Collier Charter Academy School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Collier Charter Academy

12101 IMMOKALEE RD, Naples, FL 34120

www.colliercharter.org

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Collier County School Board on 8/15/2023.

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.

Thriving through leadership and academic greatness.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Collier Charter Academy is committed to providing students in grades K-8 with critical thinking and lifelong learning skills needed to excel in the 21st century.

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
Thompson, Michelle	Principal	The role of the principal is to create the plan with the leadership team and stakeholders and be open with communication, input and feedback. The principal will have weekly meetings to monitor SIP implementation and action steps. Some responsibilities include the school budget for researched based resources, school compliance, state and district reporting, board meeting facilitation, providing professional development and supporting teachers, monitoring data and instructional practices, monitor strategic planning action steps and team lead support.

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.

During July stakeholders participated in strategic planning meetings where data was reviewed and goals were created. Initiatives were discussed based on school needs tied to data. Action plans were discussed and grade level and school wide goals were determined.

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))

The Leadership team will ensure the implementation of approved research based programs and curriculum by meeting weekly to consider student assessment data and classroom observation data.

They will discuss professional development needs and analyze instructional focus plans results and common monthly assessments. The team will provide support and guidance in the area of curriculum and instruction by reviewing lesson plans and standards mastery. Our Progress monitoring coach will have individual teacher data chats and observations will occur during instructional time with targeted small groups. They will also implement progress monitoring through personalized learning plans and involve research based reading strategies and skills. Data will be used from NWEA benchmarks, RRR, iReady, Lexia, and progress learning to determine student needs which will be monitored by the teacher, parent, and administration.

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	72%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	65%
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: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
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	4	20	17	17	4	4	8	6	6	86
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	1	0	4	6	3	17
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	2	18	28	35	2	2	4	11	12	114
Course failure in Math	1	8	24	32	8	1	4	14	11	103
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	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	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	4
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	6	9	12	3	0	2	9	6	48

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	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	
One or more suspensions	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	
Course failure in Math	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	
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	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	

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*	55	58	53	54	62	55	55		
ELA Learning Gains				56			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45			38		
Math Achievement*	52	63	55	48	45	42	43		
Math Learning Gains				57			44		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37			38		
Science Achievement*	63	55	52	57	59	54	60		
Social Studies Achievement*	97	76	68	78	56	59	65		
Middle School Acceleration	89	62	70	81	51	51	81		
Graduation Rate		56	74		54	50			
College and Career Acceleration		63	53		73	70			
ELP Progress	68	58	55	45	66	70	80		

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	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	478
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	558
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	36	Yes	2	
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	55			
HSP	67			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	64			

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	30	Yes	1	1
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	55			
HSP	56			

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%**
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	51			

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	55			52			63	97	89			68
SWD	41			31							2	
ELL	45			43							4	68
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	57			52							2	
HSP	55			53			63	95	84		7	64
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	56			47			64		100		5	
FRL	50			48			52	100	83		7	69

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	54	56	45	48	57	37	57	78	81			45
SWD	20	31	36	32	44	18						
ELL	35	56	44	25	48	36	40	55				45
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	55	60		58	47							
HSP	51	58	48	44	54	39	53	79	88			42
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	60	54	42	56	61	38	63	92				
FRL	51	53	42	43	51	29	52	73	81			37

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	55	51	38	43	44	38	60	65	81			80
SWD	30	30	30	27	38	36	65					
ELL	38	45	36	30	33	31	39	92				80
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	56	57		21	29							
HSP	56	50	48	43	42	30	55	77	88			81
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	53	47	26	49	51	47	66	40				
FRL	50	45	44	38	39	32	58	68	86			77

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	60%	60%	0%	54%	6%
07	2023 - Spring	69%	52%	17%	47%	22%

ELA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	59%	47%	12%	47%	12%
04	2023 - Spring	50%	65%	-15%	58%	-8%
06	2023 - Spring	45%	51%	-6%	47%	-2%
03	2023 - Spring	50%	56%	-6%	50%	0%

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	53%	70%	-17%	54%	-1%
07	2023 - Spring	59%	75%	-16%	48%	11%
03	2023 - Spring	56%	67%	-11%	59%	-3%
04	2023 - Spring	50%	74%	-24%	61%	-11%
08	2023 - Spring	8%	52%	-44%	55%	-47%
05	2023 - Spring	54%	70%	-16%	55%	-1%

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	69%	45%	24%	44%	25%
05	2023 - Spring	45%	62%	-17%	51%	-6%

ALGEBRA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	91%	59%	32%	50%	41%

BIOLOGY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	96%	69%	27%	63%	33%

CIVICS

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	97%	68%	29%	66%	31%

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 shows the challenges our Students with Disabilities have demonstrated particularly in ELA proficiencies and Math Lowest 25% learning gains categories. These same students are also categorized within our Lowest 25%. This trend is across grade levels and continues to be a focus of additional resources.

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

Our lowest performing declining data set is Math lowest 25% Learning for our Students with Disabilities. We attribute this to lack of consistency and appropriate rigor when planning for instruction. The addition of new standards and materials took time to learn and implement at their previous level of instruction. This caused ineffective and inconsistent instruction for struggling students.

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 gap for Students with Disabilities has declined and is 3.4% points below the State average. We attribute this to lack of filling the gaps in instruction that was previously missed and supports not being put in place prior to Quarter 1 progress monitoring.

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

Students with Disabilities subgroup data showed improvement in ELA lowest 25% learning gains with a 6% increase and improvement in Math learning gains with an improvement by 6% points. We implemented a progress monitoring coach to assist the teachers with data analysis and actions plans for identified students. ESE teachers offered after school tutoring to their students with an IEP. Social studies Civics EOC scores improved from 65% proficient to 78% proficient. The school modified the master schedule mid-year to change from a double blocked schedule to a traditional schedule so that the content would be delivered daily. We implemented standards based trackers for the teacher and students. We offered Civics bootcamp and after school and lunch bunch tutoring.

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

According to the EWS data, an area of concern is the 12 third grade students with two or more indicators. Third grade also had 35 course failure in ELA and 32 in Math.

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

Our highest priority will be to monitor data to drive instruction for Students with Disabilities and our lowest 25% of students. We will focus on standards based instruction with approved research based resources. We will have ongoing data chats with multiple data points to close achievement gaps.

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

#1. 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 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.

Based on State assessment data, Students with Disabilities performed below the 41% Federal Index Threshold with a level of 30%. This subgroup has been identified as an area of focus for the school in order to close the achievement gaps between students with and without disabilities in both proficiency and learning gains.

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

By the end of the school year the Students with Disabilities subgroup population will increase above the 41% Federal Index Threshold by 12% on the Every Students Succeed Act. This will indicate a 42% Federal Index Threshold for the 22-23 school year for Students With Disabilities. Each category will increase the percent by 10% points.

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

School Leadership team will monitor Professional Learning Communities (PLC) meetings and data chats with the ESE specialists and classroom teachers on the implementation of IEP services. Administrators and Curriculum Resource Teachers will use classroom walkthroughs to monitor that interventions are implemented as planned. Following unit assessments and benchmark assessments, PLCs will review student data and small group differentiated instructional plans. Administrators will monitor the implementation of the support facilitation schedules and progress towards IEP goals will also be used to measure for the desired outcomes. Teachers will be responsible for documenting implementation through lesson plans, keeping data current, and IEP meeting notes. Classroom walkthroughs and observations will be entered in the schools evaluation tool which is Robert Marzano aligned.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Thompson (thompsmi@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.)

During the school year, teachers will make content, skills, and concepts explicit by modeling thinking while solving problems, enacting strategies, and classifying concepts. Teachers will use researched based instructional strategies during instruction and will focus on appropriate use of scaffolding with students with different levels of depth of knowledge to ensure students understand content and complete tasks successfully. The instructional strategies will be monitored when the school support team conducts classroom walkthroughs and observations and entering the data in the Student Success Platform that used Robert Marzano indicators.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In order for students to achieve standards mastery, learners must be actively engaged in processing content through the teaching and learning process that involves interaction among the teacher, the students, and the content. High yield instructional strategies, such as non-linguistic representation, student goal setting, higher order thinking, summarizing and note taking and identifying similarities and differences will be implemented focusing on small group instruction.

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.

Deliver ongoing professional development that will focus on implementing accommodations in a general education classroom that address the academic and social needs of Students with Disabilities.

Person Responsible: Michelle Thompson (thompsmi@collierschools.com)

By When: During Returning Teacher Orientation teachers will have professional development on providing accommodations and documenting accommodations.

ESE teachers will be active participants in Professional Learning communities and data chats to review data, form intervention groups, share high yield instructional ideas and strategies for Students with Disabilities.

Person Responsible: Michelle Thompson (thompsmi@collierschools.com)

By When: ESE teachers will participate in meetings bi-weekly for the school year.

ESE classroom accommodation trackers will be implemented in all classrooms.

Person Responsible: Michelle Thompson (thompsmi@collierschools.com)

By When: ESE accommodation trackers will be collected monthly.

#2. 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.

In order to support a high achieving culture of excellence that meets the needs of all learners, Collier Charter Academy is a Leader in Me School. Students and staff work together to set and track academic, leadership, and personal goals. We focus to have all students set and monitor progress of goals to provide personalized learning for all students. Our students with disabilities subgroup will have ESE teachers included in setting and monitoring their goals along with the general education teacher and student.

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

By the end of the year stakeholder survey participation rates will increase by 5% for the Leader in Me MRA surveys.

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

The Lighthouse Chairperson will monitor participation rates, send out reminders and incentives to reach the participation goal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Thompson (thompsmi@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.)

We will use The Leader in Me, evidence based comprehensive model that builds leadership and life skills in students, creates a high-trust school culture, and lays the foundation for sustained academic achievement. We will connect these skills with cognitive strategies to support student success. In addition to classroom teaches implementing the Leader in Me curriculum we will offer a specials rotation for Leadership in elementary classes and offer Engaged Citizenship and Peer Counseling as middle school electives.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By implementing the Leader in Me and using those CASEL Core Competences as a common language we will be supporting a positive culture and connecting cognitive strategies to support student success.

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.

Professional Development and coaching yearly plan with Franklin Covey and the Leader in Me. This will include aligning academics with data notebooks and personalized learning plans.

Person Responsible: Michelle Thompson (thompsmi@collierschools.com)

By When: Professional Development calendar will be completed by August 30. Personalized Learning Plans will be created quarterly.

Monthly Lighthouse Team meetings to create and sustain student leadership teams.

Person Responsible: Michelle Thompson (thompsmi@collierschools.com)

By When: Meetings will occur monthly throughout the school year beginning in September and ending in May.

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).

We will complete a needs assessment to review resource allocations and prioritize resources for Students with Disabilities. We will look at per pupil expenditures, instructional time, early intervention, tiered resources, teacher quality, and specialized instructional support personnel. We will look at all funding resources including both general funds and funds dedicated to school improvement activities. This review will include a variety of stakeholders including parents, teachers, grants personnel, facilities personnel, curriculum specialists, and Administration.