Orange River Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Orange River Elementary School

4501 UNDERWOOD DR, Fort Myers, FL 33905

http://ore.leeschools.net/

Demographics

Principal: Cayce Staruk

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	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.

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.

Table of Contents

Orange River Elementary School

4501 UNDERWOOD DR, Fort Myers, FL 33905

http://ore.leeschools.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	94%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

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 school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://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.

Orange River Elementary's mission is to empower and motivate students to be lifetime learners while promoting high achievement and success through a love of learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Success For All

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Staruk, Cayce	Principal	Our School Leadership Team meets weekly and members of our Leadership team facilitate our weekly Grade Level Professional Learning Communities. Our School Leadership team also plans and implements our weekly staff professional development. The team analyzes grade level data and supports our School Improvement Plan. The team is involved in curriculum decisions and resource support for teachers.
Misewicz, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Our School Leadership Team meets weekly and members of our Leadership team facilitate our weekly Grade Level Professional Learning Communities. Our School Leadership team also plans and implements our weekly staff professional development. The team analyzes grade level data and supports our School Improvement Plan. The team is involved in curriculum decisions and resource support for teachers.
Bumm, Stephanie	Instructional Coach	Ms. Bumm is a Peer Collaborative Teacher and Instructional Coach. Our School Leadership Team meets weekly and members of our Leadership team facilitate our weekly Grade Level Professional Learning Communities. Our School Leadership team also plans and implements our weekly staff professional development. The team analyzes grade level data and supports our School Improvement Plan. The team is involved in curriculum decisions and resource support for teachers.
Scott, Lynne	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Corbett oversees our ESOL school wide compliance, acts as Testing Coordinator and coordinates and monitors MTSS meetings and data. Our School Leadership Team meets weekly and members of our Leadership team facilitate our weekly Grade Level Professional Learning Communities. Our School Leadership team also plans and implements our weekly staff professional development. The team analyzes grade level data and supports our School Improvement Plan. The team is involved in curriculum decisions and resource support for teachers.
Nettles, Katie	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach K-2
Johnson, Amy	Instructional Coach	Peer Collaborative Teacher
LeBlanc, Lauren	Teacher, K-12	Resource Teacher
Dunn, Heather	Teacher, K-12	
Brown, Alyssa	Teacher, K-12	
Morando, Betty	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Cayce Staruk

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A

Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here]().	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by 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	131	124	123	126	135	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	747
Attendance below 90 percent	5	7	19	9	10	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	3	8	20	12	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in Math	0	7	8	10	9	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	15	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	0	3	8	11	20	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60

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

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 10/23/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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	128	129	129	144	138	141	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	809
Attendance below 90 percent	17	15	12	18	12	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
One or more suspensions	5	1	0	1	3	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA or Math	12	19	31	49	36	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	174
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	58	51	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167

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	7	5	3	46	34	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130

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	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Prior Year - Updated

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	128	129	129	144	138	141	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	809
Attendance below 90 percent	17	15	12	18	12	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
One or more suspensions	5	1	0	1	3	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA or Math	12	19	31	49	36	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	174
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	58	51	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167

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	7	5	3	46	34	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130

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	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
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	2019			2018		
	School	**District**	**State**	**School**	**District**	**State**
ELA Achievement	40%	57%	57%	36%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	45%	56%	58%	43%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	50%	53%	52%	49%	52%
Math Achievement	55%	62%	63%	56%	60%	61%
Math Learning Gains	75%	65%	62%	60%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	66%	54%	51%	52%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	36%	52%	53%	41%	51%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**						**Total**
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
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**
03	2019	35%	58%	-23%	58%	-23%
	2018	45%	55%	-10%	57%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	37%	55%	-18%	58%	-21%
	2018	36%	53%	-17%	56%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	38%	54%	-16%	56%	-18%
	2018	40%	52%	-12%	55%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	42%	61%	-19%	62%	-20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	47%	58%	-11%	62%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison	-5%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	55%	62%	-7%	64%	-9%
	2018	51%	58%	-7%	62%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison	4%					
Cohort Comparison	8%					
05	2019	55%	58%	-3%	60%	-5%
	2018	67%	57%	10%	61%	6%
Same Grade Comparison	-12%					
Cohort Comparison	4%					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	32%	50%	-18%	53%	-21%
	2018	39%	52%	-13%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison	-7%					
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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	26	38	46	39	65	60					
ELL	32	40	33	55	78	69	35				
BLK	30	31		27	47						
HSP	37	43	34	56	76	68	35				
WHT	71	79		71	86						
FRL	41	47	44	56	73	60	38				
2018 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	6	36	36	31	76	75					
ELL	32	50	49	53	61	55	22				
BLK	32	57		22	46						
HSP	42	54	51	57	63	56	41				
WHT	64	41		88	100						
FRL	43	54	47	57	64	58	40				

2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	16	32		21	35	45					
ELL	24	32	48	54	55	53	18				
BLK	20	59		22	44						
HSP	34	40	48	59	61	53	43				
WHT	58	58		54	58						
FRL	33	42	54	54	58	53	36				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	408
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	50
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
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

Asian Students	
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

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	34
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - 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	77
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	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Our ELA L25's showed the lowest performance at 36% as well as our black sub group which was at 34% meeting standards. A contributing factor is our number of ESOL-LY students (481 LY students in grades K-5, 34 LF students) Another contributing factor is that 100% of our student population are economically disadvantaged

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

Our ELA L25% showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Last year we had 51% Learning Gains and this school year we had 36% Learning Gains for a difference of -15. A contributing factor is the number of ESOL-LY students in our lowest 25%. 100% of our student population are economically disadvantaged.

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 had the greatest gap when compared to the state average for a difference of 19.
ELA Proficiency also has a considerable gap compared to the state average for a difference of 16.
Our large ESOL- LY population contributed to this gap and trends at our school.

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

Our Math Learning Gains and Math L25% Learning Gains showed the most improvement this school year. A positive gain of +11 and +10. Standards based teaching, small group instruction with highly effective instructors, after school tutoring, targeted instruction of some students during their Art/Music block.In addition, data analysis of individual students paired with prescriptive instruction contributed to this positive gain.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators. The number of Level 1 students in grades 3, 4 and 5.

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

1. ELA Proficiency 3-5 (including Subgroup-Black)
2. ELA Learning Gains/ELA L25
3. Science

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Science achievement has consistently ranged between 36% and 41% proficient over the last five years. Orange River has shown to be below the state average of 53% and the district average of 52%.
Measurable Outcome:	In 2019-2020, science proficiency will increase from 36% to 40% according to the school grade accountability report. Our Science Coach will support classroom teachers as well as instruct students in the Science standards.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cayce Staruk (caycels@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	SIOP Lesson Planning and Instructional Delivery
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	SIOP is made up of of eight components and 33 features that target ELL students' learning through HIgh Yield Strategies. This model of instruction incorporates the following evidence based strategies: problem solving, predicting, organizing, summarizing, categorizing, evaluating, and self-monitoring. Teachers consistently provide or use scaffolding techniques (providing the right amount of support to move students from one level of understanding to a higher level) throughout the lesson. In addition, teachers use a variety of question types, including those that promote higher order thinking throughout the lesson (literal, analytical, and interpretive questions).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Increasing the amount of science direct instruction by both the teacher and science coach
2. One hour hands-on science lab every two weeks in addition to classroom experiments
3. Implementation of Argument Driven Inquiry
4. Standards based tracking of science standards
5. Science PLC to analyze data and plan for individual student need

Person Responsible Cayce Staruk (caycels@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area was lowest in achievement (bottom 300 in state, and near bottom in school district).ELA proficiency was overall at 40% according to school grade report. The grade level breakdown is as follows: 3rd grade 35%, 4th grade 37% and 5th grade 38% proficiency. WIthin our ELA proficiency our Black Subgroup has declined. Last year the Subgroup was at 57% Learning Gains and this year was 31%. Our overall ELA proficiency for this subgroup was at 32% and dropped to 30%. The state grade ELA proficiency average is higher than each grade level due to the number of students that count for school grade. Along with the classroom teacher Peer Collaborative Teachers and Resource Teachers will support students according to a prescriptive plan and schedule.
Measurable Outcome:	In 2020-2021, Orange River will increase the overall ELA proficiency from 40% to 43% according to the state school grade accountability report. In the 2020-2021 school year Orange River will increase the overall proficiency of our Black Subgroup from 34% to 38% and ELA Learning Gains from 31% to 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cayce Staruk (caycels@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	SIOP Lesson Planning and Instructional Delivery
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	SIOP is made up of of eight components and 33 features that target ELL students' learning through HIgh Yield Strategies. This model of instruction incorporates the following evidence based strategies: problem solving, predicting, organizing, summarizing, categorizing, evaluating, and self-monitoring. Teachers consistently provide or use scaffolding techniques (providing the right amount of support to move students from one level of understanding to a higher level) throughout the lesson. In addition, teachers use a variety of question types, including those that promote higher order thinking throughout the lesson (literal, analytical, and interpretive questions).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Training new teachers and supporting experienced teachers in the SIOP Model.
2. Ongoing professional development throughout the school year.
3. Monitoring of SIOP Model lesson plans through Oncourse.
4. Walkthroughs
5. Lesson Studies
6. Analyze ELA data and Subgroup (Black) data. Ongoing progress monitoring.

Person Responsible   Cayce Staruk (caycels@leeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area was lowest in achievement (bottom 300 in state, and near bottom in school district). ELA bottom 25% achievement was at 36% according to the school grade accountability report. Orange River scored the lowest in the school district.
Measurable Outcome:	In 2020-2021, Orange River will increase ELA achievement in the lowest 25% from 36% to 50% according to the school grade accountability report. Along with the classroom teacher Peer Collaborative Teachers and Resource Teachers will support students according to a prescriptive plan and schedule.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Crissy Stout (crissyws@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	SIOP Lesson Planning and Instructional Delivery Growth Mind Set PBIS Standards Tracking of students in lowest 25%/Fluency/and Comprehension Attendance Tracking of students in the lowest 25%
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	SIOP is made up of of eight components and 33 features that target ELL students' learning through HIgh Yield Strategies. This model of instruction incorporates the following evidence based strategies: problem solving, predicting, organizing, summarizing, categorizing, evaluating, and self-monitoring. Teachers consistently provide or use scaffolding techniques (providing the right amount of support to move students from one level of understanding to a higher level) throughout the lesson. In addition, teachers use a variety of question types, including those that promote higher order thinking throughout the lesson (literal, analytical, and interpretive questions).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify bottom 25% in ELA using data from FSA/Castle
2. Assigning students to a highly effective teacher
3. Scheduling blocks of interventions with highly effective teacher
4. Analyzing area of instructional need, providing instruction, and assessing
5. Monitoring for standards mastery and making changes in groupings as needed

Person Responsible	Cayce Staruk (caycels@leeschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ORE had 16 out of school suspensions during the 19-20 school year. ORE will find alternative ways to support students experiencing behavioral challenges rather than out of school suspensions.

Measurable Outcome:	In 20-21-Orange River will decrease the number of out of school suspensions for 16 to 14. Our Behavior Specialist will support our classroom teachers, Administration and Behavior Intervention students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cayce Staruk (caycels@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Orange River administration will use progressive discipline and PBIS to decrease out of school suspensions. Some evidence based strategies are: PBS strategies include altering the classroom environment, increasing predictability and scheduling, increasing choice making, adapting the curriculum, appreciating positive behaviors, and teaching replacement skills. In 19-20 ORE received Gold Status for our PBIS program.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Progressive Discipline is district initiative and supported by the Student Code of Conduct. ORE will incorporate PBIS-The broad purpose of PBIS is to improve the effectiveness, efficiency and equity of schools and other agencies. PBIS improves social, emotional and academic outcomes for all students, including students with disabilities and students from underrepresented groups. PBIS has a few important guiding principles that will be implemented throughout the learning environment. Every child can learn proper behavior. Stepping in early can prevent more serious behavior problems. Each child is different and schools need to provide many kinds of behavior support. How schools teach behavior should be based on research and science. Following a child's behavioral progress is important. Schools must gather and use data to make decisions about behavior problems.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implement and support PBIS at ORE
2. PD for teachers in the area of increasing student engagement strategies.
3. Behavior Specialist/Admin support students that are having behavior difficulties through progressive discipline and PBIS.
4. Increase parent communication between teachers/ORE personnel and parents regarding progressive discipline/PBIS and ways parents can support their child and classroom teacher.
5. Monitor out of school suspension data, EWS and MTSS data.

Person Responsible	Cayce Staruk (caycels@leeschools.net)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Attendance is crucial for student achievement. In addition to focusing on increasing overall attendance for all students we will specifically focus on our Kindergarten students. ORE had 20 students identified with an absence rate of greater than 10%. ORE had 15% of Kindergarten students with an absence rate of greater than 10%. In 20-21- ORE will continue to focus on Kindergarten overall attendance as well as our African American sub group for all students. Attendance PLC will focus on these progress monitoring pieces.
Measurable Outcome:	In 20-21 ORE will decrease the percentage of absenteeism with our Kindergarten students from 15% to 12%. School personnel will work collaboratively with classroom teachers, school nurse and our social worker.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cayce Staruk (caycels@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Relationship building with ORE staff/students/families and all stakeholders with a priority on parent communication.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Low percentage of absenteeism directly correlates with overall increased student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1.ORE staff build relationships with students.
2. Attendance incentives built in to PBIS program.
3. Inform parents of attendance policy and importance of attending school each day.
4. Monitor attendance data.
5. Involve social worker and key personnel to identify the root cause of the absenteeism with individual students.
6. Encourage positive attendance habits with our Kindergarten families.

Person Responsible Cayce Staruk (caycels@leeschools.net)

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The African American subgroup of students were identified as falling below the federal index requirement. The subgroup overall percentage of points earned on the FSA in the categories in ELA, ELA Gains, Math, and Math Gains was 34% in 2019. The percentage points were as follows: ELA 30%, ELA gains 31%, Math 27% and Math Gains 47% ELA and Math proficiency are areas of concern for this subgroup.
Measurable Outcome:	In 2020-2021, the African American subgroup will increase in ELA proficiency from 30%-40% according to the Spring FSA school report In 2020-2021, the African American subgroup will increase in Math proficiency from 27%-40% according to the Spring FSA school report
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cayce Staruk (caycels@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	SIOP Lesson Planning and Instructional Delivery
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	SIOP is made up of of eight components and 33 features that target students' learning through HIgh Yield Strategies. This model of instruction incorporates the following evidence based strategies: problem solving, predicting, organizing, summarizing, categorizing, evaluating, and self-monitoring. Teachers consistently provide or use scaffolding techniques (providing the right amount of support to move students from one level of understanding to a higher level) throughout the lesson. In addition, teachers use a variety of question types, including those that promote higher order thinking throughout the lesson (literal, analytical, and interpretive questions).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify students below level in ELA and Math in the American American subgroup.
2 Training new teachers and supporting experienced teachers in the SIOP Model.
3. Ongoing professional development throughout the school year.
4. Monitoring of SIOP Model lesson plans through Oncourse.
5. Walkthroughs
6.Analyze ELA data and Subgroup (Black) data. Ongoing progress monitoring.

Person Responsible	Cayce Staruk (caycels@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

School Leadership Team will regularly discuss student data of students identified in this subgroup.
Growth Mind Set strategies will be taught and used to encourage and motivate students to succeed
Recognition of student progress and parent contact will be tracked.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

At the beginning of the school year, families and students will be invited to our Open House and the Annual Title 1 meeting where staff will share the vision, mission, school wide date and culture of the school. Parents, teachers, students, community members and business partners will participate in the comprehensive needs assessment during our SAC meeting and other school events.
Orange River Elementary's mission is to empower and motivate students to be lifetime learners while promoting high achievement and success through a love of learning. The vision is "Success for All". Throughout the year, through SAC meetings, the SIP, family engagement plan and parent/student/teacher compact are reviewed and input is welcome. Orange River has a PTO which encourages and welcomes all families to join.
The school builds positive relationships with parents and families through our website, twitter account, and monthly newsletter in both English and Spanish. A school calendar is sent home the first day of school with all important dates and information about the school and codes of conduct. Stakeholders will participate in school events through invites via-School Messenger, Zoom, PeachJar and personal phone calls. All students have a daily planner which is used to communicate messages between teacher and parent about particular student needs.
Our office staff greets our parents and families in both English and Spanish and work to make sure that all questions and concerns are addressed in a timely manner. All communication is sent in both English and Spanish

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science**	**$0.00**
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**	**$0.00**
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**	**$0.00**
4	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline**	**$0.00**
5	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance**	**$0.00**

6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00