
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

County Wide Exceptional Child Programs

2855 COLONIAL BLVD, Fort Myers, FL 33966

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

Demographics

Principal: Theresa Bowen

Start Date for this Principal: 9/18/2019

2019-20 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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	17%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

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. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

County Wide Exceptional Child Programs

2855 COLONIAL BLVD, Fort Myers, FL 33966

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School PK-12</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>Special Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2013-14
Grade	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

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 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: 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.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Stonner, Amy	Other	ESE Coordinator for the Hospital Homebound program.
Bowen, Theresa	Other	Assistant Director of ESE
Johnson, Jennifer	Teacher, ESE	Schedule students Testing coordinator School liaison
Teeters, Debbie	Administrative Support	Enrolls students Communicates with home schools Communicates with medical staff Enters attendance
Duncan, Jessica	Other	Director, Exceptional Student Education

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	3	5	1	0	3	10	12	12	16	13	12	14	4	105
Attendance below 90 percent	2	1	0	0	2	6	8	10	7	6	6	5	2	55
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	6	7	5	0	24
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	3	8	2	4	1	0	26

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	3	6	4	6	2	0	31

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	3	6	4	6	2	0	31
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

13

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/18/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
Attendance below 90 percent															
One or more suspensions															
Course failure in ELA or Math															
Level 1 on statewide assessment															

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
Students with two or more indicators															

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	0%	62%	61%	0%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	60%	59%	0%	52%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	53%	54%	0%	51%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	62%	62%	0%	52%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	61%	59%	0%	51%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	49%	52%	0%	50%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	54%	56%	0%	45%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	78%	78%	0%	65%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey														
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	3 (0)	5 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	10 (0)	12 (0)	12 (0)	16 (0)	13 (0)	12 (0)	14 (0)	4 (0)	105 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	2 ()	1 ()	0 ()	0 ()	2 ()	6 ()	8 ()	10 ()	7 ()	6 ()	6 ()	5 ()	2 ()	55 (0)
One or more suspensions	1 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	6 (0)	7 (0)	5 (0)	0 (0)	24 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	5 (0)	3 (0)	8 (0)	2 (0)	4 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	26 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
03	2019					
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	57%	-57%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	55%	-55%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	52%	-52%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	51%	-51%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	50%	-50%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	33%	57%	-24%	56%	-23%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		33%				
Cohort Comparison		33%				
09	2019	0%	51%	-51%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	0%	48%	-48%	53%	-53%
	2018	69%	50%	19%	53%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-69%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					
	2018	0%	58%	-58%	62%	-62%
Cohort Comparison						

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
04	2019	0%	62%	-62%	64%	-64%
	2018	0%	58%	-58%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	58%	-58%	60%	-60%
	2018	0%	57%	-57%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	47%	-47%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	41%	-41%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	40%	57%	-17%	54%	-14%
	2018	0%	65%	-65%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		40%				
Cohort Comparison		40%				
08	2019	45%	60%	-15%	46%	-1%
	2018	0%	47%	-47%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		45%				
Cohort Comparison		45%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	0%	50%	-50%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	0%	46%	-46%	48%	-48%
	2018	0%	48%	-48%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	55%	56%	-1%	67%	-12%
2018	0%	61%	-61%	65%	-65%
Compare		55%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	67%	-67%	71%	-71%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	60%	66%	-6%	71%	-11%
Compare		-60%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	50%	64%	-14%	70%	-20%
2018	67%	62%	5%	68%	-1%
Compare		-17%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	59%	-59%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	60%	-60%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	50%	-50%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	53%	-53%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	56			35	36		64				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
2017 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CS&I

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	36
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	178
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	77%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
---------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
-----------------------	--

Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
--	--

Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
--------------------------	--

Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Eighth grade ELA showed the lowest performance. Our program scored a 33% which was 24% lower than the district. Students who are found eligible for full time Hospital Homebound instruction are chronically ill and frequently not well enough to perform at their true ability level.

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

Eighth grade ELA also showed the largest decline. The decline could be related to the different students that are participating in this program each time data from evaluations are given. Once students are able to experience the same level of instruction in a school environment, they are dismissed back to their original school. The medical challenges each student may be facing at the time of assessment affect the outcome of the student's performance.

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 Eighth grade ELA showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average. These students are frequently too ill for instruction and are not well enough to perform at their true ability level.

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

The most improvement was shown on the Biology EOC where we went from 0% passing to 55% passing. We created a Google Classroom which Hospital Homebound teachers accessed to share assignments that aligned with the standards covered in this course. These materials are discussed and shared at our weekly team meetings.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

The course failure in ELA and Math is our primary area of concern.

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

The number, grade level, and severity of illness of our Hospital Homebound program varies throughout the year. This makes it difficult to set goals around specific subject areas. For example, Civics is taught only in seventh grade, while algebra I may be taught in grades 8 - 11, based upon the needs of the student. The priorities below are based upon currently available data.

1. Improve Eighth Grade ELA scores
2. Improve Algebra I EOC scores
3. Improve Civics EOC scores
4. Monitor attendance (scheduled instructional sessions)
5. Completion of assignments between visits

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Eighth Grade ELA
Rationale	Proficiency percentage for Hospital Homebound students was -24% below the District. All hospital homebound students are considered students with disabilities.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percentage of eighth graders enrolled in the Hospital Homebound program at the time of the test administration who make a learning gain will increase from 33% to 36% as measured by the FSA ELA assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Amy Stonner (amys@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will engage in ongoing progress monitoring with intentional discussion regarding needs of individual students. Targeted instruction based upon data will be implemented using appropriate high-yield strategies including Text-Dependent Questioning and Writing to Raise Achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Research shows that ongoing progress monitoring, targeted instruction and high-yield strategies result in high growth. Text dependent Questioning forces students to synthesize answers based on specific evidence within the material being read and their ability to interpret the author's meaning. Writing to Raise Achievement raises student's recall from 70 to 90 percent.
Action Step	
Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Identify students who will be taking the the Eighth Grade ELA. * Encourage and support students while working on targeted skills. * Collaborate in ongoing Hospital Homebound team meetings. * Review results of ongoing progress monitoring.
Person Responsible	Amy Stonner (amys@leeschools.net)

#2	
Title	Improve Algebra I Scores
Rationale	According to our data, no students in Hospital Homebound passed the Algebra I EOC last year. All students enrolled in Hospital Homebound are considered students with disabilities.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	At least one student who is administered the Algebra I EOC while in Hospital Homebound will make a gain. If more than 10 students are tested, a minimum of two students will make a gain.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Amy Stonner (amys@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	One on one instruction of targeted skills identified through ongoing progress monitoring using high yield strategies including Higher-Order Thinking and multiple opportunities to practice the newly acquired skill.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Data shows that individualized instruction and practice to mastery will yield positive results. Higher-Order Thinking requires the learners to do something with the information they have learned, enabling them to transfer their knowledge to new, meaningful situations.
Action Step	
Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Meet weekly to review and discuss individual student needs. * Implement plan-do-study-act (PDSA) cycle * Provide students with opportunities to practice skills between instructional visits. * Provide opportunities for students to demonstrate Higher-Order Thinking
Person Responsible	Amy Stonner (amys@leeschools.net)

#3	
Title	Monitor Attendance
Rationale	Attendance is instrumental in learning as students must be available for instruction in order to learn. Hospital Homebound students are all considered students with disabilities and are frequently absent (not available for scheduled instruction) due to medical complications. Successful participation requires that the student be available for instruction at all scheduled instructional sessions when they are medically able.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The Hospital Homebound program will maintain a 75% or above attendance percentage.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Amy Stonner (amys@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Ongoing progress monitoring by teachers, school information specialist and office staff.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Ongoing progress monitoring and relationship building provide a collaborative approach for support and accountability by students and families.

Action Step	
Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Weekly review of attendance * Discussion of attendance with the parents and students weekly * Review and improve system for monitoring attendance * Develop and implement a system to work collaboratively with referring school's mental-health team members when appropriate
Person Responsible	Amy Stonner (amys@leeschools.net)

#4	
Title	Civics
Rationale	According to the 2019 Hospital Homebound data, 0 students passed the Civics EOC.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	At least one student who is administered the Civics EOC while in Hospital Homebound will make a gain. If more than 10 students are tested, a minimum of two students will make a gain.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Amy Stonner (amys@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Targeted one on one instruction using high-yield strategies to include Distributed Summarizing and Text-Dependent Questioning will be implemented.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Research shows that individualized one on one instruction where students are given multiple opportunities to summarize what they have learned throughout the lesson increases student understanding and retention. Text-Dependent Questioning ensures that students read carefully and learn to interpret the meaning of the text.
Action Step	
Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Create a bank of lessons in the Hospital Homebound Google Classroom targeting standards * Collaborate in weekly Hospital Homebound team meeting * Monitor weekly progress on electronic curriculum for individual students
Person Responsible	Amy Stonner (amys@leeschools.net)

#5	
Title	Behavior
Rationale	In order to maximize students' learning gains, students need to complete assignments between scheduled instructional sessions.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	50% of all Hospital Homebound students will complete assignments between scheduled instructional sessions.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Amy Stonner (amys@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Ongoing monitoring of students assignments where practice is provided on targeted skills/information. Discuss outcomes weekly with the student and parents.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students who practice new skills between instructional sessions perform and retain the newly acquired skills/information at a higher rate.
Action Step	
Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Devise plan for documenting students completion of assignments between scheduled instructional sessions. * Review incomplete assignments with student and parents after each instructional session.
Person Responsible	Amy Stonner (amys@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
 This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Each student receiving services through the hospital homebound program meets with a teacher individually with a parent present in the home or is served through a hospital program. In each situation a relationship must be formed with the parent or hospital agency to ensure work is completed between visits. A communication plan is set up with the teacher, parent, and agency to ensure the student has access to needed assistance. Each student receiving services is recommended through a physician. The physician works with the family and the school district personnel to ensure there is a plan for student re-entry into school once they are well enough to be instructed in school.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

All social-emotional needs are addressed by the student's IEP team when they meet to discuss eligibility for the hospital homebound program. At that time, any services which are needed by the student will be added to the IEP and provided in the hospital/homebound setting.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Student transition is monitored by the student's IEP team. In some circumstances, students transition slowly back to a traditional campus as their medical condition allows. This is planned on an individual basis based on the needs of the student.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The Hospital Homebound department maintains a small faculty of teachers which cover a diverse number of teacher certifications from K-12 as well as exceptional student education. As students qualify for services, they are placed with a teacher whose certification matches the needs identified. This happens on a daily on-going basis to ensure student services are being delivered according to IEP plans. These are the state and local resources that are employed to meet the basic needs of the students. Hospital Homebound teachers meet with the instructional staff of referring schools to obtain appropriate instructional levels and curriculum in order to provide as much educational consistency as possible while they are unable to attend their traditional school. If there are additional needs, Federal IDEA funds are used to fund specialized equipment or additional services to ensure the desired outcome for the student. Teachers and the leadership team meet together weekly to address concerns, caseloads, and needs during PLCs.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

When high school age students are enrolled, teachers discuss post-secondary goals and current academic history to help plan students identify a course of action that will enable them to complete their high school diploma and continue on track toward college or career goals. Students are referred to Vocational Rehabilitation if appropriate to be considered for services beyond high school.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Eighth Grade ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Improve Algebra I Scores	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Monitor Attendance	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Civics	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Behavior	\$0.00

	Total: \$0.00
--	-----------------------------