

The School District of Lee County

Allen Park Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 9 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 25 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 25 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 28 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

Allen Park Elementary School

3345 CANELO DR, Fort Myers, FL 33901

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lee County School Board on 10/17/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections | Title I Schoolwide Program | Charter Schools |
|--|---|------------------------|
| I-A: School Mission/Vision | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1) |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3) | |
| I-E: Early Warning System | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-A-C: Data Review | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(3) | |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection | ESSA 1114(b)(6) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4) |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii) | |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g) | |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

A high performing school community inspiring high performing lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Today's Learners...Tomorrow's Leaders

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|----------------|---------------------|---|
| Booth, Melissa | Principal | The Principal serves as the leader of the school in relation to instruction, management and operations. The Principal and admin designees also attend weekly PLT meetings and report back to the members of the Leadership Team. |
| Buen, Jessica | Assistant Principal | The Assistant Principal assists the Principal in relation to instruction, management and operations. The Assistant Principal and admin designees also attend weekly PLT meetings and report back to the members of the Leadership Team. |

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Our SIP will be presented to stakeholders (teachers, school staff, and parents) at our first SAC meeting. If needed, revisions will be made based on stakeholder feedback.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Our SIP will be reviewed regularly with our leadership team and progress will be shared at grade level PLTs. Using progress monitoring data, the plan will be revised as needed to ensure continuous improvement. Revisions will be shared with the leadership team and through grade level PLTs.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

| | |
|--|--|
| 2023-24 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | Yes |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 84% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 100% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | Yes |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | ATSI |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP)* Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)* |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C |
| School Improvement Rating History | |
| DJJ Accountability Rating History | |

Early Warning Systems

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 13 | 58 | 55 | 43 | 16 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 216 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 15 | 6 | 7 | 24 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 35 | 36 | 54 | 47 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 202 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 17 | 10 | 23 | 31 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 66 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 114 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 60 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 20 | 12 | 27 | 66 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 161 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |

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

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 56 | 42 | 44 | 19 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 197 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 8 | 13 | 16 | 7 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 19 | 25 | 46 | 28 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 123 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 11 | 11 | 27 | 20 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 39 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 41 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 120 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 10 | 12 | 51 | 38 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 153 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 2 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 56 | 42 | 44 | 19 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 197 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 8 | 13 | 16 | 7 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 19 | 25 | 46 | 28 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 123 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 11 | 11 | 27 | 20 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 39 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 41 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 120 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 10 | 12 | 51 | 38 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 153 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 2 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

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

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

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | 38 | 48 | 53 | 42 | 52 | 56 | 49 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 54 | | | 50 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 35 | | | 43 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 40 | 57 | 59 | 43 | 45 | 50 | 49 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 49 | | | 50 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 38 | | | 38 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 44 | 53 | 54 | 42 | 59 | 59 | 56 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 62 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 47 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 50 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 65 | 51 | 59 | 49 | | | 50 | | |

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 44 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 219 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--------------------------------------|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 44 |

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

| | |
|--|-----|
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 352 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| SWD | 22 | Yes | 4 | 1 |
| ELL | 31 | Yes | 2 | 2 |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 82 | | | |
| BLK | 35 | Yes | 1 | |
| HSP | 41 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 58 | | | |
| FRL | 38 | Yes | 2 | |

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| SWD | 36 | Yes | 3 | |
| ELL | 31 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 83 | | | |
| BLK | 42 | | | |
| HSP | 33 | Yes | 1 | |

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| MUL | 60 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 75 | | | |
| FRL | 40 | Yes | 1 | |

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
|------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| All Students | 38 | | | 40 | | | 44 | | | | | 65 |
| SWD | 17 | | | 14 | | | 24 | | | | 5 | 40 |
| ELL | 18 | | | 28 | | | 28 | | | | 5 | 65 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 75 | | | 88 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| BLK | 28 | | | 28 | | | 30 | | | | 5 | 61 |
| HSP | 35 | | | 38 | | | 35 | | | | 5 | 66 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 56 | | | 56 | | | 78 | | | | 4 | |
| FRL | 32 | | | 33 | | | 34 | | | | 5 | 61 |

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 | ELP Progress |
|------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| All Students | 42 | 54 | 35 | 43 | 49 | 38 | 42 | | | | | 49 |
| SWD | 18 | 42 | 38 | 20 | 55 | 50 | 14 | | | | | 53 |
| ELL | 13 | 43 | 41 | 21 | 37 | 27 | 15 | | | | | 49 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 76 | 83 | | 88 | 83 | | | | | | | |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 | ELP Progress |
| BLK | 29 | 50 | 46 | 33 | 46 | 40 | 33 | | | | | 57 |
| HSP | 31 | 43 | 20 | 32 | 38 | 27 | 26 | | | | | 47 |
| MUL | 61 | 62 | | 59 | 58 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 77 | 74 | | 73 | 69 | | 80 | | | | | |
| FRL | 33 | 50 | 39 | 33 | 39 | 37 | 37 | | | | | 50 |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 49 | 50 | 43 | 49 | 50 | 38 | 56 | | | | | 50 |
| SWD | 15 | 33 | 40 | 17 | 29 | 27 | 25 | | | | | 8 |
| ELL | 31 | 43 | 33 | 29 | 59 | 57 | 33 | | | | | 50 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 81 | | | 85 | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 29 | 39 | 44 | 28 | 30 | 22 | 32 | | | | | 41 |
| HSP | 44 | 48 | 44 | 40 | 51 | 50 | 44 | | | | | 53 |
| MUL | 44 | | | 50 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 79 | 59 | | 81 | 65 | | 84 | | | | | |
| FRL | 33 | 42 | 40 | 33 | 35 | 26 | 36 | | | | | 53 |

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 40% | 48% | -8% | 54% | -14% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 46% | 56% | -10% | 58% | -12% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 30% | 42% | -12% | 50% | -20% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 39% | 55% | -16% | 59% | -20% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 45% | 61% | -16% | 61% | -16% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 36% | 52% | -16% | 55% | -19% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 42% | 50% | -8% | 51% | -9% |

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance is ELA proficiency at 38. Contributing factors to low performance in this area include the introduction of new BEST standards and benchmarks, introduction of the FAST assessment, a high number of retained students in Grade 3, teachers new to the profession and/or Allen Park, student mobility due to Hurricane Ian, teacher instability/mobility due to Hurricane Ian.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year is ELA proficiency. Preliminary data shows a decline in ELA proficiency from 42-38 (-4). Contributing factors to this decline include the transition from the FSA assessment to the FAST assessment, the introduction of new BEST standards and benchmarks, a high number of retained students in Grade 3, teachers new to the profession and/or Allen Park, student mobility due to Hurricane Ian, teacher instability/mobility due to Hurricane Ian.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is Math. Preliminary data shows Math proficiency at 40 when compared to the state average of 58. Contributing factors to this gap include the transition from the FSA assessment to the FAST assessment, the introduction of new BEST standards and benchmarks, a high number of retained students in Grade 3, teachers new to the profession and/or Allen Park, student mobility due to Hurricane Ian, teacher instability/mobility due to Hurricane Ian. Also, multiple grade level teams fell behind in the district Scope & Sequence during Q1 and had to restructure their instructional time in order to make sure that all benchmarks/standards were taught by the end of the year.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is Science. Preliminary data shows an increase in Science from 42-44 (+2). Allen Park received weekly support from the district Science department for both data analysis and planning. The 5th grade team also provided students with daily targeted intervention in Reading. Intervention and support was also provided in the form of tutoring for targeted students on the cusp of proficiency. Fifth grade students also attended a Science elective class in which the teacher utilized the curriculum supplied by the district which correlated with the 5th grade Science standards. Finally, in late April, Allen Park hosted a family STEM night in which the target audience was 5th grade students and their families.

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

Two potential areas of concern include attendance and course failures in ELA.

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

1. ELA Proficiency (Grades 2-5)
2. Math Proficiency (Grades 3-5)
3. Science Proficiency/Achievement

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

This area has been identified as a crucial need because our 2nd grade students are not demonstrating mastery in the foundational reading skills needed to be successful in 3rd grade.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 23-24 school year, 2nd grade ELA proficiency will increase from 32% (3rd grade PY - FY23) to 35% or higher as measured by the PM3 STAR ELA assessment.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through weekly PLCs which involve data analysis of the exemplars, quarterly comprehensives, progress monitoring and other assessment data. This process will be monitored by the Assistant Principal and K-2 Literacy Coach.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jessica Buen (jessicads@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

2nd grade's daily schedule will include 60 minutes of specific, targeted intervention (WIN Time). Students will be assigned to intervention groups based on the need for phonics, comprehension, and on-grade level instruction on the benchmarks that students have not yet mastered. Teachers will use the walk-to intervention model. During WIN Time, classroom support will be provided by academic coaches and paraprofessionals in order to run successful small groups simultaneously based on student need.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Allen Park will continue to implement a system for interventions that includes walk to intervention as well as opportunities for increased intervention time (academic tutoring, Calendar Club).

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Attendance at weekly grade level PLC by Assistant Principal and K-2 Literacy Coach.

Person Responsible: Jessica Buen (jessicads@leeschools.net)

By When: Starting in August, AP and K-2 Literacy Coach will attend PLC and provide guidance related to data analysis and planning for instruction on weekly and on-going basis.

All 2nd grade teachers will learn how to pull and track their own student data and identify gaps in student learning.

Person Responsible: Jessica Buen (jessicads@leeschools.net)

By When: During Q1, teachers will learn how to pull and track their own student data from exemplars, quarterly comprehensives, and STAR progress monitoring in order to identify gaps in student learning.

Grade level teachers will use Performance Matters as a common data tracking system to track classroom progress and grade level progress.

Person Responsible: Jessica Buen (jessicads@leeschools.net)

By When: During Q1, AP and K-2 Literacy Coach will assist grade level teachers with learning how to use Performance Matters to review data on a weekly basis.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

This area has been identified as a crucial need because our 3rd grade ELA proficiency is significantly lower than ELA proficiency in grades 4 and 5. In addition, our 3rd grade ELA proficiency is significantly lower than the district average.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 23-24 school year, 3rd ELA proficiency will increase from 30% to 33% or higher as measured by the 3rd grade FAST ELA assessment.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through weekly PLCs which involve data analysis of the exemplars, quarterly comprehensives, progress monitoring and other assessment data. This process will be monitored by the Principal and the 3-5 Literacy Coach.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Booth (melissarb@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

3rd grade's daily schedule will include 60 minutes of specific, targeted intervention (WIN Time). Students will be assigned to intervention groups based on the need for phonics, comprehension, and on-grade level instruction on the benchmarks that students have not yet mastered. Teachers will use the walk-to intervention model. During WIN Time, classroom support will be provided by academic coaches and paraprofessionals in order to run successful small groups simultaneously based on student need.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Allen Park will continue to implement a system for interventions that includes walk to intervention as well as opportunities for increased intervention time (academic tutoring, Calendar Club).

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Attendance at weekly grade level PLC by Principal and 3-5 Literacy Coach.

Person Responsible: Melissa Booth (melissarb@leeschools.net)

By When: Starting in August, Principal and 3-5 Literacy Coach will attend PLC and provide guidance related to data analysis and planning for instruction on weekly and on-going basis.

All 3rd grade teachers will learn how to pull and track their own student data and identify gaps in student learning.

Person Responsible: Melissa Booth (melissarb@leeschools.net)

By When: During Q1, teachers will learn how to pull and track their own student data from exemplars, quarterly comprehensives, and FAST progress monitoring in order to identify gaps in student learning.

Grade level teachers will use Performance Matters as a common data tracking system to track classroom progress and grade level progress.

Person Responsible: Melissa Booth (melissarb@leeschools.net)

By When: During Q1, Principal and 3-5 Literacy Coach will assist grade level teachers with learning how to use Performance Matters to review data on a weekly basis.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

This area has been identified as a crucial need because our ELA proficiency in grades 3-5 is lower than the district average.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 23-24 school year, 3rd-5th grade ELA proficiency will increase from 38% to 41% or higher as measured by the FAST ELA assessment.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through weekly PLCs which involve data analysis of the exemplars, quarterly comprehensives, progress monitoring and other assessment data. This process will be monitored by the Principal and the 3-5 Literacy Coach.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Booth (melissarb@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The daily schedule in grades 3-5 will include 60 minutes of specific, targeted intervention (WIN Time). Students will be assigned to intervention groups based on the need for phonics, comprehension, and on-grade level instruction on the benchmarks that students have not yet mastered. Teachers will use the walk-to intervention model. During WIN Time, classroom support will be provided by academic coaches and paraprofessionals in order to run successful small groups simultaneously based on student need.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Allen Park will continue to implement a system for interventions that includes walk to intervention as well as opportunities for increased intervention time (academic tutoring, Calendar Club).

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Attendance at weekly grade level PLCs by Principal and 3-5 Literacy Coach.

Person Responsible: Melissa Booth (melissarb@leeschools.net)

By When: Starting in August, Principal and 3-5 Literacy Coach will attend PLCs and provide guidance related to data analysis and planning for instruction on weekly and on-going basis.

All teachers in 3rd-5th will learn how to pull and track their own student data and identify gaps in student learning.

Person Responsible: Melissa Booth (melissarb@leeschools.net)

By When: During Q1, teachers will learn how to pull and track their own student data from exemplars, quarterly comprehensives, and FAST progress monitoring in order to identify gaps in student learning.

Grade level teachers will use Performance Matters as a common data tracking system to track classroom progress and grade level progress.

Person Responsible: Melissa Booth (melissarb@leeschools.net)

By When: During Q1, Principal and 3-5 Literacy Coach will assist grade level teachers with learning how to use Performance Matters to review data on a weekly basis.

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

This area has been identified as a crucial need because we have four identified ESSA subgroups below the federal index of 41%. These subgroups include SWD, ELL, HSP, and FRL.

Measurable Outcome:

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

All ESSA subgroups will be above the federal index of 41% as measured by our school accountability data from the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored by through the use of progress monitoring data at weekly grade level PLCs. Student attendance data will also be closely monitored by our School Social Worker.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Booth (melissarb@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Strategies being implemented for this area of focus will include a system of wrap-around services that will include the identification of these students, assigning each student a mentor and tracking data including attendance and student academic progress.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students in these subgroups will benefit from targeted one-on-one support to assist with attendance, language barriers and academic progress.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Identification of students in the following ESSA subgroups: SWD, ELL, HSP, and FRL.

Person Responsible: Melissa Booth (melissarb@leeschools.net)

By When: During Q1 these students will be identified and their area(s) of specific need will be determined.

Assign adult mentors for students in these subgroups.

Person Responsible: Melissa Booth (melissarb@leeschools.net)

By When: After identifying students, adult mentors will be assigned in order to provide wrap-around services.

Mentors will meet one-on-one with assigned students. Data will be tracked including attendance and progress monitoring data.

Person Responsible: Melissa Booth (melissarb@leeschools.net)

By When: Mentor program will begin by the start of Q2.

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

During the 22-23 school year, Allen Park had 231 days of out-of-school suspension (OSS).

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 23-24 school year, Allen Park will successfully reduce the number of days of OSS by 50% (213 to 115.5) as measured by Focus discipline data.

Monitoring:

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

This focus area will be monitored through our monthly Student Services PLT, quarterly discipline review, implementation of schoolwide PBIS and implementation of Capturing Kids' Hearts.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jessica Buen (jessicads@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Implementation of schoolwide PBIS and Capturing Kids' Hearts.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PBIS is a research-based approach to creating a positive school culture. Capturing Kids' Hearts is system of processes that focuses on a relationship-driven campus culture and student connectedness. Common language and schoolwide expectations are part of both PBIS and Capturing Kids' Hearts.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers attend Capturing Kids' Hearts training.

Person Responsible: Melissa Booth (melissarb@leeschools.net)

By When: Teachers attended training on July 31st and August 1st.

Develop PBIS team and attend Level 1 training.

Person Responsible: Jessica Buen (jessicads@leeschools.net)

By When: These steps will be completed by the end of Q1.

Implementation of PBIS and Capturing Kids' Hearts will be monitored for implementation by administration.

Person Responsible: Melissa Booth (melissarb@leeschools.net)

By When: This action step will happen continuously throughout the 23-24 school year.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

The School District of Lee County follows all state and federal guidelines when allocating funding to schools. The schools are budgeted in multi-faceted methods based on the student needs. Initially the schools are tiered based on the following criteria: student proficiency, learning gains, struggling schools, % of new teachers, % of ELL students, % of ESE students for academic support and for funding purposes. Content tiers are also established to provide instructional support resources based on individual student group needs. Within each school's Title I, SAI, and UniSIG plans as appropriate there is a requirement to address ESSA student groups through high quality instruction and monitoring systems. School funding needs are addressed weekly throughout the school year in collaboration with principal supervisors and the budget department. Ongoing monitoring of student data and underperforming subgroups is provided through monthly visits and data chats by principal supervisors.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

Grades K-2 will be using the walk-to-read model for Reading interventions (WIN Time). This model provides instruction to students in their area of need in Reading/ELA (phonics, comprehension, standards-based enrichment). Utilizing this strategy plays a crucial part in ensuring that students are getting instruction based on their area of most need.

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

Grades 3-5 will be using the walk-to-read model for Reading interventions (WIN Time). This model provides instruction to students in their area of need in Reading/ELA (phonics, comprehension,

standards-based enrichment). Utilizing this strategy plays a crucial part in ensuring that students are getting instruction based on their area of most need.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

Allen Park will increase proficiency in ELA in grades K-2 from 42 to 50% or higher as measured by the 23-24 FAST ELA assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Allen Park will increase proficiency in ELA in grades 3-5 from 40.8% to 43% or higher as measured by the 23-24 FAST ELA assessment.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

This area of focus will be monitored at weekly grade level PLCs. Administration and literacy coaches will attend PLCs and assist with ongoing monitoring of student progress and student achievement data. Continual monitoring of this process will ensure that our walk-to-intervention model (WIN Time) is implemented successfully and with fidelity.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Booth, Melissa, melissarb@leeschools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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. §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?

Allen Park is implementing the district approved ELA intervention programs including Read Well for Grades K-1, FlyLeaf for Grade 2, and Phonics for Reading for Grades 3-5. These programs are evidence-based and were selected by the district. These interventions programs are also in alignment with FL B.E.S.T ELA standards.

Rationale:

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

These programs (Read Well, FlyLeaf, Phonics for Reading) are evidence-based and were selected by the district. These interventions programs are also in alignment with FL B.E.S.T ELA standards.

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 |
|--|---|
| <p>Literacy Leadership: Academic Coaches have been trained in effective data analysis in order to implement interventions with fidelity. Individuals with a strong background in literacy have been hired in the roles of K-2 Literacy Coach and 3-5 Literacy Coach.</p> <p>Literacy Coaching: Teachers will participate in job-embedded coaching from Academic Coaches to guide them in implementing the needed interventions. Teachers will receive assistance from Academic Coaches in order to analyze data.</p> <p>Assessment: Students will take the pre-test and post-test designed for each intervention program. Data will be analyzed to strategically group and re-group students for interventions.</p> <p>Professional Learning: Administration and academic coaches will facilitate PLCs in order to ensure that data is being analyzed and used to inform instructional decisions. Academic Coaches will model best instructional practices in ELA instruction.</p> | <p>Booth, Melissa, melissarb@leeschools.net</p> |

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

SIP progress will be made available and reviewed at quarterly SAC meetings. Our SIP will also be disseminated through our school website (https://alp.leeschools.net/our_school/title_i) and a hard copy will always be available in the front office. Additional information regarding our SIP progress will also be including in our quarterly newsletter.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Allen Park Elementary recognizes the enormous importance of increasing parental and family engagement in raising student achievement at all levels. To accomplish this and to determine the needs/ barriers of our parents, schools, the PFEP team analyzes the current building capacity activities, compares participation numbers, and addresses the barriers that limit parent participation. These barriers include lack of transportation to meetings, language barriers, childcare, feelings of intimidation, inability to leave work for events/meetings and in general the difficulties with the current economic

conditions. In addition, since we are a Title I school, we complete the Florida DOE template for the Parent and Family Educational Plan (PFEP). School data is reported to the district to become a part of the District PFEP Evaluation and goal setting process. Schools' baseline data sources, i.e., number of volunteers and volunteer service hours, become the guiding force to annual evaluation and improvement of the school's parent involvement program to enhance student achievement for the upcoming school year. Other sources of data may include but are not limited to parent workshop and training evaluations, sign in sheets, attendance and volunteer logs, parent surveys, the Title I Crate, the PFEP Evaluation, the School Academic Training and Workshop forms, and test results. The PFEP will be a principal element of the review process for each school in gathering data at the end of the year as the schools complete their SIP (Comprehensive Needs Analysis) in preparation for revising School Improvement Plans.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Allen Park Elementary plans to strengthen our academic program, quality of learning time and help provide an enriched accelerated curriculum by hiring additional personnel that can help us achieve these goals. Additional personnel include a Peer Collaborative Teacher (PCT), three classroom teachers, a full-time School Social Worker and a Title I Paraprofessional.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

District general funds provide the foundation for all programs. Title I A funds will be the primary supplemental source for the activities listed in this need. Title I, Part A coordinates with other federal grants, such as Titles 1C, 1D, II, III and IV, IDEA, and Homeless to expand academic enrichment opportunities for subgroups of students and Professional Development for teachers. These services include extended learning opportunities, professional development, supplemental evidence-based resources, and materials.

Title I, Part A coordinates with Title I, Part C to provide expanded academic enrichment opportunities to Migrant students. Services include; tutorials in reading and math, health services, and literacy workshops for parents because of the coordination of these funds.

Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under ESEA also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs to align towards student academic success.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

The Lee County School District follows the mental health guidelines set forth by the State of Florida Department of Education. This includes providing universal positive and behavioral support. The district also, with parental permission, assesses and screens students to determine what level of mental health support would best meet their mental health needs. These supports range from school check-ins, school-based mental health counseling as well as a referral pathway to outside mental health services.

The Lee County School District employs evidence-based practices in the foundational instruction of students with a focus on building resiliency, promoting physical and emotional wellness, overall health, social development, overcoming adversity, critical thinking and problem solving, prevention of substance use, and other topics.

The Lee County School District employs school-based mental health professionals, school counselors, school social workers, school psychologists, and licensed mental health professionals to ensure that school-based mental health services are provided to students.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Extended Learning Opportunities - Implement extended learning opportunities (tutorial programs in reading and/or math) to address the academic needs of specific subgroups of Title I students who have been identified as lowest achievers. Schools will use Title I and other funding such as SAI to develop tutorial programs using only research-based strategies and resources. Schools will determine before/after/Saturday or summer school program models. Materials and supplies will be provided to students to assist with achievement of goals and to remove barriers.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

The district ensures that every school implements a tiered model of evidence-based behavior supports within a Multi-tiered System of Supports (MTSS). District level personnel are designated to assist schools with their site-based implementation by providing training, modeling, program monitoring, technical assistance, and data collection/analysis. They work with site-based personnel to implement the tiered approach that includes:

Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS)/Positive Behavior System (PBS) - All schools are required to implement the elements of PBIS including a school-based team that facilitates systems that support positive behavior: school-wide expectations, classroom expectations and rules, positive recognition/rewards, data collection and analysis, and ongoing professional development. Most schools participate in the Florida PBIS Project. Some schools implement the elements within other approaches including the Building Assets Reducing Risks (BARR) program. PBIS/PBS integrates with the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) utilized in Florida school districts for behavior support.

All schools in the School District of Lee County are required to maintain MTSS for all students (tier 1), students needing supplemental support (tier 2), and students needing intensive support (tier 3). Each school has a team that utilizes the Response to Intervention (RtI) process in examining individual student data to identify those that may need additional behavior support beyond the universal PBIS/PBS approach, and to monitor the effectiveness of these interventions. Data analyzed include office discipline referrals, in-school suspension, out-of-school suspension, bus referrals/suspension, as well as positive behavior data. Interventions may include supplemental positive behavior interventions and/or interventions to address inappropriate behavior.

Each school has a designated Intervention Specialist that facilitates team processes and ensures that identified interventions are implemented and monitored for effectiveness. Currently, the district utilizes "Insights to Behavior" to assist with the ongoing teamwork for behavior support in the tiered model using RtI. This includes the use of additional tools such as the Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA), data

collection tools, reporting tools, and behavior intervention plan tools. Intervention Specialists assist classroom teachers and school-based personnel in the implementation of behavioral interventions and data collection, as well as serve as the primary contact for families with students receiving interventions.

In the School District of Lee County, the Multi-tiered System of Supports school-based teams may, when needed, refer students to other district/school supports including the school-based mental health team, Section 504 eligibility consideration, and/or evaluation for consideration of eligibility under IDEA. Likewise, when students respond to interventions, the team may recommend maintaining current levels of interventions, reducing interventions, or exiting interventions as appropriate.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

The district's Curriculum and Staff Development department will offer training opportunities for paraprofessionals in the core subject areas and technology. In addition, new ESOL paraprofessionals will receive 12 hours of training regarding strategies to assist English Language Learners (ELL) to improve student performance. When appropriate, Instructional Support (Para) will participate in the same training as teachers at Title I schools.

Curriculum and Staff Development will offer teachers a multitude of opportunities to improve effectiveness. They will include (but are not limited to) the following: Florida Standards, Differentiated Instructional Strategies, Analytics (Data Analysis) and Instructional Change, Classroom Walkthrough, Kagan Cooperative Learning, Instruction within the Block, SIOP, and subject area training for adopted texts.

Teacher leaders at schools will support classroom instructional staff daily by coaching, modeling, and/or providing resources to improve instructional activities. Professional development and our Peer Collaborative Teacher (PCT) will further support the initiative by collaborating closely with the teacher leaders. These individuals are chosen through a selective process that ensures highly effective instructional practices are shared with classroom teachers.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

The district has Early 5, Pre-K and Special Education programs in place to prepare students socially, emotionally and academically for Kindergarten. Many of our schools have their upcoming Kindergarten students come to school to meet the teachers and take assessments, so that they can better place them for the school year. Another transitional strategy used is to offer Kindergarten camp for a few days to acclimate students to their school and teachers instruct them on basic processes.