The Phoenix Program Naples

2022-23 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

The Phoenix Program Naples

3706 ESTEY AVE, Naples, FL 34104

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Brent Klein

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

2021-22 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Function (per accountability file)	Alternative
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School 4-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: Maintaining 2020-21: No Rating 2018-19: Maintaining 2017-18: Maintaining 2016-17: Maintaining
DJJ Accountability Rating	2023-24: No Rating

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Collier 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.

The mission of the Phoenix School Naples is to provide an alternative educational route for students who have committed zero tolerance offenses and/or been significantly disruptive to the education of others and themselves in a traditional school environment. Students advance through levels in a structured educational environment designed to help students learn to take responsibility for their actions and earn the right to return to their traditional school.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students will complete school prepared for ongoing learning, community involvement, and global responsibilities.

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

The Phoenix School Naples serves students in seventh through twelfth grade who have been placed in the program as an alternative to expulsion pursuant to the CCPS Code of Student Conduct. Student placement in the program requires enrollment for approximately one school year and students must meet minimum attendance, academic, and behavioral requirements to exit the program. The population consists of students from diverse backgrounds and ability levels who require a myriad of supports to learn how to be successful in school. Program specific supports include a structured school and classroom environment, clear behavioral objectives, positive consequences tied to a level-based hierarchy, small class sizes, frequent parent communication, and targeted academic support.

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
Klein, Brent	Principal	Mr. Klein monitors the Assistant Principal, handles all staff hiring for the Phoenix School, delegates leadership duties to the Assistant Principal and Lead Teacher, conducts staff evaluations, and manages the finances. He reports to the district and ensures the Phoenix School meets all state and district compliance requirements. Mr. Klein leads weekly meetings with the Assistant Principals and bi-weekly meetings with the Alternative Schools Leadership Team.
Cox, Dan	Assistant Principal	Dr. Cox serves as the on-site Assistant Principal for the Phoenix School Naples. He completes instructional and non- instructional evaluations, conducts professional development, and monitors program specific data. He oversees curriculum implementation, teacher instruction and development, textbook and instructional supply acquisition and management, and all facility maintenance.
Campins, Kyle	Teacher, K-12	Mr. Campins serves as the Lead Teacher at the Phoenix School Naples. He oversees all teachers and non-instructional staff on a daily basis, and he is the chief facilitator of the student behavior plan. He monitors program specific academic, behavior, and attendance data. Mr. Campins works closely with parents to best engage them in their child's education and life, and he oversees and administers all state and district tests.
Foster, Misty	Instructional Coach	Ms. Foster oversees the ELA and reading programs at all Alternative Schools. She conducts professional development related to ELA & reading instruction for teachers, and she works closely with teachers to support them in the classroom. Ms. Foster also monitors ACT and SAT student registration and tracks all student performance on these assessments.

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

No

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

Not Applicable.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/1/2022, Brent Klein

Total number of students enrolled at the school.
173

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.
14

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?
12

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?
2

Number of teachers with ESE certification?
3

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2022-23

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	1	10	29	29	42	55	7	173
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	25	21	33	33	6	128
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	1	2	12	8	19	16	3	61
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	10	9	19	2	57
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	8	19	16	3	61

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	1	5	15	8	16	19	3	67

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	1	0	0	0	13	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	3	0	6

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 8/29/2022

2021-22 - 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	1	9	15	20	22	19	3	89
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	10	16	18	16	3	71
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	13	17	18	15	3	74
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	7	6	2	1	25
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	5	5	2	2	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	8	7	6	1	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	12	5	8	0	41

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	9	14	17	18	17	3	78

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	7	1	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	1	0	5

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement		62%	55%					59%	61%
ELA Learning Gains								61%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile								63%	54%
Math Achievement		45%	42%					66%	62%
Math Learning Gains								61%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile								58%	52%
Science Achievement		59%	54%					46%	56%
Social Studies Achievement		56%	59%					83%	78%

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**
04	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019	0%	56%	-56%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019	8%	55%	-47%	52%	-44%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	8%	58%	-50%	56%	-48%
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
04	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019	0%	61%	-61%	55%	-55%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019	25%	66%	-41%	54%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	5%	36%	-31%	46%	-41%
Cohort Comparison		-25%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					
	2019					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	8%	52%	-44%	48%	-40%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	33%	68%	-35%	67%	-34%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	72%	-72%	71%	-71%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	69%	72%	-3%	70%	-1%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	67%	-67%	61%	-61%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	59%	-59%	57%	-57%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD										10	
HSP											
FRL										6	
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
FRL											
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

ESSA Data Review

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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	5
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	5
Total Components for the Federal Index	1
Percent Tested	
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	10
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	0
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

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	6
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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 related to the Areas of Focus?

The Areas of Focus for the '21-'22 SY were: 1) ELA Achievement; 2) Graduation; and 3) Social Emotional Learning. Progress monitoring for ELA Achievement consisted of weekly monitoring by classroom teachers of Read180 data and monitoring quarterly benchmark assessment data by the APC and Reading Coach. Progress monitoring for graduation included daily tracking of student course completion on a shared academic spreadsheet, monitoring student ACT and SAT scores, disaggregating sub-score data on the ACT and SAT assessments to target areas of weakness prior to the next assessment, and through monthly mentoring meetings with students to help make them reflect on their own progress towards graduation. The progress monitoring plan for the third area of focus - Social Emotional Learning - was monitored through attendance and discipline data.

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

Student learning gains in 10th grade ELA were the greatest area of strength and 8th grade ELA scale score increase was the greatest area of improvement. 50% of 10th graders demonstrated ELA gains outpacing ELA learning gains for all other grades, while 8th graders showed collectively an improvement of 22 scale score points. An instructional shift towards more explicit, systematic instruction off of the computer helped students in these grades stay engaged throughout the school day.

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?

Math achievement and corresponding learning gains need the greatest improvement. For the 2021 SY, the Phoenix School Naples reported no data for math learning gains and for the 2022 SY only 36% of students demonstrated learning gains on the state math assessment. Out of the 7 ungraded Alternative School programs in CCPS that receive a state rating, this was the lowest percentage of students making learning gains in math. Disaggregating the data by grade indicates that 7th and 8th grade students demonstrated learning gains of 46% and 29% respectively and math proficiency below 20% for both grades. Algebra 1 EOC data indicates 60% of students demonstrated proficiency on the assessment, but this only included students who took the assessment for the first time in the spring.

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

Students in Alternative Schools generally score well below the state and district averages in all tested areas for which there is available data. Phoenix students are no exception. This trend remains the same from graduation cohort to cohort and across all ESSA subgroups. New students enter the Phoenix School each year at-risk of not graduating or falling further behind their peers attending traditional school due to poor test scores, low GPAs, chronic absenteeism, lack of engagement, and lack of credits for high school students. The overarching mission of the Phoenix School is to help students take responsibility for their actions and seize control of their future to go back to their traditional school on track to graduate.

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

Instructional staff, support personnel, and administration need to continue to work together to maintain a targeted focus on student achievement and academic progress on specific standards. This will help to

tailor explicit and differentiated instruction to target specific student needs. In reading, the Read180 program needs to be used with fidelity. This can be achieved through the aforementioned collaboration and by focusing on reading for information in all subject areas. Students who can read for information will do better in all classes and the larger percentage of standardized tests cover non-fiction and informational text. In math, students in all grades need to focus on fundamental skills and fact fluency. Instruction must focus on standard attainment and mastery, and students need to receive targeted interventions in their areas of weakness.

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

All teachers will receive professional development from district curriculum experts on implementing the new math curriculum. Secondary reading and ELA teachers will also receive professional development from district curriculum experts and the reading coach to assist with implementing the new secondary ELA curriculum. High School ELA and math teachers will receive ACT and SAT specific professional development to better familiarize them with test requirements and to expand their knowledge of available resources. The Reading Coach, who has a documented history of improving student reading performance, will model exemplary reading instruction and support teachers with their own implementation. The Reading Coach will also assist teachers with tracking sub-score data and using it to target areas of student weakness. All teachers will receive PD on mentoring students, tracking student progress, and helping students track their own progress.

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Students demonstrating learning gains on the state assessment, pursuant to the FLDOE learning gain requirements, was considerably lower than the district and state average. Increasing the percentage of students demonstrating learning gains should have a positive effect on overall ELA performance for all students at the Phoenix School while also helping students on their other state assessments. Further, studies show that academic success impacts positively both behavior and attendance. Therefore, Phoenix students that improve their reading achievement have a greater opportunity of success when they transition back to their home schools after completing successfully the program at the Phoenix School Naples.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Middle and high school students demonstrating learning gains on the ELA state assessment will increase 24% from 41% to 65% as measured by comparing student achievement on the 2022 FSA ELA assessment to student scale score achievement on the 2023 ELA assessment or by earning an ACT or SAT ELA concordant score needed for graduation.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Success will be monitored continuously throughout the year by the classroom teacher and Lead Teacher by analyzing student performance on Read180, NoRedInk, Khan Academy SAT Prep, and Edgenuity. Student performance on State Progress Monitoring Assessments (Quarter 1 & 2), district quarter benchmark assessment (quarter 3), and completed ACT and SAT assessments will also be monitored for the desired outcome.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kyle Campins (campik@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teachers will use explicit, systematic instruction tied to state standards during their ELA and reading lessons. To meet the needs of individual learners and to improve areas of student weakness, teachers will use data gleaned from Read180 and classroom assessments to provide corrective feedback and to differentiate instruction. Students will also receive targeted ELA and reading instruction in a small group setting to help them overcome areas of weakness.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Explicit, systematic instruction contributes to each student's ability to clearly understand new content and to make connections to previously taught content while helping students continuously acquire knowledge that grows with complexity. Differentiated instruction with corrective feedback helps raise student awareness of errors to aid in self-correction and self-regulation while simultaneously helping the learning to improve fluency in specific areas of weakness through individual instruction.

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) Explicit, systematic instruction will be implemented in each class through each teacher's daily use of the CCPS grade specific ELA Curriculum Guide and Pacing Calendar.

Person Responsible	Dan Cox (coxda@collierschools.com)

2) Read180 and grade-specific adopted ELA resources will be used with fidelity and student progress will be monitored weekly. Teachers will then use this data to provide corrective feedback and to differentiate instruction.

Person Responsible	Dan Cox (coxda@collierschools.com)

3) Students will receive additional practice and targeted instruction addressing areas of weakness during the small group interventions. Overall student success will be tracked and monitored through student performance on Read180, State Progress Monitoring Tests, a Quarter 3 Benchmark, ACT and SAT assessments, and through additional classroom assessments.

Person Responsible	Dan Cox (coxda@collierschools.com)

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.	Student data from all of the aforementioned progress monitoring tools will be disaggregated by ESSA subgroup - SWD, ELL, Hispanic students, Economically Disadvantaged - to monitor the ELA/Reading performance of students in each group. The ESE inclusion teacher that works with students with disabilities at the Phoenix Program will work with each classroom teacher to aid in the progress monitoring of students on his caseload and he will differentiate lessons for those students to target areas of weakness. The ELL Tutor will do the same for ELL students.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	The overall math learning gains of students at the Phoenix School Naples fell below the district and state averages. 36% of Phoenix students demonstrated learning gains on the state math assessment and 20% demonstrated grade level proficiency. This was the smallest percentage of students making learning gains out of all 7 CCPS ungraded Alternative School Programs.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Students demonstrating learning gains on the state math assessment will increase 29% from 36% to 65%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Student achievement will be monitored on a weekly basis through student performance on Math Nation assessments for middle and high school students. Performance will also be monitored for all students through the State Performance Monitoring Assessment (FAST), CCPS quarterly benchmark assessments, and performance on ACT and SAT assessments..
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dan Cox (coxda@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teachers will use explicit, systematic instruction tied to state standards during their math lessons. To meet the needs of individual learners and to improve areas of student weakness, math teachers will use student data from Math Nation and classroom assessments to provide corrective feedback and to differentiate instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Explicit, systematic instruction contributes to each student's ability to clearly understand new content and to make connections to previously taught content while helping students continuously acquire knowledge that grows with complexity. Differentiated instruction with corrective feedback helps raise student awareness of errors to aid in self-correction and self-regulation while simultaneously helping the learning to improve fluency in specific areas of weakness through individual instruction.

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) Explicit, systematic instruction will be implemented in each class through each teacher's daily use of the CCPS grade specific Math Curriculum Guide and Pacing Calendar.

Person Responsible	Dan Cox (coxda@collierschools.com)

2) Math teachers will ensure all students have access to their respective, grade specific online resources and they will facilitate pre-assessments - within each district provided online learning platform, on the State Progress Monitoring Assessment, prior to each unit through a paper assessment. The teachers will then use this data to adjust their explicit instruction, as well as to develop student specific differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible	Dan Cox (coxda@collierschools.com)

3) Students will receive additional practice and targeted instruction addressing areas of weakness during small group interventions. Overall student success will be tracked and monitored through student

performance on Math Nation online and paper assessments, the State Progress Monitoring Assessments, and Quarterly Benchmark Assessments.

Person Responsible	Dan Cox (coxda@collierschools.com)

4) The principal will meet with math teachers monthly to review student data, to chart standards mastery, and to assist with making adjustments to the small groups receiving targeted intervention.

Person Responsible	Brent Klein (kleinb@collierschools.com)

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.	Student data from all of the aforementioned progress monitoring tools will be disaggregated by ESSA subgroup - SWD, ELL, Hispanic students, Economically Disadvantaged - to monitor the math performance of students in each group. The ESE inclusion teacher that works with students with disabilities in the Phoenix School will work with each classroom teacher to aid in the progress monitoring of students on his caseload and he will differentiate lessons for those students to target areas of weakness. The ELL Tutor will do the same for ELL students.

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Students with disabilities at the Phoenix School demonstrated achievement and learning gains in ELA and Math below the 41% threshold required by the ESSA. 10% of ELL students demonstrated academic achievement according to ESSA requirements that include achievement and learning gains in all subject areas.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	SWD academic achievement, as defined by ESSA, will increase 32% from 10% in 2022 to 42% in 2023.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The PLC team will disaggregate data after each test administration to track the performance of students with disabilities. The team will then work with together to plan targeted interventions to address areas of weakness. The SWD case manager will work with classroom teachers to differentiate instruction and to create individual self-paced study plans for students to complete outside of their regular ELA and math classes.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kyle Campins (campik@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Students with disabilities will receive targeted ELA and math instruction based on performance data on all of the aforementioned progress monitoring tools and data from informal classroom assessment. Students will also receive in-class support from their SWD case manager and non-instructional support staff. Students with disabilities will also participate in monthly data chats to chart their progress and to help them self-identify areas of to focus on for improvement each month.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Data-driven decision making - on a school level through PLC meetings and on a student level through individual data chats - has been shown to be an effective strategy for raising student achievement. Further, targeted instruction increases a student's exposure to the language and subject area material; thereby, increasing the likelihood they master it by the end of the school year.

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) PLC Team comprised of classroom teachers, SWD case manager, Administrator, Lead Teacher, and support personnel at each site will disaggregate progress monitoring data to analyze academic performance of SWDs on classroom assessments, State Progress Monitoring Assessments, district quarterly benchmarks, and ACT and SAT assessments.	
Person Responsible	Dan Cox (coxda@collierschools.com)
2) Analysis will lead to instructional adjustments by the classroom teacher, including targeted and differentiated instruction during explicit instruction pull-outs, and the analysis will aid the SWD case manager in supporting the student to increase academic achievement.	
Person Responsible	Dan Cox (coxda@collierschools.com)
Monitoring ESSA Impact:	Addressed in the explanations above.

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.

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment is critical in supporting sustainable schoolwide improvement initiatives. When schools implement a shared focus on improving school culture and environment, students are more likely to engage academically. A positive school culture and environment can also increase staff satisfaction and retention.

Select a targeted element from the menu to develop a system or process to be implemented for schoolwide improvement related to positive culture and environment.

Student Attendance

Describe how data will be collected and analyzed to guide decision making related to the selected target.

Teachers will monitor attendance by homeroom and make contact with parents by the 3rd consecutive absence. Teachers will record their parent contacts, or attempted contacts, in the MTSS section of FOCUS to ensure all attempts to improve a student's attendance are documented throughout the school year. Administrative staff or the Lead Teacher will also monitor student attendance and they will be tasked with making 5-day absence calls, mailing 7- and 10-day absence letters, and setting up attendance meetings with students and parents. All contacts and meetings will be documented on the MTSS panel of FOCUS. The PLC Team at the Phoenix School will analyze attendance data monthly to identify areas of improvement and to discuss possible adjustments.

Describe how the target area, related data and resulting action steps will be communicated to stakeholders.

Student attendance data will be communicated at the individual and classroom level by the homeroom teacher. For the program as a whole, positive student data and overall classroom attendance data will get posted on the attendance bulletin board. The student attendance plan and positive supports will be shared with students in their homeroom and will be posted on the attendance bulletin board. Student attendance will also be included on monthly staff and parent newsletters.

Describe how implementation will be progress monitored.

Classroom teachers will monitor their overall attendance and the individual attendance of their students. Administrative staff will run weekly and monthly reports to identify students of concern to discuss in PLC meetings and to schedule parent attendance conferences. The Assistant Principal or Lead Teacher will monitor for compliance of the Attendance Plan, including the completion of 5-day absence calls, the mailing of the 7- and 10 day absence letters, and the documentation of all student and parent contacts on the MTSS panel in FOCUS. Schoolwide goals will be monitored and available for all to see on the attendance bulletin board.

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.

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
1) Teachers monitor their classroom attendance. 2) Teachers contact parents on 3rd consecutive absence. 3) The PLC team will meet bi-weekly to determine interventions or create an action plan for students under 75% attendance. 4) PBIS tied to attendance will be implemented and monitored by each teacher at the classroom level and the Assistant Principal or Lead Teacher at the school level.	Cox, Dan, coxda@collierschools.com