Gause Academy Of Leadership

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Gause Academy Of Leadership

1395 POLK ST W, Bartow, FL 33830

http://schools.polk-fl.net/gause

Demographics

Principal: Maryjo Costine

Start Date for this Principal: 6/11/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK, 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: 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 Polk 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

Gause Academy Of Leadership

1395 POLK ST W, Bartow, FL 33830

http://schools.polk-fl.net/gause

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK, 6-12	Yes	%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year	2011-12	2011-12
Grade		

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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.

The mission of Gause Academy of Leadership and Applied Technology is to provide a nurturing environment in which each student is motivated, inspired and instructed to achieve his or her full potential of becoming a positive, proud, confident, and productive individual of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Gause will provide a small learning community built around a career theme that will enable students to build relationships among academic subjects and their application to a broad field of work. Students will be provided with day-to-day support, but they will also be expected to perform. Most significantly, the partnerships among Gause staff members, the community, and parents will be designed to guarantee that all students succeed and that they leave Gause with the skills needed to transition into college, careers and adulthood.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Jones, Daraford	Principal	Oversee the day to day management of the school
Alexander, Alita	School Counselor	Oversee academic progression of all students
Armstrong, Audrey	Administrative Support	She is the instructional leader for Reading and ELA teachers and instructional support for all other content areas
Speed, Toi	Assistant Principal	Oversee the curriculum and the facility of the school - Toi Speed

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 6/11/2020, Maryjo Costine

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK, 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: 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.	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/11/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	12	29	11	19	16	12	109
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	2	5	7	1	31
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	5	12	5	1	41
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	25	9	15	13	8	86

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	2	5	15	6	11	8	1	48

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	12	29	11	19	16	12	109
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	2	5	7	1	31
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	5	12	5	1	41
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	25	9	15	13	8	86

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	2	5	15	6	11	8	1	48

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	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%	61%	61%	0%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	58%	59%	0%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	49%	54%	0%	44%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	61%	62%	0%	52%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	56%	59%	0%	50%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	52%	52%	0%	44%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	52%	56%	0%	49%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	79%	78%	0%	68%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**							**Total**
	6	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
	(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.

ELA							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	0%	48%	-48%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	41%	-41%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	7%	42%	-35%	52%	-45%
	2018	9%	42%	-33%	51%	-42%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
08	2019	28%	48%	-20%	56%	-28%
	2018	4%	49%	-45%	58%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		24%				
Cohort Comparison		19%				
09	2019	11%	45%	-34%	55%	-44%
	2018	3%	43%	-40%	53%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
10	2019	10%	42%	-32%	53%	-43%
	2018	10%	42%	-32%	53%	-43%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	0%	47%	-47%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	40%	-40%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	15%	39%	-24%	54%	-39%
	2018	0%	40%	-40%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
08	2019	0%	35%	-35%	46%	-46%
	2018	6%	34%	-28%	45%	-39%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	23%	41%	-18%	48%	-25%
	2018	0%	42%	-42%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		23%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	23%	54%	-31%	67%	-44%
2018	11%	59%	-48%	65%	-54%
Compare		12%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	70%	-70%	71%	-71%
2018	23%	84%	-61%	71%	-48%
Compare		-23%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	31%	57%	-26%	70%	-39%
2018	29%	57%	-28%	68%	-39%
Compare		2%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	6%	50%	-44%	61%	-55%
2018	0%	60%	-60%	62%	-62%
Compare		6%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	11%	53%	-42%	57%	-46%
2018	0%	41%	-41%	56%	-56%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		11%			

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		33			50						
BLK	13	56		3	40		18				
HSP	8	60		10						50	
WHT	15	44		15	50					36	
FRL	15	56		8	38		21			36	

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
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	36
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	355
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	81%

Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2

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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	26
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	32
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	32
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	29
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

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.

N?A

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

N/A

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.

Math had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The factors that contributed to this gap were many students have been retained at least one year and/or they have gaps in the learning due to non attendance in traditional schools prior to enrolling.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was ELA Learning Gains. New actions our school used was the use of an Instructional coach in intentional planning with teachers and focusing on improving student data.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

1. Attendance

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

1. Improving attendance of all students
2. Improving school-wide data of all students
3. Providing a nurturing environment for all students
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	FSA-ELA Learning Gains/Proficient Levels Currently 16% of Juniors have met FSA-ELA graduation requirement.
Measurable Outcome:	The school will progress monitor student's measurable outcome with the STAR results, Achieve3000 (Lexile) and grades. The ACT & SAT concordant scores will be used as measurable outcomes for students meeting proficient levels.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Audrey Armstrong (audrey.armstrong@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Improved attendance. Increase student's frequency of taking ACT & SAT to improve students possibility to earn concordant scores or super-scoring concordance. Register and prepare all juniors and seniors for the In School ACT Day to possibly earn the concordant score. Prep tutoring for Juniors on ACT & SAT test taking strategies using research based practices.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The ACT/SAT is offered up to 6 times per academic year. If students prepare and take the exam frequently, they have a better chance of reaching the concordant score for graduation. ELA and Reading teachers will use research based materials such as Kaplan prepatory materials to help students learn stategies for successful testing.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Graduation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The current graduation rate is 50% for Gause Academy
Measurable Outcome:	The school plans to create a measurable tool to include students who earn Penn Foster diploma in graduation rate. The school plans to increase the graduation rate of students earning Florida Diplomas and Penn Foster Diplomas to over 80%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alita Alexander (alita.alexander@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Guidance will constantly monitor all students for academic progression towards earning a standard high school Florida diploma. Admin and teachers will meet with all students on a regular basis and have ongoing data chats to discuss exactly where students are and exactly what each individual student needs to do to improve and make learning gains.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers work daily with students, so it is imperative that they are forefront in discussing overall student data with them. Students will discuss this data and learning goals with all teachers so they will remain in the loop regarding their status for graduation and matriculation requirements. Administration will also meet with students to discuss their data during a mid year senior conference and end of year senior conference. If students are constantly discussing their data and learning goals with admin and teachers, they will be more aware of grades and improvement and the exact step they need to take to improve. This strategy will help build up the students self confidence and help them to set and attain clear educational goals.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify all lowest performing students using data in UNIFY, create a specific plan of improvement
2. Have ongoing data chats with those students regarding performance and steps to improve
4. Provide in class support for those students via teacher led small groups, one on one instruction, and small groups
5. Provide ongoing instructional support (via data chats, one on one and small groups) for all other students who have not need to meet graduation requirements
6. In January of graduating year, place all seniors who have not met graduation requirements in the Penn Foster program to ensure they receive a high school dipoloma in May of graduating year.

Person Responsible   Daraford Jones (daraford.jones@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

School leadership team will work closely with the person responsible and monitor success and areas of improvements. Students will receive incentives for progression.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.
Some of the key items that are done to build a positive school culture and environment involving all stakeholders are:
• WE3 Expo and Career Academies
• PBIS activities
• School Social Worker Conferences and Counseling Sections
• Mentoring Groups/Programs
Fall festival/ Spring fling
• School Psychologist and Mental Health Groups
• DrumBeats

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$7,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			1491 - Gause Academy Of Leadership			$7,500.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Graduation				$7,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			1491 - Gause Academy Of Leadership			$7,500.00
					Total:	$15,000.00