

The School District of Lee County

# River Hall Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# River Hall Elementary School

2800 RIVER HALL PKWY, Alva, FL 33920

<http://rhe.leeschools.net/>

## Demographics

Principal: Jody Poulakis

Start Date for this Principal: 10/11/2022

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	92%
<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* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: C (45%) 2020-21: (40%) 2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (45%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Kati Pearson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

## 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 Florida Department of Education 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.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide a safe, secure environment that ensures the development of the whole child. Through successful experiences, all children will grow academically, socially, emotionally, physically and creatively.

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

To educate all students to their fullest potential so they may become productive members of society.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Poulakis, Jody	Principal	Instructional leader, facilitates PLC process and sub group task forces. Monitors implementation of SIP and progress toward student achievement goals.
Tweet, Adam	Assistant Principal	
Remy, Lacie	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Peer Collaborative Teacher
Rodriguez, Jane	Instructional Coach	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Tuesday 10/11/2022, Jody Poulakis

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

17

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

67

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

990

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.**

24

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.**

18

**Demographic Data**

**Early Warning Systems**

**Using prior year's 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	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	170	164	184	179	135	153	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	985
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	4	7	5	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA	0	8	22	38	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Course failure in Math	0	4	3	16	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	31	10	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	23	6	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	4	4	31	2	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

**Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	2	3	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Students retained two or more times	0	5	5	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 10/11/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	171	194	152	164	154	180	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1015
Attendance below 90 percent	14	36	44	35	26	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	193
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	5	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	3	19	10	19	16	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
Course failure in Math	3	8	4	20	21	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	25	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	35	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	3	12	9	20	33	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	5	1	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	171	194	152	164	154	180	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1015
Attendance below 90 percent	14	36	44	35	26	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	193
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	5	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	3	19	10	19	16	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
Course failure in Math	3	8	4	20	21	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	25	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	35	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	3	12	9	20	33	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	5	1	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data Review**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	43%	52%	56%	39%			52%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	57%	61%	37%			54%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	47%	52%	39%			45%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	50%	59%	60%	43%			59%	62%	63%
Math Learning Gains	49%	62%	64%	41%			69%	65%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	50%	55%	42%			62%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	37%	51%	51%	36%			41%	52%	53%

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**



ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	47%	58%	-11%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	51%	55%	-4%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2022					
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	56%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	46%	61%	-15%	62%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	65%	62%	3%	64%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
05	2022					
	2019	58%	58%	0%	60%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	39%	50%	-11%	53%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						

**Subgroup Data Review**

2022 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	7	44	42	19	39	33	13				
ELL	18	48	52	29	56	52	8				
BLK	41	40		42	52		7				
HSP	34	55	50	42	49	44	36				
MUL	46			38							
WHT	52	53	39	60	51	33	46				
FRL	34	49	39	41	43	31	26				
2021 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	10	28	38	14	44	62	5				
ELL	12	30	29	14	37	44	12				
BLK	17	14		25	23		10				
HSP	35	38	38	35	41	38	26				
MUL	17			38							
WHT	50	45		55	45		52				
FRL	27	28	50	32	33	50	21				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	24	32	25	39	62	55	19				
ELL	26	47	48	49	74	67	13				
BLK	30	43	27	41	61	55	27				
HSP	47	56	59	54	68	64	31				
MUL	50			71	80						
WHT	63	57	33	68	71	62	54				
FRL	43	56	48	52	69	66	36				

**ESSA Data Review**

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	368
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	36
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	42
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	48
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

**What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?**

Overall ELA, Math and Science proficiency scores increased as did overall learning gains in ELA and Math. Learning gains of the lowest 25th percentile increased in ELA and dropped slightly (4 pts) in math. Subgroup data varies. SWD subgroup shows a 3 year decline in ELA, with increases in learning gains year over year. SWD Math proficiency increased as did Science. ELL subgroup shows increases in overall proficiency for ELA and Math with a slight decline in Science. Black subgroup shows an increase in ELA and Math proficiency and a decline in science. FRL subgroup shows increases in overall proficiency in ELA, Math, and Science.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?**

Greatest need for improvement is ELA proficiency (43%) and science proficiency (37%)

**What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?**

Contributing factors include not being fully staffed in testing grade levels and excessive absences due to COVID. We had multiple intermediate teachers resign in January which impacted core instruction as well as intervention schedules. Those teachers had the L25 groups and the students in the SWD subgroup. Substitutes were placed in classrooms because we could not hire fully certified teachers to replace those lost. Students and staff were hit hard with COVID and missed critical instructional and intervention time.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

Areas of greatest improvement include learning gains in ELA (15%) and in Math (8%) Overall ELA proficiency increased 4% and overall Matg proficiency increased 8%

**What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

The intervention block focused on strong core instruction and small group instruction in priority standards. Intervention block also focused on priority standards. 3rd grade used SRA for intervention in ELA the entire school year, combined with comprehension and vocabulary interventions.

**What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?**

Strong core instruction, increased time spent reading grade level material and additional small group instruction in ELA. Intervention and after school tutoring will also address skill gaps.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

Professional development will include using iready and FAST data to group students for instruction (grouping profiles) and intervention (instructional path in iready). Extensive professional development with the new BEST standards and new Wonders curriculum will be provided. PLC work will focus on use of exemplar and PM data to group students for specific standards based instruction.

**Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.**

A reading coach was hired to support intervention and accelerate closing of the gap in K-3.

**Areas of Focus**

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**  
 Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

2022 FSA ELA proficiency was 43%. 3 subgroups fell below 41% proficient in ELA.

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

We will increase overall ELA proficiency from 43% to 53%, as measured by FAST PM 3, by May 2023.

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

We will monitor ELA proficiency using progress monitoring data from the mid-year iReady diagnostic and the FAST PM 2 window,

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jody Poulakis (jodyp@leeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
 Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Wonders Curriculum for core instruction. iReady Phonics and Magnetic Reading (comprehension) for intervention.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
 Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

District selected curriculum for core instruction and intervention.

**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.

Teachers will use iReady diagnostic (BOY and MOY) instructional grouping profiles to place students in small groups for instruction during the core block. Groups are fluid and monitored/adjusted each time as assessment is given.

**Person Responsible**

Lacie Remy (lacierr@leeschools.net)

Teachers will build intervention groups using district standards based exemplar data & quarterly comprehensive data. Teachers collaborate and share progress monitoring data throughout the PLC cycle to re-teach and re-assess to monitor progress toward mastery of standards.

**Person Responsible**

Jody Poulakis (jodyp@leeschools.net)

Teachers monitor iReady usage to ensure students are meeting weekly goals to complete 45 minutes of ELA in the learning path and passing all lessons with at least 70% proficiency.

**Person Responsible**

Adam Tweet (adamct@leeschools.net)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**  
 Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

2022 FSA Math proficiency was 50% SWD subgroup fell below 41% proficient in Math (19%)

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

We will increase overall Math proficiency from 50% to 60%, as measured by FAST PM 3, by May 2023.

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

We will monitor Math proficiency using progress monitoring data from the mid-year iReady diagnostic and the FAST PM 2 window,

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Adam Tweet (adamct@leeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
 Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Math core curriculum Envision Math. Intervention using iready BEST practice and problem solving workbooks.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
 Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

District selected core curriculum.

**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.

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

2022 FSA Science proficiency was 37%. ELA proficiency was 43% so mastering science content was the critical need.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

We will increase overall Science proficiency from 37% to 50% as measured by the state Science assessment, by May 2023.

**Monitoring:**

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

Teachers will use the science progress monitoring assessments to monitor progress toward mastery of the science standards.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Adam Tweet (adamct@leeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Students will use interactive science notebooks to support core instruction as well as participate in live investigations that directly address priority standards.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Nature of Science standards were the lowest for our students. Increasing time spent in live investigations and processing through the experiment and its results should improve student mastery of those standards.

**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.

Provide copies of the 4th and 5th grade interactive notebooks to teachers

**Person Responsible**

Jody Poulakis (jodyp@leeschools.net)

Monitor progress monitoring assessment data and ensure teachers use it to plan for re-teaching and intervention during PLC

**Person Responsible**

Jody Poulakis (jodyp@leeschools.net)

Monitor core content instruction for pacing and adherence to district scope, sequence, and pacing as well as rigor of instruction.

**Person Responsible**

Jody Poulakis (jodyp@leeschools.net)

**RAISE**

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.



**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**

All grade levels K-2 are required to have a 90 minute uninterrupted reading block including whole group and small group instruction, utilizing Wonders curriculum for core instruction. They are also required to have 60 minutes of ELA intervention and enrichment. End of year iReady Reading Diagnostic indicated 15% of Kinder, 55% of first graders, and 48% of second graders. were not on track to score a level 3 or above on the statewide standardized ELA assessment.

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

All grade levels 3-5 are required to have a 90 minute uninterrupted reading block including whole group and small group instruction, utilizing Wonders curriculum for core instruction. They are also required to have 60 minutes of ELA intervention and enrichment. 57% of our students in grades 3-5 scored below Level 3 on the 2022 FSA ELA assessment. (48%in third, 43% in fourth, and 38% in fifth.)

**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 new 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: Measureable Outcome(s)**

We will increase proficiency in Kindergarten ELA from 85% proficient to 90% , first grade from 63% to 73%, second grade from 52% to 62%, as measured by iReady in May 2023.

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

We will increase proficiency in third grade from 62% to 70%, from 44% to 55% in fourth grade, and from 30% to 50% in fifth grade, as measured by iReady in May 2023.

**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 take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

ELA proficiency will be monitored using district exemplar and quarterly comprehensive assessments as well as iReady Diagnostics, STAR Literacy, and FAST.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Poulakis, Jody, jodyp@leeschools.net

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

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. Â§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?

All grade levels are required to have a 90 minute uninterrupted reading block including whole group and small group instruction, utilizing Wonders curriculum for core instruction. Grade levels are also required to have 60 minutes of ELA intervention and enrichment. Scientifically based reading instruction includes explicit and systematic instruction in the following areas: Oral Language, Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Fluency, Vocabulary, Comprehension as well as Writing in Response to Reading. The decision tree is used to place students into intervention groups. Ongoing progress monitoring indicates mastery of foundational skills and is used in the instructional cycle to determine what has been mastered and what skills need to be re-taught. All evidence-based programs are aligned to the BEST ELA standards and the Lee County Reading Plan.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific 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 practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The Florida decision tree is used to place students into intervention groups. Each grade level utilizes a comprehensive intervention program. Students will be strategically placed utilizing their i-Ready and screener data to ensure the program targets their needs. A walk to read model is used as a result of the specific nature of student placement. K-2 Literacy Coach and 3-5 Literacy Contact support teachers in data mining and determine which students need which programs. Evidence based programs being used include Read Well for Kindergarten and First Grade. Fly Leaf is used with second graders and iReady Phonics is used for 3rd through fifth graders. All the evidence based programs meet the phonics needs of our

students. The programs were selected by the school district to address the needs of our target population. Progress in these programs is monitored weekly in PLC teams and focus groups monthly.

**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
Literacy Leadership Council will meet monthly to review K-5 ELA progress monitoring data, give feedback to teachers, and communicate progress to Lacie Remy, PCT in charge of professional development.	Poulakis, Jody, jodyp@leeschools.net
K-2 Lit Coach and MTSS Reading Coach will pull small groups of students, substantially below grade level, for reading instruction and monitor progress.	Rodriguez, Jane, janevr@leeschools.net
Provide professional development in core curriculum and intervention curriculum to all ELA teachers	Remy, Lacie, lacierr@leeschools.net