2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Gateway Charter Intermediate School

12850 COMMONWEALTH DR
Ft Myers, FL 33913
239-768-2491
www.gatewaycharterschool.org

School Demographics

School Type	Title I	Free and Reduced Lunch Rate
Middle School	No	56%

Alternative/ESE Center	Charter School	Minority Rate
No	Yes	58%

School Grades History

2013-14	2012-13	2011-12	2010-11
C	B	A	A

SIP Authority and Template

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds, as marked by citations to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or with a grade of F within the prior two years. For all other schools, the district may use a template of its choosing. All districts must submit annual assurances that their plans meet statutory requirements.

This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridacims.org. Sections marked "N/A" by the user and any performance data representing fewer than 10 students or educators have been excluded from this document.

Table of Contents

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. A corollary at the district level is the District Improvement and Assistance Plan (DIAP), designed to help district leadership make the necessary connections between school and district goals in order to align resources. The Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: Current School Status

Part I summarizes school leadership, staff qualifications and strategies for recruiting, mentoring and retaining strong teachers. The school's Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is described in detail to show how data is used by stakeholders to understand the needs of all students and allocate appropriate resources in proportion to those needs. The school also summarizes its efforts in a few specific areas, such as its use of increased learning time and strategies to support literacy, preschool transition and college and career readiness.

Part II: Expected Improvements

Part II outlines school performance data in the prior year and sets numeric targets for the coming year in ten areas:

1. Reading
2. Writing
3. Mathematics
4. Science
5. Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM)
6. Career and Technical Education (CTE)
7. Social Studies
8. Early Warning Systems (EWS)
9. Parental Involvement
10. Other areas of concern to the school

With this overview of the current state of the school in mind and the outcomes they hope to achieve, the planning team engages in an 8-Step Planning and Problem-Solving Process, through which they define and refine their goals (Step 1), identify and prioritize problems (barriers) keeping them from reaching those goals (Steps 2-3), design a plan to help them implement strategies to resolve those barriers (Steps 4-7), and determine how they will monitor progress toward each goal (Step 8).

Part III: Coordination and Integration

Part III is required for Title I schools and describes how federal, state and local funds are coordinated and integrated to ensure student needs are met.

Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals

Appendix 1 is the professional development plan, which outlines any training or support needed for stakeholders to meet the goals.

Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals

Appendix 2 is the budget needed to implement the strategies identified in the plan.

Differentiated Accountability

Florida's Differentiated Accountability (DA) system is a statewide network of strategic support, differentiated by need according to performance data, and provided to schools and districts in order to improve leadership capacity, teacher efficacy and student outcomes. DA field teams collaborate with district and school leadership to design, implement and refine school improvement plans, as well as provide instructional coaching, as needed.

DA Regions

Florida's DA network is divided into five geographical regions, each served by a field team led by a regional executive director (RED).

DA Categories

Traditional public schools are classified at the start of each school year, based upon the most recently released school grades (A-F), into one of the following categories:

- Not in DA – currently A or B with no F in prior two years; all charter schools; all ungraded schools
- Monitoring Only – currently A or B with at least one F in the prior two years
- Prevent – currently C
- Focus – currently D
    ◦ Year 1 – declined to D, or first-time graded schools receiving a D
    ◦ Year 2 – second consecutive D, or F followed by a D
    ◦ Year 3 or more – third or more consecutive D, or F followed by second consecutive D
- Priority – currently F
    ◦ Year 1 – declined to F, or first-time graded schools receiving an F
    ◦ Year 2 or more – second or more consecutive F

DA Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses

Additionally, schools in DA are subject to one or more of the following Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses:

- Former F – currently A-D with at least one F in the prior two years. SIP is monitored by FDOE.
- Post-Priority Planning – currently A-D with an F in the prior year. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Planning – Focus Year 2 and Priority Year 1. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Implementing – Focus Year 3 or more and Priority Year 2 or more. District is implementing the Turnaround Option Plan (TOP).

2013-14 DA Category and Statuses

DA Category	Region	RED
Not in DA	N/A	N/A

Former F	Post-Priority Planning	Planning	Implementing TOP
No	No	No	No

Current School Status

School Information

School-Level Information

School
Gateway Charter Intermediate School

Principal
Sara Abraham

School Advisory Council chair

Names and position titles of the School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT)

Name	Title

District-Level Information

District
Lee

Superintendent
Dr. Nancy J Graham

Date of school board approval of SIP
Pending

School Advisory Council (SAC)

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Membership of the SAC

Julia Borra Chairperson
Mrs. Ruth Albright - Teacher
Mrs. Nicole Rodriguez - Staff Member

Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP

SAC provided approval of the plan and also contributed suggestions.

Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year

Projected use of school improvement funds, including the amount allocated to each project

Compliance with section 1001.452, F.S., regarding the establishment duties of the SAC
In Compliance

If not in compliance, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements

Highly Qualified Staff

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(C) and 1115(c)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Administrators

of administrators
3

receiving effective rating or higher
(not entered because basis is < 10)

Administrator Information:

Sara Abraham

Principal	Years as Administrator: 16	Years at Current School: 5

Credentials	Educational Leadership (all levels) Elementary Education K-6
Performance Record	An "A" school for four years in a row.

Patricia Duffy

Asst Principal	Years as Administrator: 3	Years at Current School: 3

Credentials	Educational Leadership (all levels) Social Sciences (6-12 grade)
Performance Record	An "A" school for 2 years in a row.

Stacey Burns

Asst Principal	Years as Administrator: 2	Years at Current School: 4

Credentials	Educational Leadership (all levels) ESE K-12 Elementary Education K-6
Performance Record	A "B" school rating for 2012-2013

Instructional Coaches

of instructional coaches
1

receiving effective rating or higher
(not entered because basis is < 10)

Instructional Coach Information:

Kelly Weeks		
Part-time / District-based	Years as Coach: 1	Years at Current School: 2

Areas	Other
Credentials	Business 9-12 grade
Performance Record	This is the first year in this position.

Classroom Teachers

# of classroom teachers
43

 # receiving effective rating or higher
0%

 # Highly Qualified Teachers
0%

 # certified in-field
, 0%

 # ESOL endorsed
, 0%

 # reading endorsed
3, 7%

 # with advanced degrees
, 0%

 # National Board Certified
, 0%

 # first-year teachers
, 0%

 # with 1-5 years of experience
, 0%

 # with 6-14 years of experience
, 0%

 # with 15 or more years of experience
, 0%

Education Paraprofessionals

# of paraprofessionals

 # Highly Qualified

Other Instructional Personnel

# of instructional personnel not captured in the sections above

1

 # receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Strategies to recruit and retain highly qualified, certified-in-field, effective teachers to the school, including the person responsible

Staff Development training to improve professional development of our teachers. (Stacey Burns, Sara Abraham)
Support of teacher via classroom walk-throughs, This provides feedback to teacher and allows for conversations to be held with regards to improving instruction.(Stacey Burns, Sara Abraham)
TLC program to allow for new teachers to be paired with a veteran teacher to mentor them throughout the year. This provides our new teachers with the ability to have someone to provide support or advice for a variety of issues. (Amber Jensen)
APPLES program is a new teacher orientation program as required by the Department of Education. (Amber Jensen)
CSUSA Hiring Practice (Human Resources Department and Principal)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Teacher mentoring program/plan, including the rationale for pairings and the planned mentoring activities

TLC program to allow for new teachers to be paired with a veteran teacher to mentor them throughout the year. This provides our new teachers with the ability to have someone to provide support or advice for a variety of issues. Mentor teacher completes 3 observations with their new teacher partner to provide support with instruction and classroom management. These teams meet before and after the observation to discuss ways to improve and provide support for the new teacher. (Amber Jensen)

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) / Response to Intervention (RtI)

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iv) and 1115(c)(1)(A)-(C), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Data-based problem-solving processes for the implementation and monitoring of MTSS and SIP structures to address effectiveness of core instruction, resource allocation (funding and staffing), teacher support systems, and small group and individual student needs

Function and responsibility of each school-based leadership team member as related to MTSS and the SIP

Systems in place that the leadership team uses to monitor the fidelity of the school's MTSS and SIP

Data source(s) and management system(s) used to access and analyze data to monitor the effectiveness of core, supplemental, and intensive supports in reading, mathematics, science, writing, and engagement

Plan to support understanding of MTSS and build capacity in data-based problem solving for staff and parents

Increased Learning Time/Extended Learning Opportunities

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(ii)(II)-(III), 1114(b)(1)(I), and 1115(c)(1)(C)(i) and 1115(c)(2), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Research-based strategies the school uses to increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum:

Strategy: Before or After School Program

Minutes added to school year:

Tutoring sessions are offered after school to provide students with academic support in academic subjects. Students attend one session per week in September, 2 sessions per week in October and 3 sessions per week in November.

Strategy Purpose(s)

- Instruction in core academic subjects

How is data collected and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of this strategy?

Students take pre and post tests during tutoring, benchmark assessments 3 times a year through Discovery Education and also take the FCAT.

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

Teachers, department chairs and administration.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

Names and position titles of the members of the school-based LLT

Name	Title

How the school-based LLT functions

Major initiatives of the LLT

Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Instruction

How the school ensures every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student

Teachers are instructed during professional development how to utilize reading strategies and improve vocabulary.

Expected Improvements

Area 1: Reading

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on FCAT 2.0, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	73%		No	75%
American Indian				
Asian	82%		No	84%
Black/African American	66%		No	69%
Hispanic	68%		No	72%
White	77%		No	79%
English language learners	43%		No	49%
Students with disabilities	40%		No	46%
Economically disadvantaged	66%		No	69%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	127	75%	80%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	137	75%	80%

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)	20	20%	30%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)	20	20%	30%

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking (students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)		70%	74%
Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students)		70%	74%
Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)		70%	74%

Area 2: Writing

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0) Students scoring at or above 3.5	46	37%	40%
Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4	54	20%	25%

Area 3: Mathematics

Elementary and Middle School Mathematics

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on FCAT 2.0 and EOC assessments, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	71%		No	74%
American Indian				
Asian	86%		No	87%
Black/African American	59%		No	63%
Hispanic	68%		No	71%
White	74%		No	77%
English language learners	49%		No	54%
Students with disabilities	42%		No	48%
Economically disadvantaged	65%		No	69%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	30	30%	35%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	24	24%	30%

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Learning Gains			
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and EOC)			

Algebra I End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3			
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4			

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3			
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4			

Area 4: Science

Elementary School Science

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3			
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4			

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6			
Students scoring at or above Level 7			

Middle School Science

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	26	26%	30%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	25	25%	30%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6			
Students scoring at or above Level 7			

Area 5: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM)

All Levels

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target
# of STEM-related experiences provided for students (e.g. robotics competitions; field trips; science fairs)			
Participation in STEM-related experiences provided for students			

Area 8: Early Warning Systems

Elementary School Indicators

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students who miss 10 percent or more of available instructional time			
Students retained, pursuant to s. 1008.25, F.S.			
Students who are not proficient in reading by third grade			
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals			
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that lead to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.			

Middle School Indicators

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students who miss 10 percent or more of available instructional time			
Students who fail a mathematics course			
Students who fail an English Language Arts course			
Students who fail two or more courses in any subject			
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals			
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that leads to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.			

Area 9: Parent Involvement

Title I Schools may use the Parent Involvement Plan to meet the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(F) and 1115(c)(1)(G), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Parental involvement targets for the school

Specific Parental Involvement Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %

Area 10: Additional Targets

Additional targets for the school

Specific Additional Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %

Goals Summary

Goals Detail

Action Plan for Improvement

Problem Solving Key

G = Goal   **B** = Barrier   **S** = Strategy

Coordination and Integration

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(J) and 1115(c)(1)(H), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

How federal, state, and local funds, services, and programs are coordinated and integrated at the school

Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support School Improvement Goals

This section will satisfy the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b), by demonstrating high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, for pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff is being offered to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Professional development opportunities identified in the SIP as action steps to achieve the school's goals.

Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals