



---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>31</b>

# Hancock Creek Elementary School

1601 SKYLINE DR, North Fort Myers, FL 33903

<http://han.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.**

The Hancock Creek Elementary family will inspire and cultivate all learners to their fullest potential through the implementation of engaging and relevant learning experiences.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

To be a 1st choice school of excellence for students, parents and educators.

### 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
Phillips-Luster, Dr. Denise	Principal	Provide instructional leadership at the assigned school to ensure continuous measurable student performance and achievement improvement. In addition, provide organizational oversight to include personnel, budget, purchasing safety, public relations, plant operations, food services, and transportation that will support high-performance expectations for all stakeholders.
Conley, Jessica	Assistant Principal	Assist the principal in ensuring continuous improvement in measurable student performance and achievement, customer satisfaction, performance management, and compliance. Assist the principal in the overall administration and operation of the school. Assume full responsibility for the school when the principal is absent from the building.

**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.

The administrative team reviewed and analyzed student data when writing the draft School Improvement Plan. The principal shared the tentative goals and action steps in late July with the instructional leadership team. Revisions were made after the group discussion. The FY24 School Improvement Plan was shared with the principal's executive director in early August. Hancock Creek personnel received a list of the SIP goals and action plans via email. All stakeholders are invited to continue discussing, asking questions, reviewing student academic progress, and offering revisions to the School Improvement Plan during the monthly SAC meetings.

**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 School Improvement Goals will be monitored regularly. Each teacher tracks the percentage of students scoring proficiency after administering summative and State assessments. Each teacher monitors overall scores and subgroup data. The school personnel will implement the Continuous Improvement Model (Plan, Do, Study, Act) and utilize human and fiscal resources to meet the needs of each student. All stakeholders are invited to continue discussing, asking questions, reviewing student academic progress, and offering revisions to the School Improvement Plan during the monthly SAC meetings.

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	Yes
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	52%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	100%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	Yes
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**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	0	34	26	24	22	26	0	0	0	132
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	8
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	14	12	9	18	8	0	0	0	61
Course failure in Math	0	3	4	5	7	18	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	47	37	0	0	0	89
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	23	34	0	0	0	60
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	0	1	0	16	30	0	0	0	47

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

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

**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	51	49	35	65	46	0	0	0	246
One or more suspensions	1	2	1	2	2	2	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	40	32	32	42	18	0	0	0	164
Course failure in Math	0	16	40	15	44	12	0	0	0	127
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	24	25	32	0	0	0	81
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	15	19	31	0	0	0	65
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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



Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	40	32	32	42	32	0	0	0	179

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	1	24	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

**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	51	49	35	65	46	0	0	0	246
One or more suspensions	1	2	1	2	2	2	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	40	32	32	42	18	0	0	0	164
Course failure in Math	0	16	40	15	44	12	0	0	0	127
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	24	25	32	0	0	0	81
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	15	19	31	0	0	0	65
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	1	40	32	32	42	32	0	0	0	179

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	1	24	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

**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	48	52	56	50		
ELA Learning Gains				56			39		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53			33		
Math Achievement*	49	57	59	55	45	50	48		
Math Learning Gains				50			25		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40			18		
Science Achievement*	52	53	54	41	59	59	41		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	69	51	59	78			26		

\* 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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	252
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	421
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	27	Yes	4	1
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	48			
MUL	47			
PAC				
WHT	49			
FRL	48			

**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	46			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	42			
HSP	49			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	50			
FRL	51			

**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			49			52					69
SWD	22			38			21				3	
ELL	41			41							4	69
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29			29			43				4	
HSP	43			51			46				5	68
MUL	41			53							2	
PAC												
WHT	42			51			57				4	
FRL	38			47			47				5	71

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	48	56	53	55	50	40	41					78
SWD	27	35	33	38	39		27					
ELL	39	40	40	39	54	54	20					78
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38	64		41	36		30					
HSP	44	49	45	50	51	38	33					79
MUL	50			80								
PAC												
WHT	52	58	50	58	50	33	50					
FRL	45	58	53	51	48	37	35					78

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	50	39	33	48	25	18	41					26
SWD	26	23	20	33	12		25					
ELL	36	29		38	20		43					26
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38			38								
HSP	45	26	30	37	11	8	32					23
MUL	50			55								
PAC												
WHT	54	49	43	55	35	33	47					
FRL	44	37	33	43	24	24	34					31

**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	45%	48%	-3%	54%	-9%
04	2023 - Spring	38%	56%	-18%	58%	-20%
03	2023 - Spring	35%	42%	-7%	50%	-15%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	*	52%	*	54%	*
03	2023 - Spring	51%	55%	-4%	59%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	46%	61%	-15%	61%	-15%
05	2023 - Spring	44%	52%	-8%	55%	-11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	51%	50%	1%	51%	0%

### 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.**

Based on the FAST PM3 assessment, ELA was the component with the lowest performance. Possible contributing factors: weak vocabulary and low comprehension skills.

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

Based on the FAST PM3 assessment, ELA was the component that showed the greatest decline. Forty-eight (48) percent of the students were proficient in SY22 compared to forty-two (42) percent during SY23. Possible contributing factors are weak vocabulary, comprehension, and chronic absenteeism.

**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 had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The possible contributing factors are weak vocabulary, lack of comprehension, and chronic absenteeism.

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

The component in which the most growth was made compared from SY22 to SY23 was Science by 11 points. A sense of urgency was held throughout the entire school year. Ongoing progress monitoring, intervention groups, Saturday Science tutoring, enrichment groups, targeted instruction, and the assistance of our school Science Coach helped to improve scores.

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

Areas of concern:

- 1.) The # of students absent 10% or more days
- 2.) The # of students scoring Level 1 on the statewide ELA assessment

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

All subject areas below will focus on all subgroups, including any that may fall below the federal index.

- 1.) ELA
- 2.) Math
- 3.) Science
- 4.) Attendance
- 5.) Discipline

**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.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

2nd grade ELA proficiency will increase from 53% to 59% as measured by the STAR PM3 assessment.

### Monitoring:

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

Data will be monitored based on exemplars, quarterly comprehensive assessments, iReady, and FAST progress monitoring assessments throughout the school year.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Natalie Cartwright (nataliedbe@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.)

Students will receive 60 minutes of intervention each day. During the intervention block, students will receive differentiated instruction in which students will rotate through different centers. The centers will consist of teacher-direct instruction, computer stations in which students will receive enrichment or additional intervention, and Independent reading or independent practice. Phonics will also occur during the intervention.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Strategies will include High-Yield Instructional Strategies, Numbered Heads Collaborative Pairs, Distributed Summarizing, Text-Dependent Questioning, and Writing to Raise Achievement and Higher-Order

Thinking. High-yield strategies are research-based instructional practices linked to increased student achievement. The strategies support students' higher-level thinking to use level 3 or 4 question on Webb's Depth of Knowledge. High-yield strategies are instructional-based. They can be applied across all content areas and enable teachers to focus on improving the quality of instruction students receive to fill phonics gaps, build student vocabulary, and ensure students use these newly acquired skills to build comprehension of grade-level texts. As a bonus, these strategies can also improve student retention and understanding across all other content areas. A focus on instructional practices allows for a greater impact on student learning.

### 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.



All students will have a 90-minute ELA block daily. Within the block of time, students will receive instruction that covers Foundational Skills (15 min); Whole group instruction (30 min); small group instruction (45 min). Instruction will be differentiated for students during small group instruction. Students may work independently on their Chromebook, work directly with the teacher, and have an independent reading center with a focus on practicing and reviewing skills for mastery.

**Person Responsible:** Jessica Conley (jessicac@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Planning (PLC) meets weekly and is monitored by the PCT/Literacy Coach and AP. PLCs are documented by the PLC agenda and are uploaded in a Google folder. Resources used during interventions will be as follows: iReady Standards Mastery tools, instructional guides, Wonders activities, Nearpod, Flocabulary, Imagine Learning, use of novels/chapter books, and writing across all subject areas. Teachers will also utilize Stairway to Success and the Decision Tree to assist in the planning and delivery of instruction.

## #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.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

3rd-grade proficiency will increase from 38% to 44% as measured by the FY24 FAST PM3 assessment.

### Monitoring:

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

Data will be monitored based on exemplars, quarterly comprehensive assessments, iReady, and FAST progress monitoring assessments throughout the school year.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Natalie Cartwright (nataliedbe@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.)

Students will receive 60 minutes of intervention each day. During the intervention block, students will receive differentiated instruction in which students will rotate through different centers. The centers will consist of teacher-direct instruction, computer stations in which students will receive enrichment or additional intervention, and Independent reading or independent practice. Phonics will also occur during the intervention.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Strategies will include High-Yield Instructional Strategies, Numbered Heads Collaborative Pairs, Distributed Summarizing, Text-Dependent Questioning, and Writing to Raise Achievement and Higher-Order

Thinking.

High-Yield Strategies are researched-based instructional practices linked to increased student achievement. The strategies support students' higher-level thinking with the goal of using level 3 or 4 question on Webb's Depth of Knowledge. High-Yield Strategies are instructional based. They can be applied across all content areas and enable teachers to focus on improving the quality of instruction students will receive to fill phonics gaps, build student vocabulary, and ensure students are using these newly acquired skills to build comprehension of grade-level texts. As a bonus, these strategies can also be used to improve student retention and understanding across all other content areas. A focus on instructional practices allows for a greater impact on student learning.

### 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.

All students will have a 90-minute ELA block daily. Within the block of time, students will receive instruction that covers Foundational Skills (15 min); Whole group instruction (30 min); small group instruction (45 min). Instruction will be differentiated for students during small group instruction. Students may work independently on their Chromebook, work directly with the teacher, and have an independent reading center with a focus on practicing and reviewing skills for mastery.

**Person Responsible:** Dr. Denise Phillips-Luster (denisedp@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Planning (PLC) meets weekly and is monitored by the PCT/Literacy Coach and AP. PLCs are documented by the PLC agenda and are uploaded in a Google folder. Resources used during interventions will be as follows: iReady Standards Mastery tools, instructional guides, Wonders activities, Nearpod, Flocabulary, Imagine Learning, use of novels/chapter books, and writing across all subject areas. Teachers will also utilize Stairway to Success and the Decision Tree to assist in the planning and delivery of instruction.

### #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.

#### Measurable Outcome:

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

3rd, 4th, and 5th grade ELA proficiency will increase from 42% to 48% as measured by the FAST PM3 assessment.

#### Monitoring:

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

Data will be monitored based on exemplars, quarterly comprehensive assessments, iReady, and FAST progress monitoring assessments throughout the school year.

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carrie Schneider (carriesc@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.)

Students will receive 60 minutes of intervention each day. During the intervention block, students will receive differentiated instruction in which students will rotate through different centers. The centers will consist of teacher-direct instruction, computer stations in which students will receive enrichment or additional intervention, and independent reading or independent practice. Phonics will also occur during the intervention.

#### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Strategies will include High-Yield Instructional Strategies, Numbered Heads Collaborative Pairs, Distributed Summarizing, Text-Dependent Questioning, and Writing to Raise Achievement and Higher-Order Thinking.

High-Yield Strategies are researched-based instructional practices linked to increased student achievement. The strategies support students' higher-level thinking with the goal of using level 3 or 4 questions on Webb's Depth of Knowledge. High-Yield Strategies are instructional based. They can be applied across all content areas and enable teachers to focus on improving the quality of instruction students will receive to fill phonics gaps, build student vocabulary, and ensure students are using these newly acquired skills to build comprehension of grade-level texts. As a bonus, these strategies can also be used to improve student retention and understanding across all other content areas. A focus on instructional practices allows for a greater impact on student learning.

#### 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.

All students will have a 90-minute ELA block daily. Within the block of time, students will receive instruction that covers Foundational Skills (15 min); Whole group instruction (30 min); small group instruction (45 min). Instruction will be differentiated for students during small group instruction. Students may work independently on their Chromebook, work directly with the teacher, and have an independent reading center with a focus on practicing and reviewing skills for mastery.

**Person Responsible:** Dr. Denise Phillips-Luster (denisedp@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Planning (PLC) meets weekly and is monitored by the PCT/Literacy Coach and AP. PLCs are documented by the PLC agenda and are uploaded in a Google folder. Resources used during interventions will be as follows: iReady Standards Mastery tools, instructional guides, Wonders activities, Nearpod, Flocabulary, Imagine Learning, use of novels/chapter books, and writing across all subject areas. Teachers will also utilize Stairway to Success and the Decision Tree to assist in the planning and delivery of instruction.

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

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

The percentage of SWD meeting or exceeding state standards has been below 41% for three consecutive years.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

SWD ELA proficiency will increase from 33% to 42% as measured by the FAST PM3 assessment.

**Monitoring:**

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

Data will be monitored based on exemplars, quarterly comprehensive assessments, iReady, and FAST progress monitoring assessments throughout the school year.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jessica Conley (jessicac@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.)

Students will receive 60 minutes of intervention each day. During the intervention block, students will receive differentiated instruction in which students will rotate through different centers. The centers will consist of teacher-direct instruction, computer stations in which students will receive enrichment or additional intervention, and independent reading or independent practice. Phonics will also occur during the intervention.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Strategies will include High-Yield Instructional Strategies, Numbered Heads Collaborative Pairs, Distributed Summarizing, Text-Dependent Questioning, and Writing to Raise Achievement and Higher-Order Thinking.

High-Yield Strategies are researched-based instructional practices linked to increased student achievement. The strategies support students' higher-level thinking with the goal of using level 3 or 4 questions on Webb's Depth of Knowledge. High-Yield Strategies are instructional based. They can be applied across all content areas and enable teachers to focus on improving the quality of instruction students will receive to fill phonics gaps, build student vocabulary, and ensure students are using these newly acquired skills to build comprehension of grade-level texts. As a bonus, these strategies can also be used to improve student retention and understanding across all other content areas. A focus on instructional practices allows for a greater impact on student learning.

**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.

All students will have a 90-minute ELA block daily. Within the block of time, students will receive instruction that covers Foundational Skills (15 min), Whole group instruction (30 min), and small group instruction (45 min). Instruction will be differentiated for students during small group instruction. Students may work independently on their Chromebook, work directly with the teacher, and have an independent reading center focusing on practicing and reviewing skills for mastery.

**Person Responsible:** Jessica Conley (jessicac@leeschools.net)

**By When:** Planning (PLC) meets weekly and is monitored by the PCT/Literacy Coach and AP. PLCs are documented by the PLC agenda and are uploaded in a Google folder. Resources used during interventions will be as follows: iReady Standards Mastery tools, instructional guides, Wonders activities, Nearpod, Flocabulary, Imagine Learning, use of novels/chapter books, and writing across all subject areas. Teachers will also utilize Stairway to Success and the Decision Tree to assist in the planning and delivering instruction.

**#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to****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.

Based on the February 2020 High-Reliability Schools survey data, Leading Indicator 1.3 is an area of growth. The mean item responses range of 3.00 to 4.14 showed that the teachers and staff are unclear about the types of decisions made with direct teacher input, the techniques/systems used to collect information from teachers, the electronic tools used to collect teachers' opinions, and what groups of instructors are targeted to provide input regarding specific decisions. The decrease in teachers and staff members not responding to questions also identified all survey items needing focused attention. Most notably, providing notes or reports to document how teacher input was used to make specific decisions needed to be addressed. Only forty-four of the sixty-five participants responded, and the mean was 3.00. The administrators' mean item response scores for leading indicator 1.3 ranged from 2.50 to 5.00. When asked if electronic tools are used to collect teachers' opinions regarding specific decisions, the administrators' overall mean was 2.50. The administrators were not using electronic tools to collect opinions. They were choosing to gather input informally or via paper-pencil surveys. The low mean score indicated that the current practices needed to be upgraded.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The mean score for HRS Leading Indicator 1.3 (Teachers have formal roles in the decision-making process regarding school initiatives) will increase from 3.48 to 3.5 or above as measured by the May 2024 Level HRS certification school survey.

**Monitoring:**

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

The teachers will complete a quarterly survey and the results will be analyzed and shared with all stakeholders.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Dr. Denise Phillips-Luster (denisedp@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.)

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***



## CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

The School District of Lee County follows all state and federal guidelines when allocating funding to schools. The schools are budgeted in multi-faceted methods based on the students' 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

39% percent of the 1st grade and 39% of the kindergarten students scored 40% or higher on the STAR PM3 assessment. When students are reading below grade level, the achievement gap increases, students are retained in 3rd grade, and there is an increase in the number of students not graduating from high school with a standard diploma.

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

38% of 3rd, 39% of 4th, and 47% of 5th grade students scored below a level 3 on the FY23 FAST ELA PM3 assessment. When students are reading below grade level, the achievement gap increases, and there is an increase in number of students not graduating from high school with a standard diploma.

### 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

Hancock Creek Elementary School personnel will increase the percentage of 1st-grade students scoring at or above 40% on the STAR PM3 assessment from 39% to 45%. Hancock Creek Elementary School personnel will increase the percentage of 2nd-grade students scoring at or above 40% on the STAR PM3 assessment from 53% to 59%.

#### Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Hancock Creek Elementary School personnel will increase the percentage of 3rd-grade students scoring a level 3 or above on the FAST PM3 assessment from 38% to 44%. Hancock Creek Elementary School personnel will increase the percentage of 4th-grade students scoring a level 3 or above on the FAST PM3 assessment from 39% to 45%. Hancock Creek Elementary School personnel will increase the percentage of 5th-grade students scoring a level 3 or above on the FAST PM3 assessment from 47% to 53%.

### 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.

Hancock Creek Elementary School personnel will use the iReady diagnostics, the FY24 Standardized Test for the Assessment of Reading (STAR), and the FY24 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) to monitor the percentage of students scoring below a level 3,4 or 5.

#### Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Phillips-Luster, Dr. Denise, denisedp@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?

Students will receive 60 minutes of intervention each day. During the intervention block, students will receive differentiated instruction in which students will rotate through different centers. The centers will consist of teacher-direct instruction, computer stations in which students will receive enrichment or additional intervention, and Independent reading or independent practice. Phonics will also occur during the intervention.

**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?

Strategies will include High-Yield Instructional Strategies, Numbered Heads Collaborative Pairs, Distributed Summarizing, Text-Dependent Questioning, and Writing to Raise Achievement and Higher-Order Thinking. High-yield strategies are research-based instructional practices linked to increased student achievement. The strategies support students' higher-level thinking to use level 3 or 4 question on Webb's Depth of Knowledge. High-yield strategies are instructional-based. They can be applied across all content areas and enable teachers to improve the quality of instruction students receive to fill phonics gaps, build student vocabulary, and ensure students use these newly acquired skills to build comprehension of grade-level texts. As a bonus, these strategies can also improve student retention and understanding across all other content areas. A focus on instructional practices allows for a greater impact on student learning.

**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>Planning (PLC) meets weekly and is monitored by the PCT/Literacy Coach and AP. PLCs are documented by the PLC agenda and are uploaded in a Google folder. Resources used during interventions will be as follows: iReady Standards Mastery tools, instructional guides, Wonders activities, Nearpod, Flocabulary, Imagine Learning, use of novels/chapter books, and writing across all subject areas. Teachers will also utilize Stairway to Success and the Decision Tree to assist in the planning and delivering instruction.</p>	<p>Conley, Jessica, jessicac@leeschools.net</p>
<p>All students will have a 90-minute ELA block daily. Within the block of time, students will receive instruction that covers Foundational Skills (15 min); Whole group instruction (30 min); small group instruction (45 min). Instruction will be differentiated for students during small group instruction. Students may work independently on their Chromebook, work directly with the teacher, and have an independent reading center with a focus on practicing and reviewing skills for mastery.</p>	<p>Conley, Jessica, jessicac@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, the 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, and 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))

Hancock Creek personnel recognize 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, and schools, the PFEP team analyzes the current building capacity activities, compares participation numbers, and addresses the barriers that limit parent participation. These barriers include lack of transportation to meetings, language barriers, childcare, feelings of intimidation, inability to leave work for events/meetings, and in general 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., the number of volunteers and volunteer service hours, become the guiding force for the annual evaluation and improvement of the school's parent involvement program to enhance student achievement for the upcoming school year. Other sources of data may include but are not limited to parent workshop and training evaluations, sign-in sheets, attendance, and volunteer logs, parent surveys, the Title I Crate, the PFEP Evaluation, 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)**

Two Peer Collaborative Teachers (PCTs) and a Science Coach were hired to increase effective teaching in every classroom and increase the number of students scoring proficient on all State assessments. In addition, extended day tutoring, Science Saturday, and other enrichment programs will be offered during the FY24. Furthermore, teachers will be compensated for developing the curriculum, analyzing student data, and planning for student improvement. Weekly professional development opportunities to improve teacher quality helps to strengthen the academic programs at our school.

**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. 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 voluntary program identifies elevated-risk students to receive a full year of educational opportunities. The benefits for students include readiness for kindergarten and focusing on building literacy for early reading skills. The expected outcome is for the four-year-olds who participate in the programs to 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 to 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. With parental permission, the district also 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 to school-based mental health counseling and a referral pathway to outside mental health services. The Lee County School District employs evidence-based practices in the foundational instruction of students, focusing 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 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 achieving goals and removing 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 support within a Multi-tiered System of Support (MTSS). District-level personnel are designated to assist schools with their site-based implementation by providing training, modeling, program monitoring, technical assistance, and data collection/analysis. They work with site-based personnel to implement the tiered approach that includes:

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

All schools in the School District of Lee County are required to maintain MTSS for all students (tier 1),

students needing supplemental support (tier 2), and students needing intensive support (tier 3). Each school has a team that utilizes the Response to Intervention (RtI) process in examining individual student data to identify those who 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, and positive behavior data. Interventions may include supplemental positive behavior interventions and/or interventions to address inappropriate behavior.

Each school has a designated Intervention Specialist who facilitates team processes and ensures that identified interventions are implemented and monitored for effectiveness. Currently, the district utilizes “Insights to Behavior” to assist with ongoing teamwork for behavior support in the tiered model using RtI. This includes using 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 implementing behavioral interventions and data collection and serve as the primary contact for families with students receiving interventions.

In the School District of Lee County, the Multi-tiered System of Support school-based teams may, when needed, refer students to other district/school supports including the school-based mental health team, Section 504 eligibility consideration, and/or evaluation for consideration of eligibility under IDEA.

Likewise, when students respond to interventions, the team may recommend maintaining current levels of interventions, reducing interventions, or exiting interventions as appropriate.

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

The district’s Curriculum and Staff Development department will offer paraprofessional training opportunities 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 many 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.

School teacher leaders 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 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 is to offer Kindergarten camp for a few days to acclimate students to their school, and teachers instruct them on basic processes.

## Budget to Support Areas of Focus

### Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

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

**Budget Approval**

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

No