County Wide Exceptional Child Programs

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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: 9/2/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	17%
2019-20 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
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.](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

County Wide Exceptional Child Programs

2855 COLONIAL BLVD, Fort Myers, FL 33966

http://www.leeschools.net/ese

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-12	No	%

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

School Grades History

Year	2013-14
Grade	I

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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	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
Ellinger, Susan	Other	Assistant Director, Exceptional Student Education

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 9/2/2020, Theresa Bowen

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

12

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	17%
2019-20 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
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

Wednesday 9/2/2020

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	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	

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	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	

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**	
	(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.

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						
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%
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%	0
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

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 as 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?

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.

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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Eighth Grade ELA Proficiency percentage for Hospital Homebound students was -24% below the District. All hospital homebound students are considered students with disabilities.
Measurable Outcome:	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 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 Steps to Implement

* Identify students who will be taking the Eight 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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Improve Algebra 1 Scores At least one student who is administered the Algebra 1 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.
Measurable Outcome:	At least one student who is administered the Algebra 1 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 Steps to Implement

* 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 Skills.

Person Responsible	Amy Stonner (amys@leeschools.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Monitor Attendance Attendance is instructional 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.
Measurable Outcome:	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 Steps to Implement

* 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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Civics According to the 2019 Hospital Homebound data, 0 students passed the Civics EOC.
Measurable Outcome:	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 Test-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 Steps to Implement

* 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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Behavior In order to maximize students' learning gains, students need to complete assignments between scheduled instructional sessions.
Measurable Outcome:	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 Steps to Implement

* 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)

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

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.

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	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice:	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**