# County Wide Exceptional Child Programs

leadership
analysis
students
Florida
mission
college and career
ambitious
family and community involvement
school improvement
striving
achievement
teaching
relationships
success
areas of focus
instruction
needs assessment
resources
supportive environment
growth
strategic planning
collaboration
vision
learning

## 2021-22 Ungraded 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: 8/26/2021

| | |
|---|---|
| **2021-22 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Function**<br>(per accountability file) | ESE |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Combination School<br>PK-12 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | Special Education |
| **2020-21 Title I School** | No |
| **2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 17% |
| **2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* |
| **School Improvement Rating History** | 2021-22: I<br><br>2020-21: No Rating<br><br>2018-19: Maintaining<br><br>2017-18: Maintaining<br><br>2016-17: Maintaining |
| **DJJ Accountability Rating** | 2023-24: No Rating |

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools

receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

## 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.

**Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.**

The population is unique because they all have medical conditions that confine them to either home or a hospital for varying lengths of time. Individualized instruction is provided in the home in order for students to continue their progress toward meeting standards, course requirement and IEP goals.

### School Leadership Team

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

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|---------------|--------------------------------|
| Ellinger, Susan | Assistant Director, ESE | Coordinator for Hospital Homebound Program |
| Bowen, Theresa | | Director, Exceptional Student Education |
| Johnson, Jennifer | | Schedule students<br>Testing coordinator<br>School liaison |
| Teeters, Debbie | | Enrolls students<br>Communicates with home schools<br>Communicates with medical staff<br>Enters attendance |

**Is education provided through contract for educational services?**

No

**If yes, name of the contracted education provider.**

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Thursday 8/26/2021, Theresa Bowen

**Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?**

11

**Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?**

0

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.**

12

**Total number of students enrolled at the school.**

35

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.**

1

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.**

0

**Demographic Data**

## Early Warning Systems

**2021-22**

**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 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 13 | 37 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 13 |
| 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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |

**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 8/26/2021

**2020-21 - 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 | 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 FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA 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 | |

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

**School Data Review**
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 | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | | 62% | 61% | | 55% | 60% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | | 60% | 59% | | 53% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | 53% | 54% | | 46% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | | | | | 62% | 62% | | 55% | 61% |

| School Grade Component | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | | 61% | 59% | | 55% | 58% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | 49% | 52% | | 52% | 52% |
| Science Achievement | | | | | 54% | 56% | | 51% | 57% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | | 78% | 78% | | 75% | 77% |

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**
**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 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 55% | -55% | 58% | -58% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 54% | -54% | 56% | -56% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 52% | -52% | 54% | -54% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 51% | -51% | 52% | -52% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 33% | 57% | -24% | 56% | -23% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 09 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 51% | -51% | 55% | -55% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -33% | | | | |
| 10 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 48% | -48% | 53% | -53% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 62% | -62% | 64% | -64% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 58% | -58% | 60% | -60% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 47% | -47% | 55% | -55% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 40% | 57% | -17% | 54% | -14% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 45% | 60% | -15% | 46% | -1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -40% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 50% | -50% | 53% | -53% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 46% | -46% | 48% | -48% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School Minus District** | **State** | **School Minus State** | |
| 2021 | | | | | | |
| 2019 | 55% | 56% | -1% | 67% | -12% | |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | | |
| **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School Minus District** | **State** | **School Minus State** | |
| 2021 | | | | | | |
| 2019 | 0% | 67% | -67% | 71% | -71% | |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | | |
| **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School Minus District** | **State** | **School Minus State** | |
| 2021 | | | | | | |
| 2019 | 50% | 64% | -14% | 70% | -20% | |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 0% | 59% | -59% | 61% | -61% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 0% | 50% | -50% | 57% | -57% |

## Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 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 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| 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 |

## ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | |
| 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 | |
|---|---|
| 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 |
| 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 Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

**Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place for low performing ESSA subgroups related to the Areas of Focus?**

The Hospital Homebound team met weekly during the previous year to review and discuss individual student needs with regard to improving Algebra 1 scores. The implemented a PDSA (plan-do-study-act) cycle and provided opportunities for practice that included opportunities to demonstrate higher order thinking between instructional sessions.

Students taking Grade 8 ELA were also discussed and targeting instruction based upon the needs of the students was provided which included the high yield strategies of text-dependent questioning and writing to raise achievement.

Attendance and assignment completion for all students was also monitored.

**Based on ESSA subgroup progress monitoring, which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

Attendance below 90 percent showed the most gains. Instruction was provided in person and virtually during school year 20-21, thus increasing opportunities for attendance.

**What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?**

Student completion of practice of new skills and content between direct instructional sessions is the greatest area in need for improvement. Hospital homebound instruction is designed to keep students connected to their educational program, but does not equate to the level of experience the students have in a brick and mortar program. This area of improvement is based on teacher report and monitoring of assignments/tasks in Focus gradebook.

**What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?**

Due to the pandemic, fewer students participated in testing during the 2020-2021 school year, so trend determinitaion would be inaccurate if based upon those results. Additionally, our students are frequently too ill to perform at their true ability level.

**What strategies need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?**

Increasing the the completion rate of student practice on newly acquired skills and content needs to be implemented to accelerate learning.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

Teachers will participate in PLC groups to develop concise, targeted assignments that focus on quality of student output versus quantity of student output.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

## #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Graduation

| | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. | Monitoring progress to graduation for students receiving hospital homebound services is necessary to make sure students are adequately progressing during key transitions between brick and mortar schools and hospital homebound service. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. | Each student will be monitoring utilizing a graduation monitoring checklist upon entry, exit and semester scheduling. |
| **Monitoring:** Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. | Monitoring checklist will be used to adjust student schedules to ensure progress toward graduation. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Susan Ellinger (susanme@leeschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. | Data tracking |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy. | Scheduled data review will ensure that course enrollment and student progress toward graduation are monitored at key transition intervals. |

### Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Develop checklist to be used by teams
2. Team implements checklist for all high school students
3. Checklist is monitored during entry, exit and semester scheduling

| **Person Responsible** | Susan Ellinger (susanme@leeschools.net) |
|---|---|
| **Monitoring ESSA Impact:** If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index. | As all hospital homebound students are considered students with disabilities, this monitoring of key transitions will assist with ensuring students are receiving appropriate instruction in relevant courses to assist in their achievement levels. |

| **#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports** |
|---|

| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. | In order to maximize students' learning gains, students need to both attend hospital homebound instructional sessions and complete necessary coursework between instructional sessions to make progress. |
|---|---|
| **Measurable Outcome:** State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. | 60% of all Hospital Homebound students will complete assignments between scheduled instructional sessions. |
| **Monitoring:** Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. | Ongoing monitoring of student assignment completion where practice is provided on targeted skills and information presented during direct instruction. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Susan Ellinger (susanme@leeschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. | Ongoing monitoring of students assignments were practice is provided on targeted skills/content. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy. | Practice and engagement with new skills and content between instructional sessions increases retention of the newly acquired skill/content at a higher rate. |

| **Action Steps to Implement:** List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step. |
|---|

1. HH Teacher assigns practice
2. Completion of practice is indicated in Focus gradebook
3. Gradebook is monitored for missing or incomplete assignments
4. Discussion with parent and student if assignments are incomplete

| **Person Responsible** | Susan Ellinger (susanme@leeschools.net) |
|---|---|
| **Monitoring ESSA Impact:** If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index. | As all hospital homebound students are considered students with disabilities, this monitoring of practice assignment completion will assist with ensuring students are making progress in curriculum to increase achievement levels and reduce achievement gaps. |

## 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.

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, student and when necessary the hospital agency to ensure work is completed between visits. A communication plan is set up with the teacher, parent and hospital agency when needed, to ensure the student has access to any needed assistance. Each student receiving services is recommended through a physician. The physician works directly with the family and the school district to ensure there is a plan for student re-entry into school once they are well enough to be instructed in the school setting.

### Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Hospital Homebound teacher, parents and hospital agency staff are the stakeholders collaborating and working together to ensure continuous educational support during the time in which the student is unable to access their school setting while impacted by medical conditions. These stakeholders work together to ensure the student is able to continue to access their education via direct instruction and also provide support between direct instruction opportunities to allow the student to stay connected to their education and continue to make progress.