Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Theodore R. And Thelma A. Gibson Charter School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Theodore R. And Thelma A. Gibson Charter School

450 NW 14TH STREET, Miami, FL 33136

http://www.gibsoncharterschool.com/wp/

Demographics

Principal: Yaneisy Abreu

Start Date for this Principal: 9/11/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	99%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: F (31%) 2015-16: D (34%) 2014-15: F (22%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

N/A

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

Theodore R. And Thelma A. Gibson Charter School

450 NW 14TH STREET, Miami, FL 33136

http://www.gibsoncharterschool.com/wp/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	99%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	100%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	B	F	D

School Board Approval

N/A

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.

The mission of the Gibson Charter School is to prepare our students academically and socially, through STEAM and Socio-Emotional Learning for success in a 21st century global community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of The Gibson Charter School is to provide an innovative and challenging curriculum in a safe learning environment. We will provide a unique school experience through small class sizes and the use of differentiated instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners. The school will also utilize parental and community involvement in order to support our students' academic endeavors that support 21st Century learning.

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
Abreu, Yaneisy	Principal	
Abreu, Yaneisy	Assistant Principal	
Alamo, Michele	Instructional Coach	
Rodriguez, Ailyn	School Counselor	
Moise, Susie	Instructional Coach	

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	23	19	24	31	20	27	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	165
Attendance below 90 percent	3	3	2	3	4	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	2	4	6	3	14	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	2	2	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

165

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/11/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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	6	6	1	4	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	4	2	2	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	6	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	4	6	4	8	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	5	1	1	4	7	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	3	3	7	7	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	13	8	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	4	6	4	8	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	48%	62%	57%	27%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	62%	58%	54%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	58%	53%	58%	58%	52%
Math Achievement	42%	69%	63%	19%	66%	61%
Math Learning Gains	51%	66%	62%	31%	65%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	23%	55%	51%	18%	57%	51%
Science Achievement	27%	55%	53%	9%	52%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	23 (0)	19 (0)	24 (0)	31 (0)	20 (0)	27 (0)	144 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	3 (0)	3 (6)	2 (6)	3 (1)	4 (4)	6 (1)	21 (18)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (2)	0 (4)	0 (2)	0 (2)	0 (1)	0 (11)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (14)	0 (6)	0 (9)	0 (29)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**						**Total**
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (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	24%	60%	-36%	58%	-34%
	2018	31%	61%	-30%	57%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	64%	-12%	58%	-6%
	2018	63%	60%	3%	56%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		21%				
05	2019	61%	60%	1%	56%	5%
	2018	50%	59%	-9%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	24%	67%	-43%	62%	-38%
	2018	47%	67%	-20%	62%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-23%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	69%	-2%	64%	3%
	2018	19%	68%	-49%	62%	-43%
Same Grade Comparison		48%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				
05	2019	33%	65%	-32%	60%	-27%
	2018	43%	66%	-23%	61%	-18%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	33%	53%	-20%	53%	-20%
	2018	43%	56%	-13%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						

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
ELL	38	42		38	42						
BLK	51	52		44	52		27				
HSP	40	53		35	47						
FRL	49	54	54	42	52	25	27				
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
ELL	50			40							
BLK	48	71		47	70		46				
HSP	54	83		46	67						
FRL	49	75	67	46	68	75	50				
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
BLK	29	61	64	18	28	20	11				
HSP	21	33		23	42						
FRL	27	54	58	19	31	18	9				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	369
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	45
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	47
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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.

The lowest component as evidenced by FSA Data was Science Proficiency at 27%. The contributing factor was student's lack of background knowledge of science-related content, limited opportunities to the inquiry-based delivery model, and limited reading comprehension skills served as barriers to overall proficiency on the exam.

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

The component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year as evidenced by FSA Data was Math Learning Gains in the lowest quartile. The contributing factors were lack of higher-order thinking lesson plans, and academic rigor within the subgroup.

The Math intervention program was inconsistent with its groupings, assignments, and progress monitoring. Identified students were not provided with targeted areas of instruction based on areas of weakness as indicated on I-Ready data, class performance, and teacher input.

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.

There were a number of both in-school and out-of-school factors and trends that have attributed greatly to the achievement gap of third grade math.These factors include, but are not limited to the following:

In-School factors:
Students lacking basic foundational skills before entering 3rd grade.
Chronic truancy; both absenteeism and tardiness.
Limited participation in teacher professional development for content pedagogy
Parent participation and motivation.

Out of School factors:
Parent and family instability; sudden homelessness or domestic situations, income disparities
Non-Traditional households; i.e. single parent, grandparents as legal guardians,
Poverty stricken community, research shows students with a lower social economic status perform significantly lower than students with higher social economic status.

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

The data component that showed the greatest improvement was ELA Grade 5. Best practices in this content area included explicit instruction and teaching in context. Students focused on building Word-Parts, analyzing words by using graphic organizers, and making connections between words and real-life situations (prior knowledge). The word tree also helped students see how words grow and will continue growing. Along with these strategies, dedication and determination helped us in conquering our goal.

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

Two potential areas of concern for the school are absenteeism rates/truancy issues and the number of students earning Level 1 on the statewide assessment.

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

1. Learning Gains in ELA (decrease of 22)
2. Learning Gains in Math Lowest 25 (decrease of 52)
3. Science Proficiency (decrease of 23)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increasing ELA Learning Gains
Rationale	Because the school is identified as a Title I school, it is evident that majority of students' performance is identified as below grade level. There are external factors that contribute to low academic performance and progress, especially in Head Start and early literacy development. It is because of those reasons that the school strategically focus on areas of weakness and target specific instruction based on each student's need to close the achievement gap over time, hoping that truancy or transiency do not affect the student progress.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By Spring 2020, ELA learning gains will increase from 53% to 64%, showing an increase of 11 percentage points.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Yaneisy Abreu (pr2060@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Research Based Interventions- using Reading WonderWorks (Tier 2 and 3) during additional minutes outside of the designated reading block Differentiated Instruction- Teachers will incorporate strategies based on needs (Tiers 1-3) Before-School Tutoring using Research Based program (PathBlazers)- 4 times weekly (Tier 3)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	1. Analyze School Wide Data and Create Target Groups 2. Share findings with instructional team 3. Purchase Program(s) and train staff on implementation 4. Send parent communication home about school's expectations about Intervention Plan 5. Create attendance sheets, monitor, provide support, and reward
Person Responsible	Yaneisy Abreu (pr2060@dadeschools.net)

#2	
Title	Increasing MATH Learning Gains
Rationale	Because the school is identified as a Title I school, it is evident that majority of students' performance is identified as below grade level. There are external factors that contribute to low academic performance and progress, especially in Head Start and early literacy development. It is because of those reasons that the school strategically focus on areas of weakness and target specific instruction based on each student's need to close the achievement gap over time, hoping that truancy or transiency do not affect the children progress.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By Spring 2020, MATH learning gains will increase from 51% to 66%, showing an increase of 15 percentage points.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Michele Alamo (malamo@gibsoncharterschool.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	Research Based Interventions- using Reading Go Math Reteaches (Tier 2 and 3) during additional minutes outside of the designated math block Differentiated Instruction- Teachers will incorporate strategies based on needs (Tiers 1-3) Before-School Tutoring using Research Based program (Teacher Led)- 4 times weekly (Identified Bubble students Levels 2 & 3)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	1. Analyze School Wide Data and Create Target Groups 2. Share findings with instructional team 3. Purchase Program(s) and train staff on implementation 4. Send parent communication home about school's expectations about Intervention Plan 5. Create attendance sheets, monitor, provide support, and reward
Person Responsible	Yaneisy Abreu (pr2060@dadeschools.net)

#3	
Title	Increasing Science Proficiency Rates
Rationale	Because the school is identified as a Title I school, it is evident that majority of students' performance is identified as below grade level. There are external factors that contribute to low academic performance and progress, especially in Head Start and early literacy development. It is because of those reasons that the school strategically focus on areas of weakness and target specific instruction based on each student's need to close the achievement gap over time, hoping that truancy or transiency do not affect the children progress.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By Spring 2020, the school's Science Proficiency Rates will increase from 27 to 40, by showing an increase of 13 percentage points.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Michele Alamo (malamo@gibsoncharterschool.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	Implementation of 21st Century Learning by incorporating STEAM standards, by incorporating effective labs and demonstrations on a weekly basis, and using the interactive notebook to track and support student learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	

Action Step	
Description	1. Self-Evaluate STEAM readiness by using ELEOT2.0 tool 2. Professional Development on STEAM for teachers 3. Creation of IFC Calendars 4. Common Planning 5. Labs and Demos
Person Responsible	Yaneisy Abreu (pr2060@dadeschools.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.

The school plans on building positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students by incentivizing parents to attend school-wide meetings. The school has made an increased marketing effort in educating parents and community partners with research-based data that shows that increased involvement positively impacts student outcomes.

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.

Students' social-emotional needs are addressed through counseling, mentoring, and the implementation of Sanford Harmony Social Emotional Curriculum. The school provides a full-time counselor to assist students with behavioral and social issues. The counselor will also be working with our parents and families to ensure that they are receiving social services needed and/or being referred to outside mental health agencies.

In addition, the school partners with local and community agencies, such as The Overtown Youth Center and Touching Miami with Love, and Urgent Inc. to provide mentoring, tutoring, and extra-curricular activities to students in need of additional services.

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

The school's administration will ensure that all cohorts will receive information for all students who are transitioning from one school level to another through the following:

-Before the school year is over, we invite VPK programs to attend a kindergarten transition day to explore the school and familiarize themselves with the teachers and the elementary environment.
-The school will arrange visits with both neighboring public and charter schools for outgoing cohorts
-Notifications will be sent home to inform parents of Magnet Fairs
-Notifications will be sent home of receiving schools that are hosting Open Houses Events and/or Articulation Events

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 MTSS team receives the data from previous year baseline testing, I-Ready diagnostics and growth monitoring checks and then disseminates the data to all teachers. Each teacher then creates an action

plan with guidance from administration to address every student's areas of growth and areas of strength. This data is also used to conduct Student Data Chats to inform teachers, students, and parents of their current achievement level.

The MTSS team holds bi-weekly data meetings with the staff to ensure the action plans are being executed with fidelity. Student sample work and lesson plans will be reviewed by the MTSS Team along with conducting classroom observations.

The MTSS Team along with the testing coordinator will provide students with Mini-Assessments to determine if the instruction is being effective. Data will be used to drive classroom instruction, interventions, enrichment activities, and tutoring plans.

The MTSS team will ensure the necessary students are in the appropriate Tier (Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3). The team will also monitor that the necessary data is collected and placed in the RTI Binder.

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

Gibson Charter School hosts an annual Career Day event where community partners and industry/business members present to the student body. The school also intends to expose its students to Historically Black Colleges and Universities in the Southern region by attending a week long college tour.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increasing ELA Learning Gains				$41,506.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
		100-Salaries	2060 - Theodore R. And Thelma A. Gibson Charter			$40,000.00
			Notes: Balshela Foster - Teacher Salary			
		120-Classroom Teachers	2060 - Theodore R. And Thelma A. Gibson Charter			$1,506.00
			Notes: Before school tutoring			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increasing MATH Learning Gains				$50,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
		100-Salaries	2060 - Theodore R. And Thelma A. Gibson Charter			$50,000.00
			Notes: Michele Alamo			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increasing Science Proficiency Rates				$2,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
		330-Travel	2060 - Theodore R. And Thelma A. Gibson Charter			$2,000.00
			Notes: Educational Field trips to support curriculum			
					Total:	$93,506.00