

Collier County Public Schools

Gulf Coast Charter Academy South School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Gulf Coast Charter Academy South

215 AIRPORT PULLING RD N, Naples, FL 34104

www.gccas.org

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The Mission of Gulf Coast Charter Academy South, is to foster pride in academic achievement for all students, coupled with a concerted effort focused on the ELL (English Language Learner) population, through the STEM Model (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) learning opportunities, resulting in higher student learning outcomes, concurrently with teaching lifelong fitness and developing the students' creative ability. We strive to provide the students with an environment to learn and be successful in a safe and orderly school.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Gulf Coast Charter Academy South is to establish an authentic learning community and environment, which will lead to greater academic achievement for all students. While authentic learning is a process that elevates all students to higher degrees of learning, our focus will be on English Language Learners, (which represents one out of five students in the State of Florida) using a STEM approach.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the 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
Fangmeier, Brittany	Principal	The principal will be the primary stakeholder in the SIP Plan. She will be responsible for leading the development of the plan, overseeing its implementation and monitoring its progress. She will also be responsible for communicating the plan to all stakeholders and ensuring its alignment with the state and district goals.
Staros, William	Other	The school management company will be involved in the development of the plan and will provide input on goals and objectives. He will also provide oversight and support for the plans implementation and will be responsible for ensuring compliance with legal and financial requirements.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school management company will be involved in the development of the plan and will provide input on goals and objectives. He will also provide oversight and support for the plans implementation and will

be responsible for ensuring compliance with legal and financial requirements.

The Teachers and Staff will be responsible for participating in the development of the school improvement plan and providing feedback on its goals and objectives. They will also be responsible for implementing the plan in the classroom and providing feedback on its progress and effectiveness.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Data collection including student achievement data, attendance, discipline will all be collected and analyzed to identify the areas of strength and areas that need the most improvement. Based on the continuous new data coming in that will be analyzed, goals might need to be revisited and modified throughout the year. Monitoring will be a collaborative effort involving all stakeholders, with a focus on data-driven- decision making and continuous improvement.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	76%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	57%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	1	1	2	4	0	3	1	1	1	14	
One or more suspensions	1	3	9	4	5	8	6	19	3	58	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	8	23	24	0	1	0	6	5	68	
Course failure in Math	2	3	14	18	2	0	0	10	5	54	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	21	19	17	21	14	98	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	21	24	21	29	12	112	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	2	4	21	19	17	21	14	98	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	1	3	5	4	6	2	18	3	43

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	1	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Absent 10% or more school days		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more school days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	48	58	53	52	62	55	58		
ELA Learning Gains				47			59		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				33			64		
Math Achievement*	49	63	55	55	45	42	55		
Math Learning Gains				58			56		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44			43		
Science Achievement*	45	55	52	41	59	54	53		
Social Studies Achievement*	76	76	68	93	56	59	92		
Middle School Acceleration	78	62	70	71	51	51	79		
Graduation Rate		56	74		54	50			
College and Career Acceleration		63	53		73	70			
ELP Progress	54	58	55	59	66	70	62		

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	385
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	553
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	18	Yes	2	2
ELL	36	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	27	Yes	2	1
HSP	55			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	51			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	28	Yes	1	1
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	33	Yes	1	
HSP	59			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	54			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	48			49			45	76	78			54
SWD	19			22			6				5	25
ELL	31			41			14	64			6	54
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37			32			6				5	36
HSP	47			52			47	69	74		7	60
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	54			54			58	86	86		6	
FRL	47			49			38	64	67		7	60

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	52	47	33	55	58	44	41	93	71			59
SWD	16	22	26	25	46	45	14					
ELL	36	42	27	46	56	46	26	81				59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25	31	28	32	43	37	19					46
HSP	56	49	28	59	65	49	52	91	80			61
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	60	57	53	61	49	40	41	100				
FRL	49	43	29	54	57	43	40	93	76			56

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	58	59	64	55	56	43	53	92	79			62
SWD	22	30	46	27	43	45						
ELL	53	63	63	47	54	27	40	88				62
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41	50	67	48	44	33	30					67
HSP	59	56	65	51	54	48	44	88				58
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	64	67	55	67	67		80					
FRL	55	57	60	53	55	47	47	90	73			57

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	45%	60%	-15%	54%	-9%
07	2023 - Spring	48%	52%	-4%	47%	1%
08	2023 - Spring	46%	47%	-1%	47%	-1%
04	2023 - Spring	48%	65%	-17%	58%	-10%
06	2023 - Spring	50%	51%	-1%	47%	3%
03	2023 - Spring	34%	56%	-22%	50%	-16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	41%	70%	-29%	54%	-13%
07	2023 - Spring	70%	75%	-5%	48%	22%
03	2023 - Spring	52%	67%	-15%	59%	-7%
04	2023 - Spring	49%	74%	-25%	61%	-12%
08	2023 - Spring	42%	52%	-10%	55%	-13%
05	2023 - Spring	37%	70%	-33%	55%	-18%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	52%	45%	7%	44%	8%
05	2023 - Spring	35%	62%	-27%	51%	-16%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	81%	59%	22%	50%	31%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	74%	68%	6%	66%	8%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Data from state assessments shown a decline in ELA proficiency across mid- grade levels. Science scores are also below the state and district. ELL students and ESE Students have also shown a decrease in scores since last school year. The percentage of growth for the our students in the lowest 25% of the school decreased significantly from the year before.

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

ELA and Science are areas needing the most improvement school wide. Science scores are below the state and district and ELA scores for middle aged kids are significantly below where we would like them to be. Report card grades and iReady data also reflect the same trends.

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 group that had the biggest gap compared to the state average was third grade ELA. When looking at the data specifically, areas that need reinforcement and reteaching for this grade includes cause and effect and compare and contrast.

To increase this we will start having monthly data chats for ELA and Science specifically in every grade.

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

The data shows that we improved the most in math overall. We feel the reason for this was the new math curriculum that we added last year which was hands on. We also extended the math block from one hour a day to an hour and a half a day.

Fidelity use of materials and resources, MTSS support, and purposeful common planning to address the needs of the students. Inclusion teacher involved in common planning and data meetings helped improve these scores for Math School Wide.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

According to the EWS data, the area of most concern is ELA in the middle groups.

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

1. Increase Tier 1 with use of small groups to increase overall literacy scores. and differentiated instruction
2. Increase differentiated instruction with use of small groups to increase overall literacy scores. and differentiated instruction
3. Having data chats with grade levels each month to improve the identification of areas of weakness and address those weak areas.
4. Decrease the number of disciplinary incidents with use of CHAMPS and consistent Structure throughout the building. This will help the overall academics because the focus will be on learning.
5. To increase science scores in testing grades by making sure science is being implemented fully in all grade levels and that all standards are being taught.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

During the FY22 school year FSA data indicated a increase in proficiency in all areas, including significant learning gains in all tested areas.

5th and 8th Grade Science

FY22- Grade 5 Science Proficiency 35% Grade 8 Science Proficiency 52%

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Final measurable outcomes- Science State Assessment

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Student achievement will increase by 10% in Science by implementing school-wide intentional planning with Data chats including Science and reviewing Standards taught in K-8 instruction and questioning.

Students, teachers, and admin will track the data. Quarterly benchmark assessment data, unit assessments, and progress learning will be analyzed at individual, class, and school-wide levels as well to make adjustments to support schedules.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brittany Fangmeier (fangmb@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Coach Books for Science will be used as well as Gizmos to track standard mastery.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Monitoring and tracking data and standards mastery will help be a guide map for instruction in the classroom.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Monthly Data Chat Meetings with each grade level team and administration

Person Responsible: Brittany Fangmeier (fangmb@collierschools.com)

By When: On going all year

Use of Gizmos for Benchmark Data

Person Responsible: Brittany Fangmeier (fangmb@collierschools.com)

By When: Each Quarter

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Goal: Increase T1 and differentiated instruction with use of small groups to increase overall literacy scores school wide by 15% school wide. (Current Test Score Average %45 Schoolwide Average Increase to %60 schoolwide)

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Data sheets- Discussed at Monthly Data Chat Meetings

Monthly walk-through goal This will add rigour to our lessons

Improving test scores by teachers doing small group instruction.

Communication of active literacy sent home to families via pictures, activities or links on Class Tag

Tutoring Program

Standards Mastery Training during PD Week for all staff

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

ELA will be monitored weekly iReady data on an individual, classroom, and school-wide levels. Students, teachers, and coaches will track the data. Quarterly benchmark assessment data will be analyzed at individual, class, and school-wide levels as well.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brittany Fangmeier (fangmb@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Monthly Data Chats, Weekly iReady Lesson Tracking

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Monitoring and tracking data and early intervention will increase accountability for student achievement. Weekly and end-of-unit assessments, progress monitoring, and quarterly state assessments will provide the data needed to make instructional adjustments to ensure learning gains for all students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Goal: Decrease the number of disciplinary incidents by 20% within the next six months through consistent implementation of CHAMPS Strategies and interventions. The goal can be measured by tracking the number of disciplinary incidents before and after implementing CHAMPS, and comparing the difference.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Expected Schoolwide Learning Outcome Result(s) Addressed: A decrease in behavior referrals by 10%

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Weekly Admin Meetings

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Monitoring and tracking data and early intervention will increase accountability for student achievement

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We noticed an uptick in the number of referrals school wide so we decided to put a formal Positive Behavior Plan in place. We trained staff on CHAMPS and will monitor its success weekly.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).