J. Colin English Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

J. Colin English Elementary School

120 PINE ISLAND RD, North Fort Myers, FL 33903

http://jce.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.

At J. Colin English Elementary, our mission is to inspire young people to become Internationally-minded "World Changers" by providing them with an inquiry-based learning environment that promotes global understanding and respect.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At J. Colin English Elementary, our vision is to develop "Learners for Life".

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
Williams III, Joe	Principal	School leader responsible for carrying out all aspects of the SIP.
Robinson, Michele	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal responsible for supporting the principal in carrying out all aspects of the SIP.
Stanley, Theresa	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor providing support for student service areas of the SIP.
Mett, Teresa	Other	Intervention Specialist responsible for academic intervention support services related to the the SIP.
Ellis, Rebecca	Teacher, ESE	Teacher of students with special needs responsible for ESE services and related SIP goals.

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.

Regular SAC meetings are held in which parents, community members, teachers, and staff are provided an opportunity to give input on improvement goals, barriers, and improvement strategies. Current data

on goal attainment is reviewed, as well as barriers to meeting these goals. In addition, teachers meet weekly in PLCs for progress monitoring and instructional planning for SIP goal attainment.

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))

Regular monitoring of effective instructional practices and standards alignment includes daily classroom walkthroughs and progress monitoring data chats. Teachers meet weekly in PLCs with administration for grade team common planning, data progress monitoring after each assessment, intervention planning, and professional development. Staff is able to give feedback on instructional practices and program implementation, and when appropriate adjustments are made through consensus to ensure goal attainment.

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	60%
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: C 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	13	46	28	26	15	23	0	0	0	151
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	4	17	12	18	9	3	0	0	0	63
Course failure in Math	3	5	4	10	11	2	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	23	10	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	25	14	0	0	0	42
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	3	5	4	9	24	6	0	0	0	51

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	4	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	2	6	6	3	0	0	0	17

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	24	17	16	15	6	0	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	3	2	6	13	4	1	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	1	0	6	10	4	1	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	9	13	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	7	11	0	0	0	23
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	1	0	5	12	8	9	0	0	0	35

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	0	0	10	0	2	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	3	4	4	5	4	0	0	0	20

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	24	17	16	15	6	0	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	3	2	6	13	4	1	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	1	0	6	10	4	1	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	9	13	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	7	11	0	0	0	23
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	1	0	5	12	8	9	0	0	0	35

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	0	0	10	0	2	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	3	4	4	5	4	0	0	0	20

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*	43	48	53	43	52	56	43		
ELA Learning Gains				45			62		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			60		
Math Achievement*	49	57	59	53	45	50	53		
Math Learning Gains				64			46		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48					
Science Achievement*	48	53	54	41	59	59	43		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	60	51	59	64			60		

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](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	244
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	402
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
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	11	Yes	4	2
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	49			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	49			
FRL	47			

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	24	Yes	3	1
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	42			
HSP	50			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	47			

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	43			49			48					60
SWD	7			14							2	
ELL	38			45							3	60
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41			38							2	
HSP	47			47			43				5	59
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	41			54			59				4	
FRL	43			48			47				5	56

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	43	45	44	53	64	48	41					64
SWD	6	17		18	55							
ELL	39	43		46	68							64
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	47	38		33	50							
HSP	42	45	42	50	66	50	41					65
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	46	50		60	63		48					
FRL	39	39	43	48	59	50	37					64

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	43	62	60	53	46		43					60
SWD	6			21								
ELL	28	58		38	64		40					60
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	67			33								
HSP	38	64		47	52		40					64
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	44			63								
FRL	38	64		50	47		45					69

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	39%	48%	-9%	54%	-15%
04	2023 - Spring	58%	56%	2%	58%	0%
03	2023 - Spring	38%	42%	-4%	50%	-12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	44%	55%	-11%	59%	-15%
04	2023 - Spring	50%	61%	-11%	61%	-11%
05	2023 - Spring	55%	52%	3%	55%	0%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	48%	50%	-2%	51%	-3%

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 lowest performance area for the school year 22-23 was Math achievement at 52%. This dropped from the prior year of 53%.

A contributing factor to lower Math achievement is that our area was heavily impacted by Hurricane Ian this school year in which schools were closed, and students, teachers, and staff were displaced for months, causing high mobility and loss of instruction.

Inconsistent attendance and a high mobility rate had a negative impact on student achievement. The percentage of students with attendance below 90% for the 22-23 school year was as follows:
Grade 3: 26%, Grade 4: 15%, and Grade 5: 23%.

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

Math proficiency had the greatest decline in achievement in the 22-23 school year with a -1 trend, decreasing from 53% to 52%. Loss of instructional time and consistent practice in Math skills due to Hurricane Ian had a significant impact. Schools were closed and both students and staff were displaced

for months, causing a decline in appropriate instruction with highly qualified staff, skill loss, and achievement.

Inconsistent attendance and a high mobility rate had a negative impact on student achievement. The percentage of students with attendance below 90% for the 22-23 school year was as follows:
Grade 3: 26%, Grade 4: 15%, and Grade 5: 23%.

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.

not available at this time

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

Science proficiency showed the greatest increase with a +7 increase in the 22-23 school year from the prior year, from 41% to 48%. The contributing factors included a focus on hands-on learning modules aligned to benchmarks and the IGs for teacher instruction.

Professional development in planning for Science inquiry lessons, sharing best practices at weekly PLCs, and modeling lesson content provided teachers with high-yield support.

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

Reflecting on the Early Warning data, potential areas to address for intervention include early intervention in grades 1, 2, and 3 for ELA to target students who are not meeting ELA standards. The 22-23 data for ELA not meeting standards is as follows: Grade 1: 17%, Grade 2: 12%, and Grade 3: 18%.

The second area of focus as indicated by EWS data is attendance below 90%. The 22-23 data for attendance below 90% is as follows: Grade 1: 46%, Grade 2 28%, Grade 3; 26%, Grade 4: 15%, and Grade 5: 23%.

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

Priorities for the upcoming school year include:
ELA achievement
ELA learning gains
Math Achievement
Attendance at 90% for above.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Intervention

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.

An area of needed focus is the Students with Disabilities subgroup. In 22-23, ELA proficiency for this subgroup was at 6%, and ELA learning gains were at 17%. For the 23-24 school year, ELA learning gains are to be targeted.

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

For the 23-24 school year, SWD will increase ELA learning gains from 17% to 25% as measured by the 23-24 FAST data.

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

Teachers will align instructional benchmarks and targeted intervention strategies to student outcomes, providing additional time for instructional goals and alternative teaching methods instructed by teachers with specialized training as evidenced by lesson plans and classroom walkthroughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rebecca Ellis (rebeccale@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.)

State-adopted reading intervention curricula include the following:
• i-Ready Teacher Toolbox & i-Ready Student Learning
Path (K-5)
• Read Well (K-1)
• Flyleaf (2)
• Phonics for Reading (3-5) and Magnetic (3-5).
These materials will be utilized for 60 minutes a day in small group instruction of 6 or fewer students, in addition to the ELA core reading block, when planning for targeted intervention lessons based on data for the individual student instructional above and beyond the core ELA curriculum. In grade 3, any student who had been retained will be instructed by a highly qualified reading-endorsed teacher and provided intervention with a certified ESE teacher.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The district supports these curriculum materials and the FCRR supports these evidence-based instructional strategies.

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.

District-approved ELA curriculum materials will be utilized for 60 minutes a day in small group instruction of 6 or fewer students, in addition to the ELA core reading block, when planning for aligned benchmark and targeted intervention lessons based on data for the individual student instructional above and beyond the core ELA curriculum. In grade 3, any student who had been retained will be instructed by a highly qualified reading-endorsed teacher and provided intervention with a certified ESE teacher.

Person Responsible: Joe Williams III (joewil@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly lesson plan checks and classroom walkthroughs will provide evidence of the action steps being implemented.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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.

In 22-23, students' math proficiency in grades 3,4,5 decreased from 53% to 52% as measured by the FAST test.

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

In the 23-24 school year, students in grades 3,4,5 combined will increase math proficiency from 52% to 55% as measured by the FAST test.

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored through standards-based assessments, exemplars, and diagnostic test results as well as lesson plans and classroom walk-throughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joe Williams III (joewil@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.)

Teachers will utilize higher-order questioning and hands-on learning manipulatives during core instruction. Teachers will provide a tiered level of intervention instruction for students based on data utilizing intervention instructional materials beyond the regular core instruction. Intervention Program
• i-Ready Teacher Toolbox & i-Ready Student Learning Path (K-5)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Student data will be reviewed at PLC meetings by teachers, admin, and coach to ensure the effectiveness of strategies and adjust as needed.

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 will meet in PLCs to review and discuss findings in student data. 2. Track standards for individual student intervention plans. 3. Develop of highly engaging, rigorous classroom activities. 4. Develop of discussion and tasks using higher order thinking skills and questions. 5. Continue to use Kagan structures school wide and continue Structure of the Month. 6. Develop lessons and activities incorporating Thinking Maps. 7. Provide professional development and coaching opportunities for teachers as needed. 8. Progress monitoring of all students including the ESSA subgroup, students with disabilities, will include the use of a data collection tool in the school Google drive. 9. Teachers will use

data protocols to analyze data and plan for differentiated instruction to remediate areas of need for each student.

Person Responsible: Joe Williams III (joewil@leeschools.net)

By When: By the end of the 23-24 school year.

#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.

Reflecting on the Early Warning data, intervention in grades 1, 2, and 3 for ELA is in need of decreasing the number of students at level 1 in ELA. The 22-23 data for ELA not meeting standards is as follows: Grade 1: 17%, Grade 2: 12%, and Grade 3: 18%.

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, students at level 1 in grades 1, 2, and 3 will decrease by 3% as measured by Iready or FAST data (or the equivalent), with a focus on learning gains (no prior year data available).

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

Tiered leveled supports will be implemented for small groups and targeted skills as evidenced by lesson plans and classroom walkthroughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joe Williams III (joewil@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.)

Teachers will utilize weekly ELA data to align instructional benchmarks and targeted intervention strategies to student outcomes, providing an additional time of 60 minutes beyond the core ELA instructional block in small groups of less than 6. Tiered leveled supports will be implemented for small groups and targeted skills as evidenced by lesson plans and classroom walkthroughs. FCRR strategies will be implemented in small groups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Student data will be reviewed weekly through PLCs for intervention needs and monitored.

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.

1. Teachers will meet in PLCs to review and discuss findings in student data. 2. Track standards for individual student intervention plans. 3. Develop of highly engaging, rigorous classroom activities. 4. Develop intervention lessons. 5. Continue to use Kagan structures school-wide and continue Structure of the Month. 6. Develop lessons and activities incorporating Thinking Maps. 7. Provide professional development and coaching opportunities for teachers as needed. 8. Progress monitoring of all students including the ESSA subgroup, students with disabilities, will include the use of a data collection tool in the

school Google drive. 9. Teachers will use data protocols to analyze data and plan for differentiated instruction to remediate areas of need for each student.

Person Responsible: Joe Williams III (joewil@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly observations continue throughout the entire school year.

#4. 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.

Increase ELA proficiency for all students.

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

In 23-24 school year, increase ELA proficiency from 46-48% in grades 3,4,5 combined as measured by the ELA FAST test.

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored through standards-based assessments, exemplars, and diagnostic test results as well as Lesson plans and classroom walkthroughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joe Williams III (joewil@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.)

JCE teachers will engage students in activities using higher-order thinking skills and questioning techniques (e.g. Kagan and Thinking Maps).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers will implement a variety of evidence-based strategies to reach all learners. Lesson plan expectations include planning for Kagan and Thinking Maps and will be reviewed weekly through OnCourse. Student data will be reviewed at PLC meetings by teachers, admin, and coach to ensure the effectiveness of strategies and adjust as needed.

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.

1. Teachers will meet in PLCs to review and discuss findings in student data. 2. Track standards for individual student intervention plans. 3. Develop of highly engaging, rigorous classroom activities. 4. Develop of discussion and tasks using higher order thinking skills and questions. 5. Continue to use Kagan structures school wide and continue Structure of the Month. 6. Develop lessons and activities incorporating Thinking Maps. 7. Provide professional development and coaching opportunities for teachers as needed. 8. Progress monitoring of all students including the ESSA subgroup, students with disabilities, will include the use of a data collection tool in the school Google drive. 9. Teachers will use data protocols to analyze data and plan for differentiated instruction to remediate areas of need for each student.

Person Responsible: Joe Williams III (joewil@leeschools.net)

By When: By the end of the 23-24 school 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.
The Early Warning System attendance data for 22-23 indicates that student attendance is in need of improvement with a combined K-5 average of student attendance below 90% at 25%.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.
For the 23-24 school year, the combined K-5 average of students with attendance below 90% will decrease from 25% to 20%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.
Daily attendance data will be reviewed by the attendance clerk, administration, teachers, and students through the focus portal. Weekly student service meetings will be held in which attendance will be reviewed to identify students in need of improvement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Joe Williams III (joewil@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.)
Weekly attendance meetings with parents will be held to plan for improvement. Attendance incentives will be implemented for students in need of improvement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
The Early Warning System attendance data for 22-23 indicates that student attendance is in need of improvement with a combined K-5 average of student attendance below 90% at 25%.
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's 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 are 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

The district will provide ongoing (at minimum 2 times monthly) Literacy Coach support for grade-level team planning to backward design lessons directly related to BEST Standard Benchmarks, Instructional Guides, and assessment test items.

The district will provide ongoing (at minimum 2 times monthly) Literacy Coach support for grade-level team planning to design targeted instructional groups based on intervention data needs and differentiated lesson best practices. Data which will be considered will be formative, progress monitoring, and diagnostic data.

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

The district will provide ongoing (at minimum 2 times monthly) Literacy Coach support for grade-level team planning to backward design lessons directly related to BEST Standard Benchmarks, Instructional

Guides, and assessment test items.

The district will provide ongoing (at minimum 2 times monthly) Literacy Coach support for grade-level team planning to design targeted instructional groups based on intervention data needs and differentiated lesson best practices.

Data which will be considered will be formative, progress monitoring, and diagnostic data.

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

In grade K, students scoring below the 40% threshold on STAR will maintain at 45%.
In grade 1, students scoring below the 40% threshold on STAR will decrease from 53%-50%.
In grade 2, students scoring below the 40% threshold on STAR will decrease from 54% to 50%.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

In grade 3, students scoring below the 40% threshold on STAR will decrease from 57% to 50%.
In grade 4, students scoring below the 40% threshold on STAR will maintain at 41%.
In grade 5, students scoring below the 40% threshold on STAR will decrease from 65% to 50%.

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.

All grade levels will have a common data document which includes grade level progress monitoring data and intervention group data which is focused on targeted BEST Standard Skills. The document will be utilized at every PLC when planning for instruction for both core and intervention lessons.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Robinson, Michele, michelero@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?

Reading Intervention Programs utilize evidence-based best practices and are aligned to the B.E.S.T. Standards, the Comprehensive K-12 Model Plan for intervention instruction, and include walk-to-read and small group instruction.

These programs are as follows:
Kinder and Grade 1: Read Well
Grade 2: Fly Leaf
Grade 3-5: Phonics for Reading

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 are approved by the school district as being evidence-based and the most appropriate for our target population.

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
Teachers will participate in Professional Learning Communities focused on data-driven assessment planning for both core and intervention instruction.	Robinson, Michele, michelero@leeschools.net
Teachers will participate in professional learning focused on high-yeild strategies for student engagement.	Littman, Erica, erical@leeschools.net
Teachers will utilize a variety of data, and document student progress for the purpose of intervention planning.	Robinson, Michele, michelero@leeschools.net
Teachers will participate in coaching cycles for professional growth of instuctional practices.	Bumm, Stephanie, stephaniejbu@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.

● District protocol is for each school to do the following:
○ 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))

J. Colin English recognizes the 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 and school, the Parent and Family Engagement plan 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, and the time events/ meetings are held. 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...., the number of volunteers and volunteer service hours, become the guiding force for 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, and parent surveys. 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))

J. Colin English utilizes Title 1 funds to enhance and strengthen our academic programs. Supplemental materials are purchased for students to support curriculum programs such as the IReady workbooks for ELA and math. Funds are allocated to the media center to replenish library books and increase the number of reading materials that at non-fiction. Funds are allocated for professional development for teachers to increase their knowledge with standings planning and alignment and high-yield strategies. In addition, IB quarterly meetings are held to ensure teachers are current on IB focus and alignment. Additional staff, 4 teaching assistants, a reading coach, and a partial Music teacher who pushes in for instruction, is purchased through funding from Title 1 to support supplemental and intervention reading instruction for our students who are struggling. Teachers are provided support by the reading coach.

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 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))

Students at J. Colin English are part of the IB program. They are exposed to IB initiatives are a young age, preparing them for future opportunities to continue toward IB programs in secondary and post-secondary. International Baccalaureate (IB) – The District offers the IB Diploma Program at a selected high school in each attendance zone. Successful completion of the IB Diploma Program earns the student a diploma recognized for university admission throughout the world and for course credit and academic placement at 1,000 leading colleges and universities in the US. The curricula incorporate standards that assume an elevated level of achievement during the prior years. A pre-IB curriculum for 9th and 10th grades has been developed to prepare students for the full IB diploma that they can earn in the 11th and 12th grades. The district has now expanded the IB program into the elementary and middle schools in each attendance zone to prepare students for the high school program.

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 support within a Multi-tiered System of Support (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 Support (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 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 Support 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 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.

The administration holds monthly APPLES meetings for new teachers which focus on professional development specific to new teachers and their needs.

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))

J. Colin English provides Head Start programs for early learning to our community on our elementary campus. When students are school-age, they and their families are able to make a smooth transition as

they are familiar with our campus. 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: ESSA Subgroup: Intervention				$35,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5200	169	0261 - J. Colin English Elem. School	IDEA	1.0	$35,000.00
			Notes: IDEA prek helping teacher to assist with early intervention			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$74,954.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	169	0261 - J. Colin English Elem. School	Other	1.0	$74,954.00
			Notes: Two .5 teachers paid by SAI funding to provide push-in small group instructional support in math			
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$74,954.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	6300	196	0261 - J. Colin English Elem. School	Other	1.0	$74,954.00
			Notes: Intervention support specialist to plan and provide intervention for students at tier 2 and 3			
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$74,954.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	6400	196	0261 - J. Colin English Elem. School	Other	1.0	$74,954.00
			Notes: Literacy coach to provide modeling for teachers, planning support and in-class student support for students			
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System				$70,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	170	0261 - J. Colin English Elem. School	Title, I Part A	2.0	$70,000.00
			Notes: 4 paraprofessionals to provide classroom support to students and support to teachers in creating a supportive environment, provide incentives, and increase student engagement in attendance.			
					Total:	$329,862.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes