

The School District of Lee County

Edgewood Academy 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	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	24
VI. Title I Requirements	27
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	31

Edgewood Academy

3464 EDGEWOOD AVE, Fort Myers, FL 33916

<http://ewd.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.

Edgewood Academy exists to engage students through quality instruction in rigorous and meaningful work aligned with the Florida B.E.S.T. standards.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Edgewood inspires a love of learning to create future 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
Nader, Angela	Principal	
Adams, Tiffany	Assistant Principal	
Paiva, Sarah	Instructional Coach	
Anthony, Tonisha	Instructional Coach	
Shields, Noel	Instructional Coach	

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.

Parents attend quarterly SAC meetings where SIP data is reviewed and feedback is given. At the beginning of the year parents review the SIP plan at a meeting and vote on goals.

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))

Dashboards will be created at each grade level to track students progress throughout the year. Edgewood will track interventions, Tier 1 instruction data, and Progress monitoring data. SIP plans will be used to guide PLC work. Teams will monitor their progress towards SIP goals with grade level specific goals. If revisions are needed to plans teams will make changes as needed quarterly, weekly, and at the semester.

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	92%
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) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 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	16	18	14	15	14	19	0	0	0	96	
One or more suspensions	2	1	1	1	7	4	0	0	0	16	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	18	28	0	0	0	65	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	12	25	0	0	0	47	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	0	10	0	10	3	11	0	0	0	34	
Course failure in Math	0	4	0	3	5	4	0	0	0	16	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	16	27	0	0	0	61	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	9	23	0	0	0	41	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	0	11	5	21	0	0	0	41	

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	5	5	4	18	17	29	0	0	0	78

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	16	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	34
Students retained two or more times	0	0	2	0	7	2	0	0	0	11

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	11	25	36	28	16	18	0	0	0	134	
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	6	4	4	0	0	0	19	
Course failure in ELA	0	14	10	9	9	4	0	0	0	46	
Course failure in Math	0	5	2	8	14	5	0	0	0	34	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	52	29	0	0	0	84	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	37	29	0	0	0	67	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	0	11	5	21	0	0	0	41	

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	7	3	7	31	25	0	0	0	73

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	16	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	2	9	0	0	0	13

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*	28	48	53	37	52	56	31		
ELA Learning Gains				62			47		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				67			27		
Math Achievement*	50	57	59	55	45	50	45		
Math Learning Gains				68			33		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				73			50		
Science Achievement*	41	53	54	47	59	59	40		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	57	51	59	48			56		

* 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	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	200
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	57

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	457
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
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	29	Yes	4	1
ELL	35	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP	37	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	46			
FRL	40	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%
SWD	40	Yes	3	
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	60			
HSP	55			

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				
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	57			

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	28			50			41					57
SWD	24			46			15				5	32
ELL	18			48			32				5	57
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31			53			56				4	
HSP	24			49			32				5	57
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	50			42							2	
FRL	28			49			36				5	59

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	37	62	67	55	68	73	47					48
SWD	6	50		34	58							50
ELL	15	60	58	50	67	75	27					48
AMI												
ASN												

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	50	64		69	75		44					
HSP	31	64	67	48	66	74	41					48
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	42	53		59	62		70					
FRL	40	62	80	56	64	73	45					39

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	31	47	27	45	33	50	40					56
SWD	19			42			46					39
ELL	21	35		47	44		28					56
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33	31		40	33		24					
HSP	28	47	27	43	31	42	38					55
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	33			71								
FRL	26	38	20	42	29	60	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	33%	48%	-15%	54%	-21%
04	2023 - Spring	31%	56%	-25%	58%	-27%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	22%	42%	-20%	50%	-28%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	51%	55%	-4%	59%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	41%	61%	-20%	61%	-20%
05	2023 - Spring	53%	52%	1%	55%	-2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	40%	50%	-10%	51%	-11%

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.

ELA proficiency showed the lowest performance at 30% proficient in grades 3-5.

Contributing factors:

- teachers in grades 3-5 implemented a new reading curriculum
- change in ELA standards
- new intervention program
- change in computer intervention program utilization of data
- loss of instruction due to hurricane
- student attendance after hurricane was inconsistent

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

Science showed the greatest decline from 47% down to 44% proficient.

Contributing factors:

- lower proficiency in ELA
- lack of two critical staff members that remediated on science standards

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.

According to the data 3rd ELA shows the greatest gap.

State average 50% Edgewood 24%

Contributing factors:

- limited to no English proficiency
- lacking foundational skills in ELA
- loss of instruction due to hurricane
- student attendance after hurricane was inconsistent
- COVID (loss of learning)

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

According to the data 3rd math shows the most improvement.

21-22 16%

22-23 55%

Consistent daily support in math with an additional adult.

Coaching and planning

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

Based on the EWS data an area of concern is course failures. This will be an additional data component to track and review with teachers in PLC's.

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

Priorities:

ELA proficiency

Attendance

Course failures

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.

ELA was identified as a crucial need due to the gap between the school and state average.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Edgewood Academy will increase ELA proficiency in grades 3-5 from 30% to 40% as measured by the PM3 FAST Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor this area of focus through weekly PLC's, grade level data chats, and grade level goals. Student intervention placement will monitored to ensure students are getting what they need. In addition, students will monitor their own learning though proficiency scales in their data notebooks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Angela Nader (angelamn@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.)

Using multiple data points students will be placed in intervention or extension groups. These groups will be smaller student to teacher ratio, teacher/student placement based on strength of teacher and needs of the student. Strategies that will be used in intervention groups will be: teacher/student placement, low student to teacher ratio. Some of the data points are PM, i-Ready, exemplars & fluency. This data will be reviewed at the end of an instructional cycle. Data collected will be reviewed for each student in PLC's. The data is located in a grade level google dashboard and will be monitored by administration and the curriculum team.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Programs and strategies will be consistent amount the school through the use of Edgewood's Instructional Framework. This framework will be modeled after Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching.

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.

Planning System:

Teachers will identify key learning benchmarks (priority)and create proficiency scales through the use of backwards designs. This will be done at the beginning of each instructional guide. Curriculum team will attend and guide planning sessions. Administration will monitor through lesson plans, classroom

walkthroughs and drop ins to planning sessions.

Tier I Instruction:

Teachers will create an instructional framework using NASOT. It's an expectation that teachers use the specific strategies of Edgewood's Instructional Framework. The focus will be on direct instruction lessons during Tier 1 instruction using: Chunking Content, Processing Content, and Reporting & Representing Content. In addition, teachers will focus on Engagement through Increase Response Rates. This will be monitored during classroom walkthroughs with coaching on the specific strategy observed and instructional rounds. Administration, coaches, and mentor teachers will monitor.

Person Responsible: Angela Nader (angelamn@leeschools.net)

By When: on going throughout the school year

#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.

ELA was identified as a crucial need due to the gap between the school and state average.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Edgewood Academy will increase ELA proficiency in 3rd grade from 24% to 40% as measured by the PM3 FAST Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor this area of focus through weekly PLC's, grade level data chats, and grade level goals. Student intervention placement will monitored to ensure students are getting what they need. In addition, students will monitor their own learning though proficiency scales in their data notebooks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Using multiple data points students will be placed in intervention or extension groups. These groups will be smaller student to teacher ratio, teacher/student placement based on strength of teacher and needs of the student. Strategies that will be used in intervention groups will be: teacher/student placement, low student to teacher ratio. Some of the data points are PM, i-Ready, exemplars & fluency. This data will be reviewed at the end of an instructional cycle. Data collected will be reviewed for each student in PLC's. The data is located in a grade level google dashboard and will be monitored by administration and the curriculum team.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Programs and strategies will be consistent amount the school through the use of Edgewood's Instructional Framework. This framework will be modeled after Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching.

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.

Planning System:

Teachers will identify key learning benchmarks (priority)and create proficiency scales through the use of backwards designs. This will be done at the beginning of each instructional guide. Curriculum team will attend and guide planning sessions. Administration will monitor through lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs and drop ins to planning sessions.

Tier I Instruction:

Teachers will create an instructional framework using NASOT. It's an expectation that teachers use the specific strategies of Edgewood's Instructional Framework. The focus will be on direct instruction lessons during Tier 1 instruction using: Chunking Content, Processing Content, and Reporting & Representing Content. In addition, teachers will focus on Engagement through Increase Response Rates. This will be monitored during classroom walkthroughs with coaching on the specific strategy observed and instructional rounds. Administration, coaches, and mentor teachers will monitor.

Person Responsible: Angela Nader (angelamn@leeschools.net)

By When: ongoing throughout the school year

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

#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.

ELA was identified as a crucial need due to the gap between the school and state average.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Edgewood Academy will increase ELA proficiency in grades 2 from 42% to 50% as measured by the PM3 FAST Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor this area of focus through weekly PLC's, grade level data chats, and grade level goals. Student intervention placement will monitored to ensure students are getting what they need. In addition, students will monitor their own learning though proficiency scales in their data notebooks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tiffany Adams (tiffanyaa@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.)

Using multiple data points students will be placed in intervention or extension groups. In these groups teachers will use Really Great Reading, Flyleaf, and ReadWell to support student learning. These groups will be a smaller student to teacher ratio, teacher/student placement based on strength of teacher and needs of the student. Strategies that will be used in creating intervention groups will be: teacher/student placement, low student to teacher ratio. Some of the data points are PM, i-Ready, exemplars & fluency. This data will be reviewed at the end of an instructional cycle. Data collected will be reviewed for each student in PLC's. The data is located in a grade level google dashboard and will be monitored by administration and the curriculum team.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Programs and strategies will be consistent amount the school through the use of Edgewood's Instructional Framework. This framework will be modeled after Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching.

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.

Planning System:

Teachers will identify key learning benchmarks (priority) and create proficiency scales through the use of backwards designs. This will be done at the beginning of each instructional guide. Curriculum team will attend and guide planning sessions. Administration will monitor through lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs and drop ins to planning sessions.

Tier I Instruction:

Teachers will create an instructional framework using NASOT. It's an expectation that teachers use the specific strategies of Edgewood's Instructional Framework. The focus will be on direct instruction lessons during Tier 1 instruction using: Chunking Content, Processing Content, and Reporting & Representing Content. In addition, teachers will focus on Engagement through Increase Response Rates. This will be monitored during classroom walkthroughs with coaching on the specific strategy observed. Administration, coaches, and mentor teachers will monitor.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Adams (tiffanyaa@leeschools.net)

By When: ongoing throughout the year

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

ESSA SWD sub group scored 40% proficient in ELA on the PM3 Fast Assessment in the 2022-2023 school year. This is an increase of 7% compared to the 21-22 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our ESSA SWD sub group will increase from 40% proficient in ELA to 45% on the PM3 Fast Assessment in the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will monitor weekly progress of pass rates and minutes on task in i-Ready ELA. SWD are included in grade level interventions and placed in groups based on need. SWD PLC created to focus on ELA strategies for SWD. Teacher lesson plans will list ESSA sub groups and specific strategies for teaching and learning. Admin checks for completion and implementation during walk throughs. PD is held bi-monthly on early release days for SWD teachers and paras.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Angela Nader (angelamn@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.)

Using multiple data points students will be placed in intervention or extension groups. In these groups teachers will use Really Great Reading, Flyleaf, and ReadWell to support student learning. These groups will be a smaller student to teacher ratio, teacher/student placement based on strength of teacher and needs of the student. Strategies that will be used in creating intervention groups will be: teacher/student placement, low student to teacher ratio. Some of the data points are PM, i-Ready, exemplars & fluency. This data will be reviewed at the end of an instructional cycle. Data collected will be reviewed for each student in PLC's. The data is located in a grade level google dashboard and will be monitored by administration and the curriculum team

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students will be grouped with similar ability peers for intervention. Students are grouped based on progress monitoring data. This gives grade levels common data to plan for SWD. This creates continuity of SWD throughout the school.

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.

Planning System:

Teachers will identify key learning benchmarks (priority) and create proficiency scales through the use of backwards designs. This will be done at the beginning of each instructional guide. Curriculum team will attend and guide planning sessions. Administration will monitor through lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs and drop ins to planning sessions.

Tier I Instruction:

Teachers will create an instructional framework using NASOT. It's an expectation that teachers use the specific strategies of Edgewood's Instructional Framework. The focus will be on direct instruction lessons during Tier 1 instruction using: Chunking Content, Processing Content, and Reporting & Representing Content. In addition, teachers will focus on Engagement through Increase Response Rates. This will be monitored during classroom walkthroughs with coaching on the specific strategy observed and instructional rounds. Administration, coaches, and mentor teachers will monitor.

Person Responsible: Angela Nader (angelamn@leeschools.net)

By When: ongoing throughout the year

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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 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

* Provide whole group and small group instruction on standards; Teachers follow the district's scope and sequence. Use the 12 day close reading routine and planning slides from the district.

* Uninterrupted ELA block.

* Integration of targeted High Yield Strategies: Vocabulary, Numbered Heads together (Kagan), higher order questions and thinking skills, cooperative learning strategies and thinking maps etc.

* Centers: engagement focus, perfect practice centers, thinking maps

* Really Great Reading phonics instruction daily on master schedule

Applications approved during the ELA Block:

1. iREADY Reading-centers or whole group

2. K-2 Reading playground is an optional center rotation during Core or intervention

* During the Reading block students are receiving differentiated core instruction. Utilizing WONDERS companions and anchor texts curriculum pieces, district instructional guides

- * K-2 will utilize Wonders for their CORE and Really Great Reading.
- * Readwell and FlyLeaf will be used during additional intervention block time

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

* Provide whole group and small group instruction on standards; Teachers follow the district's scope and sequence. Use the 12 day close reading routine and planning slides from the district.

* Uninterrupted ELA block.

* Integration of targeted High Yield Strategies: Vocabulary, Numbered Heads together (Kagan), higher order questions and thinking skills, cooperative learning strategies and thinking maps etc.

Applications approved during the ELA Block:

1. iREADY Reading-centers or whole group
2. Wonders App

* During the Reading block students are receiving differentiated core instruction. Utilizing WONDERS companions and anchor texts curriculum pieces, district instructional guides

*3-5 will utilize Wonders for their CORE

Teachers will utilize Phonics for Reading and BEST literature library from Wonders

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

47% of Kindergarten - Second grade will be proficient in ELA as measured by the Spring 2024 administration of the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST).

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Students in grades will increase from 37% to 47% proficiency in the area of ELA as measured by the Spring 2023 administration of the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST).

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.

Administration, academic coaches and PLCs will monitor these areas of focus after each progress monitoring window by data disaggregation/analysis and adjusting intervention groupings and instructional practices accordingly. Additionally, the results of i-Ready diagnostics and benchmark assessments will be

used to gauge overall trends across grade levels. Students will also track their own data using data binders on a weekly basis to monitor assessments, iready progress and accelerated reader. Administration will conduct data chats with PLCs to target necessary changes to implement immediately in order to progress toward the school's goals.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Nader, Angela, angelamn@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?

The following evidence-based practices are being implemented:

- 1- Small-group, standards-based instruction facilitated within the uninterrupted 90-minute ELA block to include instruction on oral language, phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension
- 2- Questioning and tasks that includes higher order thinking skills⁴
- 3- Use of i-Ready learning path which targets and monitors each student's instructional level;
- 4- PLCs collaborate to share best practices, create quality lesson plans, and plan for assessments of student learning;
- 5- Implementation of skill-based intervention practices to target students' academic gaps or provide enrichment
- 6 Targeted interventions and support the SWD subgroup

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?

All mentioned strategies are evidence-based practices and meet Florida's definition of strong practices. All programs align with the K-2 Comprehensive Evidence Reading Plan and align with the 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**

The school will utilize K-2 Literacy Coach, Intervention Support Specialist, ESE resource teachers, paraprofessionals, ESOL Teacher, and 3-5 Literacy Coach to support ELA Core and intervention blocks. Resources will coach, co-teach, push in small groups, and monitor formative assessments through a standards tracker. Resources will help lead and facilitate PLC meetings along with attended grade level planning.

Nader, Angela,
angelamn@leeschools.net

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.

- School Improvement Plans (SIPs) must be created and managed using the Florida CIMS website. This will allow for our completed SIPs to be made available publicly and parents can request a copy from the school's front office in their preferred language after publication approval.
- On Aug 1, 2023, schools must have SIPs reviewed by Academic Services & Title I Depts
- On or before Oct 6, 2023, School Advisory Council (SAC) must present, review, and request feedback on the SIP and budget. The meeting minutes will be uploaded into the school's Title I Crate (web-based site) and FY24 School document folder in the google team drive.
- On Oct 17, 2023, The Lee County School Board will approve publication and dissemination.
- Schools must review Annual School Improvement Assurances, complete & submit School Advisory Council Membership List 2023-2024, complete & submit School Advisory Council 2022-2023 Nomination and Election Process Verification on or before Nov 1, 2023, in the google drive FY24 School Document Folder.

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))

Edgewood Academy 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, and child care. 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.

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)

Edgewood Academy has hired additional academic coaches and paraprofessionals to support student learning. We also offer extended day tutoring and enrichment programs. There are additional professional development opportunities for teachers using Title I funds.

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.

Collaborative partners (i.e include Early Childhood Services (Head Start, VPK) ; Career and Adult Education; Foundation for Lee County Schools; local Literacy Council; Florida Gulf Coast University; Florida SouthWestern State College; and Local Chamber of Commerce. Activities with Early Childhood include blended VPK/Title I classrooms for four-year-olds. This is a voluntary program that identifies elevated risk students to receive a full year of educational opportunities. The benefits for students include readiness for kindergarten and focusing on building literacy for early reading skills. The expected

outcome is for the four-year-olds who participate in the programs to be able to perform at the readiness level in all areas of the kindergarten readiness screening. Adult Education has partnered with Title I schools to offer ESOL classes for parents to learn English. The benefit of these classes is to help the monolingual parents learn English so that they can become more self-sufficient.)

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))

To increase graduation rate and decrease dropout rate, the district has implemented several specific activities:

Secondary Education – A variety of technology related courses offered in the high schools and middle schools. Upon completion of these courses, students can either seek immediate employment or they can articulate credit to Florida Southwestern State College or receive advance standing at the district's technical schools or Florida Southwestern State College. The emphasis of Technical Education allows students the opportunity to do hands-on exploration in a variety of programs which can lead to immediate employment or advanced training. Many of the programs allow on-the-job training or internships while still attending high school.

Comprehensive High Schools – Comprehensive high schools provide secondary students with an educational alternative that enhances the traditional high school curriculum. Students will not only be able to select from the traditional academic and extracurricular programs but also can pursue a specialized program within a Technical and Career Education Academy within this high school setting. Students graduating from a comprehensive high school will leave with marketable skills and competencies now required in businesses and industries.

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 Peer Collaborative

Teachers (PCTs) 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.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes