

The School District of Lee County

Lehigh Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	25
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	25
VI. Title I Requirements	27
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Lehigh Elementary School

200 SCHOOLSIDE DR, Lehigh Acres, FL 33936

<http://lhl.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.

Lehigh Elementary is dedicated to building life-long learners through a safe, nurturing, and respectful environment driven by high expectations, school-wide collaboration, community, and family involvement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Imparting Wisdom, Inspiring Excellence, Impacting the Future.

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
Morgan, Jackson	Principal	
Stafford, Jessica	Assistant Principal	
Plucker, Jason	Assistant Principal	
Canino, Cara	Instructional Coach	
Ledbetter-Smith, Natasha	Instructional Coach	
McStravic, Angela	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.

We invited SAC and PTO to participate in our creation of the SIP.

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))

We have created a system of monitoring our data with the grade levels. We will meet with grade chairs monthly to review data as well as meet monthly with our grade levels to discuss their best practices and how they are achieving their goals.

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	82%
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) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: 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	77	50	69	72	54	65	0	0	0	387
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	13	14	35	33	2	19	0	0	0	116
Course failure in Math	6	1	2	19	14	19	0	0	0	61
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	99	59	61	0	0	0	219
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	75	62	65	0	0	0	202
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	
	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	1	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	6

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	15	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2

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	1	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	1	38	22	87	16	11	0	0	0	175
Course failure in Math	0	20	14	9	2	2	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	41	36	42	0	0	0	119
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	30	45	56	0	0	0	131
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	15	14	42	30	37	0	0	0	138

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	14	4	0	41	0	0	0	0	0	59
Students retained two or more times	0	2	4	2	22	3	0	0	0	33

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	1	38	22	87	16	11	0	0	0	175
Course failure in Math	0	20	14	9	2	2	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	41	36	42	0	0	0	119
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	30	45	56	0	0	0	131
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	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	15	14	42	30	37	0	0	0	138

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	14	4	0	41	0	0	0	0	0	59
Students retained two or more times	0	2	4	2	22	3	0	0	0	33

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*	37	48	53	40	52	56	39		
ELA Learning Gains				57			39		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				58			47		
Math Achievement*	44	57	59	41	45	50	41		
Math Learning Gains				45			32		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39			24		
Science Achievement*	51	53	54	39	59	59	39		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	50	51	59	48			50		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	216
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	367
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	21	Yes	4	1
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	31	Yes	1	1
HSP	45			
MUL	35	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	43			
FRL	42			

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	33	Yes	3	
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	45			
HSP	46			
MUL	44			
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	44			

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	37			44			51					50
SWD	11			29			18				5	38
ELL	29			37			48				5	50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29			29			26				5	44
HSP	39			46			56				5	50
MUL	35			40							3	
PAC												
WHT	32			50			55				4	
FRL	35			41			51				5	50

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	40	57	58	41	45	39	39					48
SWD	17	49	50	23	37	36	24					27
ELL	32	56	47	33	43	48	30					48
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33	60	68	28	36	37	37					59
HSP	41	58	52	42	44	44	38					47
MUL	33	64		33	45							
PAC												
WHT	45	52		52	59		52					
FRL	37	56	60	36	43	35	35					47

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	39	39	47	41	32	24	39					50
SWD	13	18		17	18	20	11					50
ELL	24	31	43	25	33	41	8					50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33	38		33	22		33					
HSP	39	38	39	40	31	26	38					51
MUL	42			32								
PAC												
WHT	45	47		55	44		52					
FRL	32	36	52	36	29	21	35					49

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	38%	48%	-10%	54%	-16%
04	2023 - Spring	42%	56%	-14%	58%	-16%
03	2023 - Spring	32%	42%	-10%	50%	-18%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	45%	55%	-10%	59%	-14%
04	2023 - Spring	51%	61%	-10%	61%	-10%
05	2023 - Spring	39%	52%	-13%	55%	-16%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	47%	50%	-3%	51%	-4%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance is our 3rd grade ELA. The contributing factors are: low scores upon entry to the grade level, two classes of retained students, and the district required intervention program was not as effective as our previous plan.

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

None of our data components showed decline from the previous year.

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

The greatest gap in our data component compared to the state data is in 3rd grade ELA. The contributing factors are: low scores upon entry to the grade level, two classes of retained students, and the district required intervention program was not as effective as our previous plan.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is our 5th grade science. Our science proficiency went up by 12% from the previous year! This last year, we provided more resources and supports for the team. Our science coach pushed into the classrooms and worked alongside the grade level to support their planning process and implementation of the content.

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

The greatest area of concern is attendance overall for each grade level.

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

ELA proficiency

ESE student growth and proficiency in ELA

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 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.

Our SWD have been identified as being below the federal index of 41% in 3 consecutive years.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In 2023-2024 Lehigh Elementary will increase the SWD proficiency from 38% to 42% by the end of the school year as measured by FAST data.

Monitoring:

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

We will strategically place our SWD into classes that will have additional support. We will also place students in classrooms with teachers that understand the strategies needed to support the diverse needs of our students. We have created an out of classroom role for ESE to allow our ESE teachers to be in the classrooms supporting students full time.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jessica Stafford (jessicanst@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.)

Our ESE students will be provided direct instruction as an intervention support through the walk to read model. Our ESE teachers will pull our students during intervention and provide standards based instruction that aligns with their IEP goals as well as filling in gaps in reading. Our SWD will continue to use iReady, which is an evidence based program that assists students with filling in learning gaps and also provides targeted instruction to meet their learning needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By using and monitoring iReady with fidelity, our students have had previous success. We anticipate seeing similar results with our ESE students when combined with direct instruction for intervention.

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.

Admin will meet with ESE teachers to review needs of students and grade level data to ensure that the scheduling of the students is strategic.

Person Responsible: Jessica Stafford (jessicanst@leeschools.net)

By When: Before August 10 and ongoing as students enroll in the school.

Creation of intervention plan that includes specific plan for our ESE students. Our ESE students will be tested with a diagnostic exam to see where the students have specific needs. The students will receive direct instruction and will be monitored frequently to re-assess and monitor their progress and determine best intervention placement.

Person Responsible: Cara Canino (carasc@leeschools.net)

By When: By week 6 and ongoing monitoring until the end of the school year.

Our school social worker will continue to monitor attendance of our students, in particular our ESE students. We will use our PBIS rewards system to incentivize positive attendance as well as have quarterly attendance awards for students with positive attendance.

Person Responsible: Sheri Povia (sherilp@leeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing

Lehigh Elementary School has a "behavior squad" team that meets to discuss data related to behaviors. This group will also discuss specific behavioral needs for our SWD population and come up with strategies that will support the classroom and the student. The team will meet monthly and create action plans at the meeting to provide ongoing supports as needed.

Person Responsible: Jessica Stafford (jessicanst@leeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing

#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 our overall lowest subject area in terms of proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In the 2023-2024 school year, Lehigh Elementary's 3rd grade ELA scores will increase from 34% to 37% by the end of the school year as measured by the end of year FAST assessment.

Monitoring:

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

We will strategically place our students into classes that are aligned based on the strength of the teacher and the needs of the student. Our students will be provided direct instruction as an intervention support through the walk to read model. The students will be placed into intervention programs based on the standard that they are still needing to master. Those students that have mastered the standard will be placed in an enrichment group to deepen their understanding of the standard. Our students will continue to use iReady, which is an evidence based program that assists students with filling in learning gaps and also provides targeted instruction to meet their learning needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cara Canino (carasc@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.)

We will use the walk to read model for intervention. We will use direct instruction for our students that need it. We will use a diagnostic to place students in the appropriate targeted intervention. We will use iReady, which is an evidence based program to fill in the learning gaps for students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By using and monitoring iReady with fidelity, our students have had previous success. We anticipate seeing similar results with our lowest 25% students when combined with direct instruction for intervention.

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.

Work with a team to strategically create class lists based on student need and teacher strengths.

Person Responsible: Jackson Morgan (jacksoncm@leeschools.net)

By When: August 2

Complete the diagnostic for students and place students appropriately based on their individual needs. Assign intervention program based on student levels and continue to monitor and adjust as needed throughout the school year.

Person Responsible: Cara Canino (carasc@leeschools.net)

By When: 6 weeks to establish intervention groups and ongoing monitoring.

Admin will meet with grade chairs on a monthly basis to discuss data overall. We will then meet with the grade levels during their PLC time to discuss data and intervention placements based on progress monitoring.

Person Responsible: Jason Plucker (jasonbp@leeschools.net)

By When: ongoing monthly

#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.

Our ELA proficiency scores had the least amount of growth for all our content areas.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In the 2023-2024 school year, Lehigh Elementary students will increase from an overall ELA proficiency in grades 3-5 of 40% to 43% as measured by FAST by the end of the school year.

Monitoring:

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

We will strategically place our students into classes that are aligned based on the strength of the teacher and the needs of the student. Our students will be provided direct instruction as an intervention support through the walk to read model. The students will be placed into intervention programs based on the standard that they are still needing to master. Those students that have mastered the standard will be placed in an enrichment group to deepen their understanding of the standard. Our students will continue to use iReady, which is an evidence based program that assists students with filling in learning gaps and also provides targeted instruction to meet their learning needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cara Canino (carasc@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.)

We will use the walk to read model for intervention. We will use direct instruction for our students that need it. We will use a diagnostic to place students in the appropriate targeted intervention. We will use iReady, which is an evidence based program to fill in the learning gaps for students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By using and monitoring iReady with fidelity, our students have had previous success. We anticipate seeing similar results with our lowest 25% students when combined with direct instruction for intervention.

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.

Work with a team to strategically create class lists based on student need and teacher strengths.

Person Responsible: Jackson Morgan (jacksoncm@leeschools.net)

By When: By August 2

Complete the diagnostic for students and place students appropriately based on their individual needs. Assign intervention program based on student levels and continue to monitor and adjust as needed throughout the school year.

Person Responsible: Cara Canino (carasc@leeschools.net)

By When: Diagnostic by 6 weeks and ongoing monitor.

Admin will meet with grade chairs on a monthly basis to discuss data overall. We will then meet with the grade levels during their PLC time to discuss data and intervention placements based on progress monitoring.

Person Responsible: Jason Plucker (jasonbp@leeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing monthly

#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.

ELA was the lowest performing subject area overall for each grade level.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In the 2023-2024 school year, Lehigh Elementary School's 2nd grade ELA proficiency scores will increase from 52% to 55% by the end of the school year as measured by the FAST assessment.

Monitoring:

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

We will strategically place our students into classes that are aligned based on the strength of the teacher and the needs of the student. Our students will be provided direct instruction as an intervention support through the walk to read model. The students will be placed into intervention programs based on the standard that they are still needing to master. Those students that have mastered the standard will be placed in an enrichment group to deepen their understanding of the standard. Our students will continue to use iReady, which is an evidence based program that assists students with filling in learning gaps and also provides targeted instruction to meet their learning needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jessica Stafford (jessicanst@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.)

We will use the walk to read model for intervention. We will use direct instruction for our students that need it. We will use a diagnostic to place students in the appropriate targeted intervention. We will use iReady, which is an evidence based program to fill in the learning gaps for students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By using and monitoring iReady with fidelity, our students have had previous success. We anticipate seeing similar results with our lowest 25% students when combined with direct instruction for intervention.

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.

Work with a team to strategically create class lists based on student need and teacher strengths

Person Responsible: Jackson Morgan (jacksoncm@leeschools.net)

By When: August 2

Complete the diagnostic for students and place students appropriately based on their individual needs. Assign intervention program based on student levels and continue to monitor and adjust as needed throughout the school year.

Person Responsible: Cara Canino (carasc@leeschools.net)

By When: 6 weeks to begin intervention program and ongoing.

Admin will meet with grade chairs on a monthly basis to discuss data overall. We will then meet with the grade levels during their PLC time to discuss data and intervention placements based on progress monitoring.

Person Responsible: Jason Plucker (jasonbp@leeschools.net)

By When: ongoing

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

Our SWD student group continues to demonstrate minimal growth. We continue to struggle to staff our job positions that serve this student group.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By December 2023, 100% of job vacancies related to SWD (i.e. teacher and support staff) will be filled by qualified applicants.

Monitoring:

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

We will frequently check job postings and attend hiring fairs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jackson Morgan (jacksoncm@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.)

N/A

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

N/A

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.

Post jobs

Person Responsible: Jackson Morgan (jacksoncm@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Check jobs for applicants and schedule interviews

Person Responsible: Jackson Morgan (jacksoncm@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

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

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Comprehensive intervention plan in place includes research based programs such as Readwell and Fly Leaf. Based on current ELA data there are significant deficits in our students' learning. We used screeners and i-Ready diagnostic scores to determine students' needs and implement explicit systematic programs and targeted instructions to fill in learning gaps. Students will also participate in a walk-to-read model with additional support from resource teachers.

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

Comprehensive intervention plan in place includes research based programs such as Magnetic Reading and Phonics for Reading. Based on current ELA data there are significant deficits in our students' learning. We used i-Ready diagnostic scores to determine students' needs and implement explicit systematic programs and targeted instructions to fill in learning gaps. Students will also participate in a walk-to-read model with additional support from resource teachers.

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

By PM3, 2024, we will reduce the percentage of students not scoring proficient on FAST Reading from 60% to 57%.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By PM3, 2024, we will reduce the percentage of students not scoring proficient on FAST Reading from 60% to 57%.

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.

FAST, i-Ready diagnostics, and standards-based assessments will be used to monitor student progress.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Stafford, Jessica, jessicanst@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?

Comprehensive intervention plan in place includes research based programs, such as ReadWell, Fly Leaf, Magnetic reading, and 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?

Based on current ELA data, there are significant deficits in our students' learning. We used screeners and diagnostic scores to determine student's needs and implement explicit, systematic programs and targeted instruction to fill in learning gaps.

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
1. Administration will meet with grade levels weekly to analyze data and discuss instructional needs. 2. Teachers will work with small groups of students, targeting goals. 3. Instructional support personnel will work with small groups of students to provide support. 4. Coaches will work with PLCs to plan instruction. 5. Students are encouraged to independently read interdisciplinary books to support curricular understanding.	Stafford, Jessica, jessicanst@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))

Lehigh Elementary School recognizes the enormous importance of increasing parental and family engagement in raising student achievement at all levels. To accomplish this and to determine the needs/barriers of our parents, schools, the PFEP team analyzes the current building capacity activities, compares participation numbers, and addresses the barriers that limit parent participation. These barriers include lack of transportation to meetings, language barriers, childcare, inability to leave work for events/meetings and in general the difficulties with the current economic conditions. In addition, since we are a Title I school, we complete the Florida DOE template for the Parent and Family Educational Plan (PFEP). School data is reported to the district to become a part of the District PFEP Evaluation and goal setting process. Schools' baseline data sources. i.e., number of volunteers and volunteer service hours, become the guiding force to annual evaluation and improvement of the school's parent involvement program to enhance student achievement for the upcoming school year. (Choose if you do this or any part of it - Other sources of data may include but are not limited to parent workshop and training evaluations, sign in sheets, attendance and volunteer logs, parent surveys, the Title I Crate, and test results. The PFEP will be a principal element of the review process for each school in gathering data at the end of the year as the schools complete their SIP (Comprehensive Needs Analysis) in preparation for revising School Improvement Plans

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

- Personnel hired (Teachers, Coaches, PCTs, Counselor, Social Workers, Instructional Support/Para).
- Extended day/Tutoring/Enrichment Programs if you have reserved funds to do such
- Curriculum and Development Supplemental Contracts for processing for improvement include ongoing data chats at the classroom level, data review and instructional change, baseline/midyear/final, and adjustments to align curriculum, resources, and the results for assessments aligned to Florida's academic standards.
- PD opportunities to improve teacher quality made available 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-old's 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))

N/A

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 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.