
Table of Contents

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

Orangewood Elementary School

4001 DELEON ST, Fort Myers, FL 33901

<http://owd.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 Orangewood Elementary, diversity is celebrated in both academics and individual talents. As a safe and welcoming community, we strive to create a student-driven culture that builds confident, life-long leaders. By practicing the 7 Habits, we develop the whole person enabling ALL to achieve their personal best.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Inspiring a passion for learning through leadership.

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
Browder, Jami	Principal	Monitor completion and implementation
Tracey, Kori	Assistant Principal	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

Our School Advisory Council provides input as well as votes to accept the plan each year.

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))

The SIP will be monitored after each Progress Monitoring by our leadership team for consistency of implementation for intervention and core curriculum instruction. Data will also be monitored at this time to track progress and align new processes or goals determined by data.

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	78%
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: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B
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	6	21	25	23	11	12	0	0	0	98
One or more suspensions	0	4	7	3	12	6	0	0	0	32
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	18	12	14	30	16	0	0	0	90
Course failure in Math	0	6	6	11	29	5	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	43	18	0	0	0	73
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	41	22	0	0	0	73
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	0	7	6	13	45	20	0	0	0	91

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	13	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	7

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	5	3	4	3	6	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	0	11	1	12	1	13	0	0	0	38
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	21	38	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	16	21	41	0	0	0	78
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	20	24	54	21	44	0	0	0	163

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	5	0	23	16	35	0	0	0	79

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	13	1	1	19	0	0	0	0	0	34
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	0	12

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	
One or more suspensions	1	5	3	4	3	6	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	0	11	1	12	1	13	0	0	0	38
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	21	38	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	16	21	41	0	0	0	78
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	20	24	54	21	44	0	0	0	163

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	5	0	23	16	35	0	0	0	79

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	13	1	1	19	0	0	0	0	0	34
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	0	12

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*	41	48	53	47	52	56	47		
ELA Learning Gains				51			44		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47			36		
Math Achievement*	47	57	59	44	45	50	53		
Math Learning Gains				47			50		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39			20		
Science Achievement*	47	53	54	46	59	59	51		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	30	51	59	49			47		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	201
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	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	370
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	17	Yes	2	2
ELL	27	Yes	2	2
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	29	Yes	2	1
HSP	39	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	35	Yes	1	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	29	Yes	1	1
ELL	31	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	44			
MUL	44			
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	42			

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	41			47			47					30
SWD	11			22							2	
ELL	24			37			25				5	30
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	28			31			32				5	33
HSP	37			47			43				5	30
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	64			67			72				4	
FRL	34			40			39				5	30

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	47	51	47	44	47	39	46					49
SWD	15	19		12	44	60	21					
ELL	25	43	43	20	25	36	8					49
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32	47	50	30	41	48	36					29
HSP	45	51	48	40	41	24	46					54
MUL	33			55								
PAC												
WHT	69	57		64	69		65					
FRL	43	47	52	38	41	35	41					41

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	47	44	36	53	50	20	51					47
SWD	17	0		13	9							36
ELL	26			29								47
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	41	31	37	34	18	27					47
HSP	44	38		51	50		43					48
MUL	57			71								
PAC												
WHT	69	67		79	67		83					
FRL	41	43	39	44	43	18	37					47

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

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

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	40%	48%	-8%	54%	-14%
04	2023 - Spring	63%	56%	7%	58%	5%
03	2023 - Spring	33%	42%	-9%	50%	-17%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	42%	55%	-13%	59%	-17%
04	2023 - Spring	59%	61%	-2%	61%	-2%
05	2023 - Spring	50%	52%	-2%	55%	-5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	44%	50%	-6%	51%	-7%

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.

Our ELA proficiency went down 2% this year from the previous year (FSA to FAST). This year we had our lowest performing grade level in 3rd grade and our 5th graders were promoted with an N in 3rd grade and have not been able to catch up and surpass thier level from previous years. Other major life events caused loss of learning for these 2 grade levels and students. Third grade is the lowest data.

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

5th grade ELA showed the most decline from the previous year of 2%. The 5th graders were promoted with an N in 3rd grade and have not been able to catch up and surpass thier level from previous years. Other major life events caused loss of learning for these 2 grade levels and students.

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.

ELA has the greatest gap compared to the state average. Students in 2 of the 3 tested grade levels were impacted. 3rd grade had the lowest scoring students historically and 5th graders were promoted in 3rd

grade via good cause with an N. This promotion has hurt these students because they continued on and holes were being filled but getting bigger at the same time.

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

MATH! Our Math data went up by 7% this year. We departmentalized in 4th and 5th grade to limit the teacher focus to 1 or 2 tested areas versus all of areas. We also limited transitions for these students and created math intervention for grades k-5. We also have a school wide fluency program that is paper based that was used as well as a computer based fluency program also used daily. T

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

Our attendance data is definitely of some concern in some grades more than others. We will continue with our attendance incentives and work with SW to address these issues - especially the ones that are not Hurricane related. My other area of concern would be the numbers in some grades of failing ELA grades and how they grow starting in 3rd grade. Primary rigor is of concern there.

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

ELA proficiency 3-5

4th grade good cause students ELA

MATH - 5th grade proficiency and gains - 4th grade scores were higher than we thought should be.

Writing components and getting all instruction in blocks provided

Area of Focus

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

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

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

The ELA data for Orangewood Elementary School shows a 45% proficiency rate. This is a decline in proficiency rate from 2021-2022 FSA results by 2%. Since there was lack of growth in this area, we feel that this is a critical area of need.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Orangewood Elementary School will increase our ELA Proficiency from 45% to 48% as measured by the FAST in Progress Monitoring 3.

Monitoring:

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

Data is monitored during weekly PLC meetings and by admin during admin PLC's. Data is tracked on exemplars, Quarterly Comprehensives, and iReady . Teachers and Administration monitor and review weekly iReady usage monitoring sheet. PLC facilitator meetings/ monthly admin PLC's, facilitators will share out/ PCTs and Lit Coach and Teacher Leaders lead PLC/monthly learning PLC based on instructional needs and data Admin monitor agenda notes and google drives.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jami Browder (jamimb@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 are continuing to work on this - back to the basics...continuing to work on High Yield Strategies, Student Engagement, i-Ready, implementing school wide Writing strategies, and High Reliability School strategies. PD based off observations and feedback. We will continue with PBIS, discipline/classroom management, our Leader In Me and Kagan. PD will continue monthly with our after school PD/planning time (T/Th PLC times). This PD will be a continuation of our pre-school focus and areas of need. PCTs/Lit Coach support/coaching. During the school year we will be doing a book study/PD based on the book, 'Teach Like a Champion' with Apples and any interested parties. Intervention - K-2-20/20/20 plan 20 - RW, and FLleaf used for 20, 20 minutes computer Wonders and 20 Heggerty. 3-5 - 20/20/20 or 30/30 - Phonics for Reading for 20-30 and Wonders App 20-30 and then in some cases 20 Best Literature for below levels with HYQ. On and above level 30 Best Lit and 15 Wonders or iReady and 15 Standards review or preview Not on level groups will add in review of exemplar needs and prereqs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Cooperative Learning and Distributive Summarizing have over a 1.0 effect size according to John Hattie's research.

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.

Monthly Professional Development is pre-planned for the first semester and can be adjusted based on need. The plan was created during district leadership. Calendar reminders have been set so that information goes out in a timely manner. Our PCT oversees this process with the Assistant Principal.

Person Responsible: Kori Tracey (korilo@leeschools.net)

By When: monthly

Training on new Phonics for Reading Program and data collection of pre-test

Person Responsible: Jami Browder (jamimb@leeschools.net)

By When: September 1.

intervention data collection and PLC discussion monthly

Person Responsible: Kori Tracey (korilo@leeschools.net)

By When: monthly

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

We had a drop in proficiency for our African American, ESE, and ELL subgroups over the last few years. However, this year we saw all three groups increase just not to the 41% or higher threshold.

AA - 35% - 32% - 39%

ESE - 17% - 15% - 29%

ELL - 26% - 25% - 31%

These are definite improvements but still below the threshold that can help with proficiency for the entire school as well. The percentages are low any way and below our school proficiency at 45%. We feel closing the gap here could help increase the overall proficiency as well as the overall proficiency in ELA went down 2% as well.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Orangewood Elementary School will increase our African American ELA Proficiency from 39% to 41% as measured by the FAST. Orangewood Elementary School will increase our ESE ELA Proficiency from 29% to 31% as measured by the FAST. Orangewood Elementary School will increase our ELL ELA Proficiency from 31% to 33% as measured by the FAST.

Monitoring:

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

Data is monitored during weekly PLC meetings and by admin during admin PLC's. Data is tracked on exemplars, Quarterly Comprehensives, and iReady . Teachers and Administration monitor and review weekly iReady usage monitoring sheet. PLC facilitator meetings/ monthly admin PLC's, facilitators will share out/ PCTs and Lit Coach and Teacher Leaders lead PLC/monthly learning PLC based on instructional needs and data Admin monitor agenda notes and google drives Our ESOL Contact will also monitor running records from the ESOL Paras to look for trends and holes to fill. Teachers will use the test item specs, pacing guides/IG's, benchmarks within planning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jami Browder (jamimb@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 are continuing to work on this - back to the basics...continuing to work on High Yield Strategies, Student Engagement, i-Ready, implementing school wide Writing strategies, and High Reliability School strategies. PD based off observations and feedback. We will continue with PBIS, discipline/classroom management, our Leader In Me and Kagan. PD will continue monthly with our after school PD/planning time (T/Th PLC times). This PD will be a continuation of our pre-school focus and areas of need. PCTs/Lit Coach support/coaching. During the school year we will be doing a book study/PD based on the book, 'Teach Like a Champion' with Apples and any interested parties. Our ELL and ESE Support teams will continue to meet and look at data and support given to see what trends we can address and PD will be given where needed. Intervention - K-2-20/20/20 plan 20 - RW, and FLyleaf used for 20, 20 minutes computer Wonders and 20 Heggerty. 3-5 - 20/20/20 or 30/30 - Phonics for Reading for 20-30 and Wonders App 20-30 and then in some cases 20 Best Literature for below levels with HYQ. On and above level 30 Best Lit and 15 Wonders or iReady and 15 Standards review or preview. Not on level groups will add in review of exemplar needs and prereqs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Cooperative Learning and Distributive Summarizing have over a 1.0 effect size according to John Hattie's research.

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.

Monthly Professional Development is pre-planned for the first semester and can be adjusted based on need. The plan was created during district leadership. Calendar reminders have been set so that information goes out in a timely manner. Our PCT oversees this process with the Assistant Principal. ELL and ESE team will meet biweekly with Assistant Principal to conduct trend analysis and needs assessments.

Person Responsible: Kori Tracey (korilo@leeschools.net)

By When: monthly

PLC/MEETING with ESOL Team and ESE Team monthly. Create and meet monthly with Dream team for goals of improving ESSR subgroup of Black students

Person Responsible: Kori Tracey (korilo@leeschools.net)

By When: monthly

Data collection on intervention scores inputted and discussed in PLC.

Person Responsible: Kori Tracey (korilo@leeschools.net)

By When: 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.

The 3rd grade ELA data for Orangewood Elementary School shows a 34% proficiency rate. Our second graders are entering 3rd grade with 60% proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Orangewood Elementary School will increase our 3rd grade ELA Proficiency from 60% to 63% as measured by the FAST Progress Monitoring Test.

Monitoring:

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

Data is monitored during weekly PLC meetings and by admin during admin PLC's. Data is tracked on exemplars, Quarterly Comprehensives, and iReady . Teachers and Administration monitor and review weekly iReady usage monitoring sheet. PLC facilitator meetings/ monthly admin PLC's, facilitators will share out/ PCTs and Lit Coach and Teacher Leaders lead PLC/monthly learning PLC based on instructional needs and data Admin monitor agenda notes and google drives.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jami Browder (jamimb@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 are continuing to work on this - back to the basics...continuing to work on High Yield Strategies, Student Engagement, i-Ready, implementing school wide Writing strategies, and High Reliability School strategies. PD based off observations and feedback. We will continue with PBIS, discipline/classroom management, our Leader In Me and Kagan. PD will continue monthly with our after school PD/planning time (T/Th PLC times). This PD will be a continuation of our pre-school focus and areas of need. PCTs/Lit Coach support/coaching. During the school year we will be doing a book study/PD based on the book, 'Teach Like a Champion' with Apples and any interested parties. Intervention - K-2-20/20/20 plan 20 - RW, and FLyleaf used for 20, 20 minutes computer Wonders and 20 Heggerty. 3-5 - 20/20/20 or 30/30 - Phonics for Reading for 20-30 and Wonders App 20-30 and then in some cases 20 Best Literature for below levels with HYQ. On and above level 30 Best Lit and 15 Wonders or iReady and 15 Standards review or preview. Not on level groups will add in review of exemplar needs and prereqs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Cooperative Learning and Distributive Summarizing have over a 1.0 effect size according to John Hattie's research.

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.

Monthly Professional Development is pre-planned for the first semester and can be adjusted based on need. The plan was created during district leadership. Calendar reminders have been set so that information goes out in a timely manner. Our PCT oversees this process with the Assistant Principal.

Person Responsible: Jami Browder (jamimb@leeschools.net)

By When: monthly

Data collection from intervention and PLC discussion montly.

Person Responsible: Kori Tracey (korilo@leeschools.net)

By When: 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.

The 2nd grade ELA data for Orangewood Elementary School shows a 60% proficiency rate. Even though OWE was above the district average in this area, we will continue to implement strategies in order to continue to grow in this area which will allow us to improve our proficiency percentage. Our 1st grade data indicated 50% of students proficient. This is an area of need.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Orangewood Elementary School will increase our 2nd grade ELA Proficiency from 50% to 53% as measured by the STAR Progress Monitoring.

Monitoring:

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

Data is monitored during weekly PLC meetings and by admin during admin PLC's. Data is tracked on exemplars, Quarterly Comprehensives, and iReady . Teachers and Administration monitor and review weekly iReady usage monitoring sheet. PLC facilitator meetings/ monthly admin PLC's, facilitators will share out/ PCTs and Lit Coach and Teacher Leaders lead PLC/monthly learning PLC based on instructional needs and data Admin monitor agenda notes and google drives 2nd grade will also track Phonemic Awareness And Phonics scores via Dibels.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jami Browder (jamimb@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 are continuing to work on this - back to the basics...continuing to work on High Yield Strategies, Student Engagement, i-Ready, implementing school wide Writing strategies, and High Reliability School strategies. PD based off observations and feedback. We will continue with PBIS, discipline/classroom management, our Leader In Me and Kagan. PD will continue monthly with our after school PD/planning time (T/Th PLC times). This PD will be a continuation of our pre-school focus and areas of need. PCTs/Lit Coach support/coaching. During the school year we will be doing a book study/PD based on the book, 'Teach Like a Champion' with Apples and any interested parties. Intervention - K-2-20/20/20 plan 20 - RW, and FLyleaf used for 20, 20 minutes computer Wonders and 20 Heggerty. 3-5 - 20/20/20 or 30/30 - Phonics for Reading for 20-30 and Wonders App 20-30 and then in some cases 20 Best Literature for below levels with HYQ. On and above level 30 Best Lit and 15 Wonders or iReady and 15 Standards review or preview. Not on level groups will add in review of exemplar needs and prereqs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Describe the Cooperative Learning and Distributive Summarizing have over a 1.0 effect size according to John Hattie's research.

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.

Monthly Professional Development is pre-planned for the first semester and can be adjusted based on need. The plan was created during district leadership. Calendar reminders have been set so that information goes out in a timely manner. Our PCT oversees this process with the Assistant Principal.

Person Responsible: Kori Tracey (korilo@leeschools.net)

By When: monthly

#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.

Our early Warning system shows that attendance has 17% of students with 10 or more days absent. These students fall into our subgroups of concern as well.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Orangewood Elementary School will decrease our students with more than 10 days of absences from 17% to 15% as measured by the FOCUS attendance data.

Monitoring:

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

Our SW will continue to monitor the data weekly and report out during our Attendance Admin Meetings weekly. She will also work with these families and students individually to help with any barriers that are present.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kori Tracey (korilo@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.)

Monthly Calendar Program and school wide reward system quarterly. SW will call home and offer resources where needed as well.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

SW working with families is best way!!

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.

SW will do a weekly attendance club with students of concern.

Person Responsible: Kori Tracey (korilo@leeschools.net)

By When: monthly

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

We will continue to work on backwards planning with use of benchmarks to meet the level of rigor. We will continue to implement interventions daily for 1 hour in all grades. Those interventions start by 9/11/23. Those intervention groups are fluid and will be updated as needed. We have district liaisons working with our teams to help plan lessons and strategies to meet all learners including our ELL learners.

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

We will continue to work on backwards planning with use of benchmarks to meet the level of rigor. We will continue to implement interventions daily for 1 hour in all grades. Those interventions started on 08/28/23. Those intervention groups are fluid and will be updated as needed. We have district liaisons

working with our teams to help plan lessons and strategies to meet all learners including our ELL learners. Our ELL contact is coming to work with students and our 4/5 PLC. She will also work to plan lessons with our ELL staff. Our students have 90 uninterrupted minutes of instruction in the core as well as 60 minutes of intervention daily. In grades 4/5 students will benefit from Reading instruction through Science as well.

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

Our 2nd graders scored 49% not proficient in first grade. Our 2nd graders will increase from 51% to 54% proficient as measured by the FAST Progress Monitoring 3 Test.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Our 4th graders scored 66% not proficient in 3rd grade. Our 4th graders will increase from 44% to 50% proficient as measured by the FAST Progress Monitoring 3 Test.

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.

We monitor our grade level exemplars, DIBELS, iReady, and progress Monitoring to drive instruction through intervention and differentiation during CORE instruction. Continued monitoring allows us to make groups fluid to meet students needs as they arise.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Browder, Jami, jamimb@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?

We are continuing to work on this - back to the basics...continuing to work on High Yield Strategies, Student Engagement, i-Ready, implementing school wide Writing strategies, and High Reliability School strategies. PD based off observations and feedback. We will continue with PBIS, discipline/classroom management, our Leader In Me and Kagan. PD will continue monthly with our after school PD/planning time (T/Th PLC times). This PD will be a continuation of our pre-school focus and areas of need. PCTs/ Lit Coach support/coaching. During the school year we will be doing a book study/PD based on the book, ‘Teach Like a Champion’ with Apples and any interested parties. Intervention - K-2-20/20/20 plan 20 - RW, and FLyleaf used for 20, 20 minutes computer Wonders and 20 Heggerty. 3-5 - 20/20/20 or 30/30 - Phonics for Reading for 20-30 and Wonders App 20-30 and then in some cases 20 Best Literature for below levels with HYQ. On and above level 30 Best Lit and 15 Wonders or iReady and 15 Standards review or preview. Not on level groups will add in review of exemplar needs and prereqs.

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?

Cooperative Learning and Distributive Summarizing have over a 1.0 effect size according to John Hattie’s research.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school’s Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<p>Teachers will be trained during APPLES on Teach Like a Champion Strategies as well as other teachers invited.</p> <p>Teachers will be trained by our PCT High yield strategies throughout the year and will have to implement those as we move forward from trainings.</p> <p>Teachers will be trained on ELL strategies by our District Liaison as well as ELL staff.</p> <p>We have PD support and planning support from our Math, ELA, and Science District Liaisons as well. They come on a regular basis to support.</p>	<p>Tracey, Kori, korilo@leeschools.net</p>
<p>We have a Literacy Leadership Team that meets on a regular basis after Leading and Learning Meetings. This team works out school based decisions that need a plan and train their teams on information shared.</p>	<p>Browder, Jami, jamimb@leeschools.net</p>
<p>Literacy Coaching is done via our district Liaisons, Leading and Learning Teacher Leaders, Literacy Coach and PCT. This ongoing.</p>	<p>Tracey, Kori, korilo@leeschools.net</p>
<p>Assessment monitoring is ongoing via exemplars, iReady, Phonics for Reading, Read Well, and Fly Leaf. Dibels, Quarterly Comprehensives, and Teacher assigned lessons.</p>	<p>Browder, Jami, jamimb@leeschools.net</p>

Title I Requirements

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

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

- 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))

owd.leeschools.net

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)

Orangewood plans to strengthen our academic program, quality of learning time, and provide enriched/accelerated curriculum with aligned Title I funds. We currently allocate two PCT's, a paraprofessional, and a parent involvement clerk-typist using our title I funds. We also have Extended day/Tutoring/Enrichment Programs via Saturday Boot Camps and PE Waivers. We use 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 are also available to improve teacher quality 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))

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

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

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

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

All schools in the School District of Lee County are required to maintain MTSS for all students (tier 1), students needing supplemental support (tier 2), and students needing intensive support (tier 3). Each school has a team that utilizes the Response to Intervention (RtI) process in examining individual student data to identify those that may need additional behavior support beyond the universal PBIS/PBS

approach, and to monitor the effectiveness of these interventions. Data analyzed include office discipline referrals, in-school suspension, out-of-school suspension, bus referrals/suspension, as well as positive behavior data. Interventions may include supplemental positive behavior interventions and/or interventions to address inappropriate behavior.

Each school has a designated Intervention Specialist that facilitates team processes and ensures that identified interventions are implemented and monitored for effectiveness. Currently, the district utilizes "Insights to Behavior" to assist with the ongoing teamwork for behavior support in the tiered model using RtI. This includes the use of additional tools such as the Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA), data collection tools, reporting tools, and behavior intervention plan tools. Intervention Specialists assist classroom teachers and school-based personnel in the implementation of behavioral interventions and data collection, as well as serve as the primary contact for families with students receiving interventions. In the School District of Lee County, the Multi-tiered System of Supports school-based teams may, when needed, refer students to other district/school supports including the school-based mental health team, Section 504 eligibility consideration, and/or evaluation for consideration of eligibility under IDEA. Likewise, when students respond to interventions, the team may recommend maintaining current levels of interventions, reducing interventions, or exiting interventions as appropriate.

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

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

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

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

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

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