Six Mile Charter Academy School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Six Mile Charter Academy

6851 LANCER AVE, Fort Myers, FL 33912

www.sixmilecharter.org

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lee County School Board on 9/26/2023.

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.

Empowering students to lead and achieve.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Six Mile Charter Academy will inspire greatness in our pursuit of academic excellence as we develop today's leaders.

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
Fields, Samantha	Principal	The role of the principal is to create the plan with the leadership team and stakeholders and be open with communication, input and feedback. The principal will have weekly meetings to monitor SIP implementation and action steps. Some responsibilities include the school budget for researched based resources, school compliance, state and district reporting, board meeting facilitation, providing professional development and supporting teachers, monitoring data and instructional practices, monitor strategic planning action steps and team lead support.
Salter Johnson, Elizabeth	Assistant Principal	The role of the assistant principal is to help the principal create the plan with the leadership team and stakeholders and be open with communication, input and feedback. The principal will have weekly meetings to monitor SIP implementation and action steps. Some responsibilities include the school budget for researched based resources, school compliance, state and district reporting, board meeting facilitation, providing professional development and supporting teachers, monitoring data and instructional practices, monitor strategic planning action steps and team lead support.
Colla, Abbie	School Counselor	The role of the school counselor is to assist the principal and assistant principal in creating the plan with the leadership team and stakeholders and be open with communication, input and feedback. The principal will have weekly meetings to monitor SIP implementation and action steps. Some responsibilities include the school budget for researched based resources, school compliance, state and district reporting, board meeting facilitation, providing professional development and supporting teachers, monitoring data and instructional practices, monitor strategic planning action steps and team lead support.

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.

During July stakeholders participated in strategic planning meetings where data was reviewed and goals were created. Initiatives were discussed based on school needs tied to data. Action plans were discussed and grade level and school wide goals were determined.

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 will ensure the implementation of approved research based programs and curriculum by meeting weekly to consider student assessment data and classroom observation data. They will discuss professional development needs and analyze instructional focus plans results and common monthly assessments. The team will provide support and guidance in the area of curriculum and instruction by reviewing lesson plans and standards mastery. Our Progress monitoring coach will have individual teacher data chats and observations will occur during instructional time with targeted small groups. They will also implement progress monitoring through personalized learning plans and involve research based reading strategies and skills. Data will be used from NWEA benchmarks, RRR, Lexia, and progress learning to determine student needs which will be monitored by the teacher, parent, and administration.

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)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	72%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	62%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) 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: B
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	1	1	0	1	0	0	3	0	1	7
One or more suspensions	0	4	3	6	6	7	12	12	4	54
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	6	9	12	7	1	14	0	0	49
Course failure in Math	0	2	4	4	5	3	18	0	6	42
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	18	21	51	32	17	157
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	15	23	20	52	36	16	162
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	9	8	21	0	0	0	38

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	2	3	17	13	16	45	28	10	134

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	18	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	3	2	2	2	0	1	0	10

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	
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*	39	45	53	40	48	55	45		
ELA Learning Gains				43			47		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				35			32		
Math Achievement*	37	48	55	35	37	42	32		
Math Learning Gains				48			29		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45			28		
Science Achievement*	37	47	52	26	47	54	33		
Social Studies Achievement*	77	60	68	80	51	59	66		
Middle School Acceleration	79	77	70	72	42	51	65		
Graduation Rate		51	74		43	50			
College and Career Acceleration		33	53		66	70			
ELP Progress	59	47	55	56	69	70	51		

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	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	368
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
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	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	480
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	11	Yes	4	2
ELL	36	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	69			
BLK	39	Yes	2	
HSP	52			
MUL	38	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	54			

	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	46			

	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	17	Yes	3	1
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	76			
BLK	34	Yes	1	
HSP	45			
MUL	59			
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	44			

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	39			37			37	77	79			59
SWD	17			6			11				3	
ELL	29			29			25				5	59
AMI												
ASN	62			81			64				3	
BLK	28			30			21	72			5	
HSP	41			30			33	81	70		7	68
MUL	29			47							2	

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	45			43			45	79	81		6	
FRL	36			31			23	69	71		7	54

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	40	43	35	35	48	45	26	80	72			56
SWD	13	26	24	7	17	7	8	30				
ELL	35	45	35	33	44	29	23	91				56
AMI												
ASN	67	75		71	90							
BLK	27	34	24	18	45	46	7	71				
HSP	36	39	35	31	42	41	23	75	67			60
MUL	60	50		60	64							
PAC												
WHT	46	48	41	44	50	47	40	88	60			
FRL	31	42	33	25	43	45	21	75	62			58

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	45	47	32	32	29	28	33	66	65			51
SWD	15	22	21	3	21	28	0	50				
ELL	44	53	38	22	19	27	12	45				51
AMI												
ASN	85	73		69	47							
BLK	31	41	36	21	21	15	25	72	60			
HSP	44	47	24	29	29	26	29	55	63			42
MUL	61	43		67	43							
PAC												
WHT	48	47	50	33	32	42	37	75	54			
FRL	46	47	29	32	30	31	30	61	67			47

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	25%	48%	-23%	54%	-29%
07	2023 - Spring	53%	44%	9%	47%	6%
08	2023 - Spring	44%	44%	0%	47%	-3%
04	2023 - Spring	43%	56%	-13%	58%	-15%
06	2023 - Spring	28%	44%	-16%	47%	-19%
03	2023 - Spring	39%	42%	-3%	50%	-11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	23%	52%	-29%	54%	-31%
07	2023 - Spring	35%	37%	-2%	48%	-13%
03	2023 - Spring	38%	55%	-17%	59%	-21%
04	2023 - Spring	43%	61%	-18%	61%	-18%
08	2023 - Spring	50%	60%	-10%	55%	-5%
05	2023 - Spring	23%	52%	-29%	55%	-32%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	29%	43%	-14%	44%	-15%
05	2023 - Spring	23%	50%	-27%	51%	-28%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	70%	39%	31%	50%	20%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	43%	57%	48%	52%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	77%	50%	27%	63%	14%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	72%	59%	13%	66%	6%

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.

Data shows the challenges was Science overall, Students with Disabilities and Black Subgroup. This trend is across grade levels and continues to be a focus of
additional resources.

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

Our lowest performing declining data set is ELA Proficiencies and LGs and Science as a school.
We attribute this to lack of consistency and appropriate rigor when planning for instruction. The addition of new standards and materials took time to learn and implement at their previous level of instruction. This caused ineffective and inconsistent instruction for struggling students

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.

The largest gap is Students with Disabilities. We had inconsistencies with support and instruction. Students were not being held to the true rigor of the standards.

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

Math LGs and Math L25 LGs. We focused heavily on math facts and repetition as well as intentional small groups.

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

The most alarming from EWS was the 52 level 1s from 6th grade math and also 45 6th graders that have 2 or more indicators.

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

Improve ELA proficiencies and LGs
Increase SWD proficiencies
Increase Black subgroup

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

#1. 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.

In order to support a high achieving culture of excellence that meets the needs of all learners, Six Mile Charter Academy uses Attitude is Altitude (AiA) and Ron Clark House System School to support PBIS. Students and staff work together to set and track academic leadership, and personal goals. We focus to have all students set goals and track them. With Ron Clark Houses each grade level is a different house and each grade level competes against each other to gain points for attendance, work completion, positive behavior and more.

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

We plan to increase our staff, parent and student surveys by 5% for engagement and equity.

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

The Incentives committee will regularly monitor and implement school wide incentives as well as plan PBIS parties quarterly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Samantha Fields (samanthafi@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.)

We will use Attitude is Altitude (AiA), evidence based comprehensive model that builds leadership and life skills
in students, creates a high-trust school culture, and lays the foundation for sustained academic achievement. We will connect these skills with cognitive strategies to support student success. In addition to classroom teaches implementing the AiA we will offer a specials rotation for
Leadership in elementary classes and offer Engaged Citizenship as middle school
electives.

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

By implementing Attitude is Altitude (AiA) as a common language
we will be supporting a positive culture and connecting cognitive strategies to support student success.

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.

Implementation of Attitude is Altitude in all grade levels

Person Responsible: Samantha Fields (samanthafi@leeschools.net)

By When: June 2023

#2. 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.

Based on State assessment data, Students with Disabilities performed below the 41% Federal Index Threshold with a level of 17%. This subgroup has been identified as an area of focus for the school in order to close the achievement gaps between students with and without disabilities in both proficiency and learning gains.

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

By the end of the school year the Students with Disabilities subgroup population will increase above the 41% Federal Index Threshold by 25% on the Every Students Succeed Act. This will indicate a 42% Federal Index Threshold for the 22-23 school year for Students With Disabilities. Each category will increase the percent by 10% points.

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

School Leadership team will monitor Professional Learning Communities (PLC) meetings and data chats with the ESE specialists and classroom teachers on the implementation of IEP services. Administrators and Curriculum Resource Teachers will use classroom walkthroughs to monitor that interventions are implemented as planned. Following unit assessments and benchmark assessments, PLCs will review student data and small group differentiated instructional plans. Administrators will monitor the implementation of the support facilitation schedules and progress towards IEP goals will also be used to measure for the desired outcomes. Teachers will be responsible for documenting implementation through lesson plans, keeping data current, and IEP meeting notes. Classroom walkthroughs and observations will be entered in the schools evaluation tool which is Robert Marzano aligned.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Samantha Fields (samanthafi@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.)

During the school year, teachers will make content, skills, and concepts explicit by modeling thinking while solving problems, enacting strategies, and classifying concepts. Teachers will use researched based instructional strategies during instruction and will focus on appropriate use of scaffolding with students with different levels of depth of knowledge to ensure students understand content and complete tasks successfully. The instructional strategies will be monitored when the school support team conducts classroom walkthroughs and observations and entering the data in the Student Success Platform that used Robert Marzano indicators.

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

In order for students to achieve standards mastery, learners must be actively engaged in processing content through the teaching and learning process that involves interaction among the teacher, the students, and the content. High yield instructional strategies, such as non-linguistic representation, student goal setting, higher order thinking, summarizing and note taking and identifying similarities and differences will be implemented focusing on small group instruction.

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.

Deliver ongoing professional development that will focus on implementing accommodations in a general education classroom that address the academic and social needs of Students with Disabilities.

Person Responsible: Samantha Fields (samanthafi@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).

We will complete a needs assessment to review resource allocations and prioritize resources for Students with Disabilities. We will look at per pupil expenditures, instructional time, early intervention, tiered resources, teacher quality, and specialized instructional support personnel. We will look at all funding resources including both general funds and funds dedicated to school improvement activities. This review will include a variety of stakeholders including parents, teachers, grants personnel, facilities personnel, curriculum specialists, and Administration.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

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

No