	61%	-2%
08	2023 - Spring	74%	60%	14%	55%	19%
05	2023 - Spring	50%	52%	-2%	55%	-5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	47%	43%	4%	44%	3%
05	2023 - Spring	43%	50%	-7%	51%	-8%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	96%	39%	57%	50%	46%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	74%	59%	15%	66%	8%

### 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 2020-21 and 2021-22 Sy data, the group with the most significant achievement gap was the SWD-Students with Disabilities. For these school years, this group scored 33% and 27% proficiency in ELA achievement, compared to the state average of 20% and 21% ( students without disabilities scored 56% and 57%), respectively. Analyzing this initial data, our team noted the 5% decline in our SWD population scoring proficient was indeed alarming when contrasting the proficiency percentage of students without disabilities.

(52% to 57%) Although we do not have enough data to support a "trend," per se, we certainly understand we need to address both deficits before this achievement gap increasingly becomes even more challenging than its current status.

This information prompted our team to analyze other school reports to see what contributing factors played a significant or equal role in these scores. We know, based on multiple reports such as Out-of-field teacher reports, student and teacher attendance reports, Student Discipline report summaries, and even school-level surveys sent out to staff members ( assessing morale and leadership confidence), all played a role in our SWDs' lack of growth. We experienced high teacher turnover and not enough teachers or support staff who were qualified and or ESE-certified. Additionally, remembering the years our data was derived, absenteeism with these students certainly played a role. Although the school was functioning in the "normal" classroom setting, the residue effects of digital platforms, Google classrooms, and blended learning to finally the return to a brick-and-mortar setting were more apparent with the SWD population. Attendance was a problem when trying to provide services on a Zoom platform. If they had computers and the internet, other challenges began to surface, such as the ability to maintain attention and possess the skills necessary for this unconventional learning platform. Another contributing factor was the lack of face-to-face specialized instruction which impeded many students with disabilities from making academic gains. Still, on our part, maintaining the academic momentum to close these achievement gaps was lacking. Our population of students who needed additional support and interventions grew school-wide, which this level meant we needed to look at our "core" which included our teachers, not just the materials or methods we were using.

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

Largest decline from 20-21 to 21-22 was Math Achievement in L25 students, a 16% decrease.

\*\*\*Attendance

\*\*\*Level 1 scores in MATH and ELA

\*\*\* ( 2 or more indicators within these combinations )

\*\*\* Hired new staff and focused on interventions in middle school during research classes



**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.**

Science achievement - 27.2% school average vs 52.7% state average

\*\*\*First year science teacher/change over in the middle of the year as former science teacher became Assistant Principal

\*\*\*Student transiency - new 5th and 8th grade students coming from out of state, county or from prior schooling with differing standards and achievement levels

\*\*\*Small testing pool increases impact on achievement percentages

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

ELL 11% increase of ELA achievement

\*\*\*Hired employee dedicated to ensuring extra support provided to ELL students

\*\*\*Push in and pull out of ELL students

\*\*\*District ESOL specialists issued training to staff regarding interpretation of WIDA scores and provided spectrum of instructional methods to assist English language learners.

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

\*\*Attendance

\*\*\*Level 1 Reading

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

\*Foundational reading skills across all grades

\*Creating strong department leads and teams who are able to maintain the momentum and vision for literacy.

(Ex. Creating common planning time for the K-2 team members to assist one another, encouraging collaboration and professional development catered to their grade level needs)

\*Opportunities for teachers to have professional learning opportunities relevant to them and, when possible monetary or other incentives to demonstrate administrative support

**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.

SWD achievement/scores below the Federal Index.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

By implementing a fully staffed ESE Coordinator and paraprofessional, iReady and Really Great Reading interventions, our SWD will increase proficiency in ELA by 20% and 15% in Math at the end of the 22-23 school year as determined by the FAST Assessment.

### Monitoring:

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

We will implement and utilize a fully staffed ESE Coordinator for the duration of the school year.

iReady and FAST monitoring will be used for monitoring desired outcome.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Douglas Cuveron (douglascu@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.)

\*iReady and Really Great Reading

Walk to reading interventions occur once per week for 45 minutes. Students are grouped according to reading level and provided explicit instruction on grade level. School instructional methods includes small group instruction and centers.

iReady is implemented within classroom to provide additional differentiation for both reading and math.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

iReady and Really Great Reading are both utilized for differentiated, individualized instruction and are approved by the State and Lee County.

### 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.

Hire full time ESE Coordinator and paraprofessional to assist with meeting service hours.

**Person Responsible:** Douglas Cuveron (douglascu@leeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/10/2023

ESE Department review incoming and new students IEP/504 plans. Meet with teachers during preplanning week to preview accommodations and services students will receive.

**Person Responsible:** Stacey Anderson (staceyaa@leeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/10/2023

Staff training regarding IEP, 504 and MTSS laws, policies and procedures.

**Person Responsible:** Douglas Cuveron (douglasscu@leeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/10/2023

ESE/504 tracking Google Form created and shared with teachers. Teachers will submit once per week to ensure accommodations are being provided and utilized by students.

**Person Responsible:** Douglas Cuveron (douglasscu@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Weekly, ongoing, entire school year.

Monthly meetings between ESE department and grade levels to review and discuss students with IEPs/504 and their progression.

**Person Responsible:** Douglas Cuveron (douglasscu@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Monthly, ongoing, entire school year.

Walk to reading interventions - once per week, students are grouped by reading levels and provided targeted instruction for 45 additional minutes. Iready and Really great reading will be utilized to conduct the lessons.

**Person Responsible:** Stacey Anderson (staceyaa@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Wednesdays, ongoing, entire school year.

FAST and iReady diagnostic testing.

**Person Responsible:** Douglas Cuveron (douglasscu@leeschools.net)

**By When:** FAST - three times per year iREady - three times per year

Data review of SWD FAST and IReady scores. Regrouping of pull outs/intervention groups based on individual need as determined by the data.

**Person Responsible:** Stacey Anderson (staceyaa@leeschools.net)

**By When:** After diagnostic testing and progress monitoring.

**#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Our top two indicators in the EWS was attendance and level 1 reading levels across grade levels K-8. To improve student attendance, establishing and maintaining a positive culture and environment is the first step to achieving this goal. Students that feel comfortable in school will want to come to school. Improving attendance will lead to a decrease of level 1 reading levels.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Total daily student attendance will increase 4% to 95% for the school year by implementing a PBIS system, creating and maintaining a positive culture and environment.

**Monitoring:**

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

Utilizing FOCUS for attendance records, checked weekly and monthly. Teachers will monitor students with excessive absences and refer them to our administration/MTSS to reach out to parents and form attendance contracts. iReady reading diagnostics, FAST progress monitoring will be conducted quarterly and three times per year, respectively.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Douglas Cuveron (douglascu@leeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

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

The school will implement PBIS in order to assist in cultivating the positive environment and culture that will hopefully improve student attendance. Attendance interventions will improve our Level 1 Reading results - iReady, Really Great Reading and small group interventions pulled weekly for 45 minutes in addition to standard instructional times.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PBIS is a system that focuses on teaching correct behaviors and rewards instead of punishments, cultivating a positive and supportive environment for staff and students. Lee County utilizes PBIS.

iReady is an intervention program approved by the FLDOE and Lee County. It provides differentiated instruction to users.

**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.

Establish attendance policy and procedures within rewritten parent and staff handbook.

**Person Responsible:** Douglas Cuveron (douglascu@leeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/10/2023

Review attendance procedures with staff during preplanning week - including notifying administration of students that are becoming chronically absent to possibly consider MTSS or attendance contracts.

**Person Responsible:** Douglas Cuveron (douglascu@leeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/10/2023

Revamp PBIS system and train staff on Class Dojo use as well as full training of PBIS, behavior interventions, reward systems, etc. during pre planning week.

**Person Responsible:** Douglas Cuveron (douglascu@leeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/10/2023

Two day attendance check in. Front office staff will call parents if students have not attended the first two days of school.

**Person Responsible:** Douglas Cuveron (douglascu@leeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14/2023

Ten day attendance check in. Front office staff will call parents if students have not attended the first 10 days of school and drop students if needed.

**Person Responsible:** Douglas Cuveron (douglascu@leeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/23/2023

Teachers will reach out to administration with students who are projected to be chronically absent in order to hold attendance meetings.

**Person Responsible:** Stacey Anderson (staceyaa@leeschools.net)

**By When:** 9/29/2023

Plan out reward days/weeks for attendance and PBIS rewards and share with stakeholders.

**Person Responsible:** Stacey Anderson (staceyaa@leeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/10/2023