

The School District of Lee County

Orange River Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	0

Orange River Elementary School

4501 UNDERWOOD DR, Fort Myers, FL 33905

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

Demographics

Principal: Cayce Staruk

Start Date for this Principal: 9/20/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 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	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Staruk, Cayce	Principal	
Misewicz, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	
Scott, Lynne		MTSS and ESOL
Bumm, Stephanie	Instructional Coach	
LeBlanc, Lauren	Instructional Coach	
Johnson, Amy	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 9/20/2021, 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.*

4

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Total number of students enrolled at the school

760

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

5

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

6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	126	122	124	133	119	136	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	760
Attendance below 90 percent	19	36	31	34	27	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	179
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	14	11	33	30	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108
Course failure in Math	0	5	11	32	24	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	34	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	7	32	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	7	10	31	37	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147

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	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/21/2021

2020-21 - 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	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

2020-21 - 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	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

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				40%	57%	57%	43%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				45%	56%	58%	55%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36%	50%	53%	51%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				55%	62%	63%	58%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				75%	65%	62%	64%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				66%	54%	51%	56%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				36%	52%	53%	41%	54%	55%

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
03	2021					
	2019	35%	58%	-23%	58%	-23%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	37%	55%	-18%	58%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
05	2021					
	2019	38%	54%	-16%	56%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	42%	61%	-19%	62%	-20%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	55%	62%	-7%	64%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
05	2021					
	2019	55%	58%	-3%	60%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	32%	50%	-18%	53%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Data was collected through a quarterly progress monitoring cycle, which included instruments such as STAR, iReady, and district-created progress monitoring assessments.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7/6.1	11/8.9	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/10	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	6/7.2	2/2.3	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7/6.1	11/8.9	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	5/6	5/5.8	0/0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	4/3.6	8/6.9	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/7.1	2/13.3	0/0
	English Language Learners	1/1.3	2/2.5	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0/0	2/1.8	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/1.3	0/0
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	16/13.9	40/32.8	49/38.9
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/16.7	2/33.3	3/42.9
	English Language Learners	0/0	8/13.1	12/18.8
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6/5.3	23/19.3	36/29.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/16.7	3/50
	English Language Learners	0/0	4/6.8	11/18.0

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	28/22.4	33/25.2	38/28.8
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	5/7.2	5/7.0	8/11.3
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4/3.3	13/10.3	35/26.5
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/12.5	1/12.5
	English Language Learners	0/0	2/2.9	10/14.1
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	18/17.8	22/20.8	22/20
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/10	1/9.1	1/7.7
	English Language Learners	2/4.1	2/3.9	2/3.8
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	3/3.2	15/15.3	23/22.8
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	2/18.2	2/16.7
	English Language Learners	0/0	3/6	5/9.8
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	14/13.9	22/21.6	34/32.4
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/10	1/8.3
	English Language Learners	2/4.2	1/2	8/16

Subgroup Data Review

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	15	30		25	60						
ELL	24	26	39	36	50	57	18				
BLK	15			25							
HSP	31	32	42	42	53	52	22				
WHT	62			55							
FRL	32	30	41	44	47	41	23				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	42
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	315
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	20
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	40
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Pacific Islander Students	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	59
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	37
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

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?

Across core content areas ELA trends continue to remain steady with 40% average proficiency. Math trends show that students generally perform within the 50% proficiency range. ELA gains and ELA L25 gains show that students generally perform at an average range of 36%-42%. Third grade proficiency in ELA is higher than in 4th or 5th grade.

in 2018 3rd grade ELA was at 45%, in 2019 students in 3rd grade were at 35%, but in 2020 students in 3rd grade had a proficiency in ELA of 43%.

In 2018 3rd grade Math was at 47% proficiency and in 2019 students in 3rd grade were at 42% proficiency.

In 2018 4th grade ELA was at 36%, and in 2019 students in 4th grade were at 37% proficiency.

In 2018 4th grade Math was at 51%, and in 2019 students in 4th grade were at 55% proficiency.

In 2018 5th grade ELA was at 40%, and in 2019 students in 5th grade were at 38% proficiency.

In 2018 5th grade Math was at 67%, and in 2019 students in 5th grade were at 55% proficiency.

Science in 2018 was at 39% proficient and in 2019 was at 32% proficient.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

ELA proficiency, ELA L25, and ELA gains are the greatest need of improvement based on 2019 state assessments.

Our African American Subgroup demonstrate a need for improvement as well.

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

The contributing factors for this need of ELA improvement are language barriers and socioeconomic status.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Math gains and L25 Math gains showed the most improvement based on 2019 state assessments. Math gains were at 75% and Math L25 gains were at 66%.

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

Exemplary teaching through implementation of the SIOP instructional model, small group instruction, and math coach were contributing factors to this improvement.

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

SIOP model lessons, differentiated instruction, high yield instructional strategies, small group instruction, maximizes instructional time and Kagan strategies. We will continue on-going progress monitoring and data analysis.

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.

SIOP Professional Development, modeling of Kagan structures and strategies, I-Ready PD.

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

Extra 30 minutes built into the school day, After-school Tutoring Program, ongoing professional development for our teachers and continue to hire and retain highly effective teachers.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the data reviewed, instructional practices related specifically to ELA, has been identified as a critical need. The school's overall ELA Achievement was 40%.
Measurable Outcome:	In 2021-2022, Orange River will increase the overall ELA Achievement from 40% to 43% according to the state accountability report.
Monitoring:	ELA Achievement will be monitored throughout the year using iready progress monitoring data and district ELA quarterly comprehensive assessments and exemplars. Fluency checks and comprehension checks will be given by our reading coaches to students that are below level in ELA for monitoring and planning.
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 eight components and 33 features that target ELL students' learning through High Yield Strategies. This model of instructing incorporates the following evidence based strategies: problem solving, predicting, organizing, summarizing, categorizing, evaluating and self monitoring. Teachers consistently provide or use scaffolding techniques 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

Training new teachers and supporting experienced teachers in the SIOP Model.

Person Responsible Cayce Staruk (caycels@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus	Based on the data reviewed, instructional practices related specifically to ELA, has been identified as a critical need. The school's overall ELA Achievement was 40% and ELA L25 Learning Gains were 36%.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	In 2022, Orange River ELA L25 learning gains will increase from 36% to 50% according to the State Accountability Report.
Monitoring:	ELA L25 students will be identified by 2020 FSA data. L25 ELA Achievement will be monitored throughout the year using i-ready progress monitoring data and district ELA quarterly comprehensive assessments and exemplars. Fluency checks and comprehension checks will be given by our reading coaches to students that are below level in ELA for monitoring and planning.
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 eight components and 33 features that target ELL students' learning through High Yield Strategies. This model of instructing incorporates the following evidence based strategies: problem solving, predicting, organizing, summarizing, categorizing, evaluating and self monitoring. Teachers consistently provide or use scaffolding techniques 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

Train new teachers and supporting experienced teachers in the SIOP model.

Person Responsible Cayce Staruk (caycels@leeschools.net)

Identify the L25 students in ELA and plan for intervention based on each student's area of need.

Person Responsible Stephanie Bumm (stephaniejbu@leeschools.net)

After students have been instructed by highly qualified teachers, the students' will be assessed for proficiency of standards through i-ready, exemplars, quarterly comprehensive assessments, fluency and comprehension checks.

Person Responsible Stephanie Bumm (stephaniejbu@leeschools.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to the 2019 State Accountability report the Black African American Subgroup's ELA Achievement was 32%. The Black/African American subgroup did not meet the ESSA Federal Index of 41%
Measurable Outcome:	In 2022, the ESSA Subgroup of Black/African American students' achievement will increase from 32% to 42% according to the State Accountability report.
Monitoring:	Each student in the subgroup will have progress monitoring data analyzed for achievement. Areas that are identified as needing intervention will have a prescribed plan that reading resource and classroom teachers will implement.
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 eight components and 33 features that target ELL students' learning through High Yield Strategies. This model of instructing incorporates the following evidence based strategies: problem solving, predicting, organizing, summarizing, categorizing, evaluating and self monitoring. Teachers consistently provide or use scaffolding techniques 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

Identify the students in the Black/African American Subgroup and plan for interventions based on each student's area of need.

Person Responsible Stephanie Bumm (stephaniejbu@leeschools.net)

After students are identified, FSA data and current data will be reviewed to determine the intervention that is needed to improve student achievement in ELA for these students.

Person Responsible Jennifer Misewicz (jenniferjm@leeschools.net)

After instruction by highly qualified teachers, student progress will be assessed using i-ready, ELA exemplars, quarterly comprehensive assessments, and fluency checks. Interventions will occur on a daily basis as needed in ELA.

Person Responsible Jennifer Misewicz (jenniferjm@leeschools.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	in 2019, Black/African American's math achievement was 27% as compared to overall math achievement of all students of 55%
Measurable Outcome:	in 2021-2022, Black/African American students math achievement will increase from 27% to 42% according to the State Accountability Report.
Monitoring:	Students will be instructed in the math standards by highly qualified teachers, and the data will be tracked for mastery. Students that need additional intervention will be provided more intensive instruction and review of standards in math. The school uses math exemplars, i-ready math, and Reflex math to monitor student progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cayce Staruk (caycels@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	SIOP lesson planning and instructional delivery. Teachers will also use backwards design.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	SIOP is made up of eight components and 33 features that target ELL students' learning through High Yield Strategies. This model of instructing incorporates the following evidence based strategies: problem solving, predicting, organizing, summarizing, categorizing, evaluating and self monitoring. Teachers consistently provide or use scaffolding techniques 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

Identify the students in the Black/African American Subgroup and plan for math interventions based on each student's area of need

Person Responsible Amy Johnson (amyjjo@leeschools.net)

After students are identified, FSA data and current data will be reviewed to determine the intervention that is needed to improve student achievement in Math for these students.

Person Responsible Cayce Staruk (caycels@leeschools.net)

After instruction by highly qualified teachers, student progress will be assessed using i-ready, Math exemplars, and Reflex math data.

Person Responsible Amy Johnson (amyjjo@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

For the 2019-2020 school year, Orange River Elementary School reported 0.4 incidents per 100 students. When compared to all elementary schools statewide, it falls into the low category and ranked 538 out of 1395 elementary schools statewide. For the 2021-2022 school year, Orange River Elementary School will monitor the discipline data and continue to utilize evidence-based strategies. The primary area of concern is the increase of 13 student discipline referrals from the previous school year. The school will monitor the student discipline progress and continue to utilize behavior supports including PBIS, MTSS, and teaching replacement behavior skills as needed. The school has Administrative support, a full-time Behavior Specialist, full-time MTSS/PBIS Specialist, and a full-time Dean of Student Discipline to further assist the school's objectives.

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.

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, and school wide data 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 lifelong learners while promoting high achievement and success through a love of learning. The vision is "Success for All." Throughout the year, during 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 set home on the first day of school with all the 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 the 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.

Within the classroom, Orange River Elementary builds a positive school culture through our Positive Behavior Intervention Support Expectations where all students learn about our school-wide R.O.A.R. expectations through two weeks of lesson plans that are grade level specific. Students are able to earn Individual or Classroom Positive Referrals given by any staff member on campus when they are meeting the R.O.A.R. expectations. Students are also recognized on the morning news for their Accelerated Reader, iReady, and Reflex Math accomplishments. Teachers begin each PLC by stating celebrations going on within their classroom or the grade level. Staff members are also encouraged to recognize one another on our teacher shoutout board, nominating a "Wellness Warrior", and participate in various activities through our Sunshine and PBIS committees.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

ORE staff (administration, dean, office, cafeteria staff, custodial staff, resource teachers) promotes the PBIS program daily through review of expectations, modeling of expectations, and recognizing students through positive referrals for excellent choices.

Within the classroom, Orange River Elementary builds a positive school culture through our Positive Behavior Intervention Support Expectations where all students learn about our school-wide R.O.A.R. expectations through two weeks of lesson plans that are grade level specific. Students are able to earn Individual or Classroom Positive Referrals given by any staff member on campus when they are meeting the R.O.A.R. expectations. Students are also recognized on the morning news for their Accelerated Reader, iReady, and Reflex Math accomplishments. Teachers begin each PLC by stating celebrations going on within their classroom or the grade level. Staff members are also encouraged to recognize one another on our teacher shoutout board, nominating a "Wellness Warrior", and participate in various activities through our Sunshine and PBIS committees