Gateway High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Gateway High School

13820 GRIFFIN DR, Fort Myers, FL 33913

http://ghs.leeschools.net/

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lee County School Board on 10/17/2023.

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.

To prepare scholars for college, career, and life by providing a high-quality, student-centered learning experience.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To develop world-class scholars prepared for success after high school.

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
Watson, Neketa	Principal	
Thompson, April	Assistant Principal	
Whitlow, Darla	Magnet Coordinator	

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.

School Leadership, including teachers, assists in the development of the SIP by creating instructional goals specific to their areas. Students groups like SGA and Key Club assist in supporting school leadership with feedback and ideas for improvement. Community Stakeholders including families, business owners, and community leaders are including on the SIP process through our SAC meetings.

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 SIP will be regularly monitored through multiple processes included:
PLCs
Classroom Walkthroughs
Quarterly Department Data Chats
Student Data Chats
Professional Development

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)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	77%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

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*	46	47	50	53	49	51	49		
ELA Learning Gains				54			55		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			47		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement*	30	34	38	33	33	38	40		
Math Learning Gains				42			38		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45			38		
Science Achievement*	66	54	64	64	35	40	85		
Social Studies Achievement*	63	58	66	63	40	48			
Middle School Acceleration					38	44			
Graduation Rate		84	89		49	61			
College and Career Acceleration		65	65		60	67			
ELP Progress	43	36	45	40			55		

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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	248
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	436

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98
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	21	Yes	2	2
ELL	33	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	65			
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	48			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	45			

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	25	Yes	1	1
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN	77			
BLK	43			
HSP	49			
MUL	47			
PAC				
WHT	53			

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%
FRL	44			

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	46			30			66	63				43
SWD	12			9			28	23			5	31
ELL	20			13			39	50			5	43
AMI												
ASN	60							69			2	
BLK	41			20			55	55			5	25
HSP	42			28			65	61			5	44
MUL	63			31			75	52			4	
PAC												
WHT	58			44			76	73			4	
FRL	41			24			59	61			5	41

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	53	54	42	33	42	45	64	63				40
SWD	13	29	24	6	33	46	33	9				29
ELL	27	46	43	16	43	52	49	61				40
AMI												
ASN	83						70					
BLK	45	56	40	21	37	44	50	50				43
HSP	51	54	42	33	42	45	64	71				41
MUL	49	39		30	50		65					
PAC												

| 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
WHT	64	54	44	44	45	42	74	55				
FRL	46	52	40	29	39	43	58	60				33

| 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	49	55	47	40	38	38	85					55
SWD	19	43	38	26	49	48						
ELL	33	48	38	29	36	43	77					55
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42	48	48	30	32	35	81					
HSP	50	55	46	37	37	35	85					57
MUL	58	45		45	40							
PAC												
WHT	53	61	50	54	43		84					
FRL	43	53	47	35	36	35	84					50

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
10	2023 - Spring	48%	45%	3%	50%	-2%
09	2023 - Spring	51%	46%	5%	48%	3%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	18%	39%	-21%	50%	-32%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	42%	43%	-1%	48%	-6%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	62%	50%	12%	63%	-1%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	60%	54%	6%	63%	-3%

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.

The Algebra 1 EOC scores were the lowest at 21% proficiency. Although that seems low, it was 2nd highest among the East Zone schools of Lee County and slightly above the mean proficiency for all high schools in Lee County. Much of this can be attributed to Lee County's math progression. Students who tested on or above level in grades 6 and 7 are placed in Algebra in middle school. Therefore, incoming 9th-grade scholars who take Algebra are predominantly levels 1 and 2.

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

The 9th grade ELA reading scores had the most significant decline from 2022 to 2023, with a decrease of 6%. This was most likely due to not having a teacher in the reading classroom for most of the year. That would have impacted the lowest reading students. Teacher turnover and changes in platforms could have also contributed to the decline.

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.

Math scores showed the most significant gap when compared with the state average. Algebra was 11% below, and Geometry at 7% below compared to other 9-12 scores across the state. Scholars in these courses were the students who missed significant instructional time and fundamental concepts needed to master Algebra and Geometry due to COVID. In the fall of 2022, these students missed three weeks of instructional time in 2022 due to Hurricane Ian.

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

The group showing the most significant improvement was Geometry, which increased by 7% over the 2022 school year. This group had low teacher turnover and several highly effective teachers in the department. Some of the changes could also be due to a new testing platform and using calculators on the entire exam rather than only a portion.

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

No data here....

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

1) Increase math proficiency in both Algebra and Geometry.
2) Increase reading proficiency school wide
2) Increase student daily attendance
3) Improve teacher retention

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

#1. 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.

Gateway High School places a priority on building a positive school culture. As a newly established school, having a positive school culture and environment directly affects all aspects of teaching and learning. At the start of the school year, and then quarterly, norms and expectations are clearly set for students, faculty, parents, and staff. Educators and administrators strive for consistency in following and modeling set expectations. Achievements of all stakeholders are celebrated regularly, and outstanding performances are rewarded. Teachers are responsible for establishing a positive classroom environment by building relationships with students, using classroom management techniques that promote student achievement and create an engaging classroom. The administration and school leaders will continue and improve on model systems that manifest a positive and productive culture. One area of focus will be with our PBIS project. Gateway High School will build on positive behavior supports by working towards Tier 1 status. SWD will be positively affected with the increased use and frequency of PBIS by giving them more opportunities to be included and engaged in campus incentives.

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

GHS will achieve Tier 1 status within Florida's PBIS program by increasing evidence-based interventions as determined by the Tiered Fidelity Inventory.

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

The PBIS program requires the completion of the Tiered Fidelity Inventory at the beginning of the year and egain at the end of the year to determine if their has been improvement in the school's PBIS initiatives.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Neketa Watson (neketagc@leeschools.net)

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.)

PBIS will include:

Student Celebrations
Weekly Tangible Rewards
Student of the Month

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

As a newer school, GHS has only started to implement positive behavior supports schoolwide. The implementation has not been consistent. With the adoption of the state's Florida PBIS program, we will begin to follow the evidence-based steps to properly implement PBIS this year.

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

#2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

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.

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

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

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.)

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

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).

Funded Reading Coach and College & Career Coach as directed by the district.