

The School District of Lee County

County Wide Exceptional Child Programs School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

County Wide Exceptional Child Programs

2855 COLONIAL BLVD, Fort Myers, FL 33966

<http://www.leeschools.net/ese>

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.

County Wide Exceptional Child Programs include students that have become eligible for full time Hospital Homebound services. It is the mission of this program to allow students to continue to work towards meeting standards and course requirements in order to reach their highest personal potential while impacted by a medical condition.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To support students enrolled in the School District of Lee County who are medically compromised and confined to home or hospital by helping them reach their highest personal potential. The population is unique because they all have medical conditions that confine them to either home or a hospital setting for varying lengths of time. Individualized instruction is provided in the home or hospital in order for students to continue their progress toward meeting standards, course requirements and IEP goals.

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
Ellinger, Susan	Assistant Director ESE	Coordinator Hospital Homebound Program
Johnson, Jennifer	Learning Resource Specialist	Schedule Students Testing Coordinator School Liason
Bowen, Theresa	Director ESE	
Teeters, Debbie		Enroll students Communicate with home schools Communicate with medical staff Enter Attendance

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.

County Wide Exceptional Child Programs include students that have become eligible for full time Hospital Homebound services. It is the mission of this program to allow students to continue to work towards meeting standards and course requirements in order to reach their highest personal potential

while impacted by a medical condition. Participation in the program is meant to be a temporary measure while the student works through medical treatment and or recovery. Teachers and the leadership team are in constant contact with parents to support the individual needs of each student participating in the program.

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))

County Wide Exceptional Child Programs include students that have become eligible for full time Hospital Homebound services. It is the mission of this program to allow students to continue to work towards meeting standards and course requirements in order to reach their highest personal potential while impacted by a medical condition that confines them to home or hospital. Participation in the program is meant to be a temporary measure while the student works through medical treatment and or recovery.

Quality instruction will be monitored by classroom walkthroughs. Common planning will be utilized by the homebound teaching team to allow for collaboration. Staff feedback is monitored by leadership and acted upon accordingly. Leadership meets with the HH team biweekly.

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)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	56%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	17%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
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)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: I 2018-19: MAINTAINING 2017-18: MAINTAINING 2016-17: MAINTAINING

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	20
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	14	45	53	29	48	55			
ELA Learning Gains									
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	5	48	55	14	37	42			
Math Learning Gains									
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*		47	52	20	47	54			
Social Studies Achievement*		60	68	10	51	59			
Middle School Acceleration		77	70		42	51			
Graduation Rate		51	74		43	50			
College and Career Acceleration		33	53		66	70			
ELP Progress		47	55		69	70			

* 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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	10
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	19
Total Components for the Federal Index	2
Percent Tested	59
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	18
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	73
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	50
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	30	Yes	1	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				

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%
FRL				

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	53			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL				

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	14			5								
SWD	30										1	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												

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
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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	29			14			20	10				
SWD	70			36								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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
10	2023 - Spring	*	45%	*	50%	*
05	2023 - Spring	*	48%	*	54%	*
07	2023 - Spring	*	44%	*	47%	*
08	2023 - Spring	*	44%	*	47%	*
09	2023 - Spring	*	46%	*	48%	*
04	2023 - Spring	*	56%	*	58%	*
06	2023 - Spring	*	44%	*	47%	*

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	*	52%	*	54%	*
07	2023 - Spring	*	37%	*	48%	*
04	2023 - Spring	*	61%	*	61%	*
08	2023 - Spring	*	60%	*	55%	*
05	2023 - Spring	*	52%	*	55%	*

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	*	43%	*	44%	*
05	2023 - Spring	*	50%	*	51%	*

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	39%	*	50%	*

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	43%	*	48%	*

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	50%	*	63%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	59%	*	66%	*

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	54%	*	63%	*

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

The enrollment of the Hospital Homebound Program is constantly changing. Students are found eligible and released based on the current medical conditions. Data comparisons yield not consistent trends due to this ever changing population.

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

The enrollment of the Hospital Homebound Program is constantly changing. Students are found eligible and released based on the current medical conditions. Data comparisons yield not consistent trends due to this ever changing population.

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

The enrollment of the Hospital Homebound Program is constantly changing. Students are found eligible and released based on the current medical conditions. Data comparisons yield not consistent trends due to this ever changing population.

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

The enrollment of the Hospital Homebound Program is constantly changing. Students are found eligible and released based on the current medical conditions. Data comparisons yield not consistent trends due to this ever changing population.

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

The enrollment of the Hospital Homebound Program is constantly changing. Students are found eligible and released based on the current medical conditions. Data comparisons yield not consistent trends due to this ever changing population.

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

To support students enrolled in the School District of Lee County who are medically compromised and confined to home or hospital by helping them reach their highest personal potential.

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 Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

In order to motivate students to work between hospital homebound sessions to maximize learning gains, hospital homebound teachers will participate in PLC's focusing on student motivation and reinforcement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

90% of hospital homebound teachers will use positive behavior interventions during face to face instruction.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will occur during teacher observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Susan Ellinger (susanme@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.)

Applied behavior analysis training.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Applied behavior analysis training will give the teachers the skills necessary to implement positive behavior intervention and reinforcement strategies during student instructional sessions.

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.

Schedule PLC training for teachers.

Person Responsible: Susan Ellinger (susanme@leeschools.net)

By When: November 2023

Teachers participate in a make it take it PLC for creating student motivators.

Person Responsible: Susan Ellinger (susanme@leeschools.net)

By When: November 2023

Observe teachers using new strategies during teacher observations.

Person Responsible: Susan Ellinger (susanme@leeschools.net)

By When: March 2024

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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.

Teaching students who are chronically and terminally ill takes an emotional toll on hospital homebound teachers. They build close relationships and frequently are faced with the passing of students. They often feel alone in this grief since they are not in a traditional school community.

Measurable Outcome:

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

90% of teachers will feel positively supported in dealing with student illness and loss.

Monitoring:

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

Teacher survey

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Susan Ellinger (susanme@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.)

PLC group sessions with licensed mental health clinicians focusing on dealing with student grief and loss.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers expressed the need for this intervention.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Schedule quarterly group sessions for dealing with student illness and loss.

Person Responsible: Susan Ellinger (susanme@leeschools.net)

By When: August 2023

Teacher satisfaction survey related to provision of services.

Person Responsible: Susan Ellinger (susanme@leeschools.net)

By When: March 2024

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 schools' 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 at and underperforming subgroups is provided through monthly visits and data chats by principal supervisors.