

Seminole County Public Schools

Galileo School For Gifted Learning Skyway School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	20

Galileo School For Gifted Learning Skyway

3755 SKYWAY DR, Sanford, FL 32773

www.galileogifted.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.

Galileo School for Gifted Learning provides innovative, research-based education in a nurturing environment for gifted and talented students and those who want to learn in a gifted learning environment that will challenge and motivate them to pursue their passionate interests in service to others.

The goal of Galileo School for Gifted Learning is to engage our students through an integrated curriculum using science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) content while simultaneously providing them with the guidance to see its applications and purpose through history, literature, and the arts; thereby producing our country's next generation of independent thinkers.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Galileo's core values follow these three beliefs:

1. Kindness rules our hearts.
2. Intellectual honesty and curiosity rules our minds.
3. Perseverance and respect for others guides our behavior.

Our Guiding Principles follows:

Love Principle: Nurture

Empathy Principle: Service

Goldilocks Principle: Challenge

No Child Left Bored Principle: Passionate Interests

Power Principle: Motivation

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
Nunez, Michelle	Principal	Oversee and manage school budget, oversee student, faculty, and parent policies & procedures, HR oversee and conflict management resolution, oversee testing data analysis, , communicate with the faculty/staff and families of Galileo, SAC administrator, SCPS & Galileo Board liaison, primary responsibility over new hiring, employee retention, and termination of contracts, monitor new curriculum & programs, VAM scores, future planning, Board Committee School Rep, DOE Contact, Legal contact, Fundraising Oversight.
Joyner-Cunningham, Leslie	Assistant Principal	Marzano Support for New Teachers, Instructional Evaluations, DPP plans, Oversee CARE/discipline processes in coordination with Alexander, Carline Dropoff and Pickup, Oversee ESE, 504, and MTSS, Administrative contact for multicultural committee, Administrative member of Conscious Discipline and PBIS Team. Administrative Contact for PEAKS, Lunch Administrator - Middle, Attend all middle school PLCs, Ukeru Team Member. ESE Schedule, Supervision Schedule, Lunch Duty Schedule, Threat Assessment Team Commander, Middle School Expo Coordinator. Master schedule- Middle, Administrative Contact - School Safety (Drills, Emergency Planning, Raptor)
Patterson, Samantha	Assistant Principal	Principal's Designee, Marzano Support for New Teachers, Administrative Member of Conscious Discipline Team and PBIS Team, Instructional Evaluations, Facilities Manager, ESOL Compliance Oversight, Custodial Manager, hiring support, lunch supervision - elementary, Carline Dropoff and Pickup, Testing Administrator, Administrator over all Professional Development Activities, DPP Plans, Curriculum Monitoring, Master Schedule Elementary, Facility Rental Coordinator, Threat Assessment team member, Administrative Oversight CSP Inventory, Summer School Coordinator, Curriculum Ordering with Coaches., Instructional Assistant Scheduling, Substitute Training and onboarding, Daily Announcement Lead

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 process of involving stakeholders involves identifying the priority areas of improvement, formulating strategies, and tracking implementation progress. Galileo's school leadership team and teachers utilize a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) to support the academic and behavioral achievement of the students. The stakeholders make decisions by establishing clear and open lines of communication. Information about the school's improvement plan's purpose, goals, and benefits are shared with stakeholders. Stakeholder's needs, concerns and suggestions for improvement are gathered through surveys and 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 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, by engaging in an on-going data disaggregation process with stakeholders and correlating the achievements or lack of to the action steps outlined on the SIP. This will be done through grade level meetings, data chats, faculty meetings, and SAC meetings. To ensure continuous improvement, the plan will be analyzed in areas of concern to develop new steps that will be purposeful.

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)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	52%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	33%
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) 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: B
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	13	9	10	6	14	12	9	10	18	101
One or more suspensions	2	4	14	8	11	11	14	15	22	101
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	1	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	10	3	5	1	19
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	16	9	13	14	19	83
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	15	22	13	14	7	6	77
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	4	7	8	8	11	1	39

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	0	0	1	5	12	9	8	8	10	53

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	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	63	61	53	69	65	56	68		
ELA Learning Gains				57			54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51			37		
Math Achievement*	64	64	59	61	46	50	59		
Math Learning Gains				63			29		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42			11		
Science Achievement*	61	65	54	54	65	59	47		
Social Studies Achievement*	84			81	62	64			
Middle School Acceleration	78				45	52			
Graduation Rate					62	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	65	77	59	18			50		

* 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	479
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55

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	496
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
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	37	Yes	2	
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN	84			
BLK	49			
HSP	58			
MUL	72			
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	55			

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	40	Yes	1	
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN	73			
BLK	48			
HSP	46			

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	70			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	46			

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	63			64			61	84	78			65
SWD	29			37			40	40			5	
ELL	48			48							3	65
AMI												
ASN	88			79			75				4	
BLK	52			50			46				3	
HSP	53			58			53	82	76		7	50
MUL	74			70							2	
PAC												
WHT	65			65			66	86	79		6	
FRL	49			52			54	73	65		7	40

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	69	57	51	61	63	42	54	81				18
SWD	34	45	44	31	48	36	23	55				
ELL	57	52	36	48	57	40						18
AMI												
ASN	78	65		72	77		73					

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	45		40	52							
HSP	65	46	33	53	52	32	38	77				17
MUL	80	67		62	69							
PAC												
WHT	70	62	56	66	68	48	62	83				
FRL	56	54	43	49	54	34	39	76				10

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	68	54	37	59	29	11	47					50
SWD	31	29	25	29	12		15					
ELL	43	46		43	31							50
AMI												
ASN	73			65								
BLK	64			48								
HSP	68	56		55	19	8	39					
MUL	58			42								
PAC												
WHT	68	51	42	63	36	10	53					
FRL	60	51	44	54	27	7	35					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
05	2023 - Spring	62%	61%	1%	54%	8%
07	2023 - Spring	65%	53%	12%	47%	18%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	59%	50%	9%	47%	12%
04	2023 - Spring	59%	66%	-7%	58%	1%
06	2023 - Spring	60%	52%	8%	47%	13%
03	2023 - Spring	63%	60%	3%	50%	13%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	57%	66%	-9%	54%	3%
07	2023 - Spring	76%	67%	9%	48%	28%
03	2023 - Spring	70%	66%	4%	59%	11%
04	2023 - Spring	43%	68%	-25%	61%	-18%
08	2023 - Spring	59%	31%	28%	55%	4%
05	2023 - Spring	66%	44%	22%	55%	11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	66%	55%	11%	44%	22%
05	2023 - Spring	53%	64%	-11%	51%	2%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	90%	54%	36%	50%	40%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	53%	*	48%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	84%	71%	13%	66%	18%

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 lowest performing data component was SWD math achievement. The COVID-19 pandemic significantly impacted Galileo SWD population because students who or whose family members were directly impacted were absent. This absenteeism means they did not receive the individualized support to succeed academically.

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

Third Grade Math showed the greatest decline. In 20-21 student proficiency was at 73%. In 21-22, student proficiency was at 51%. That is a decline of 22%. After the COVID-19 pandemic, students returning to the classrooms were getting re-engaged in the academic process. The shift to remote learning in the 2019 school year disrupted traditional classroom instruction and created several challenges for our 3rd grade students which made it difficult for some students to progress effectively.

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.

Galileo's Geometry students averaged 39 points above the state and Galileo's Algebra students averaged 21 points above the state. 4th grade math students had an average scale score of 14 points below the district and 8 points below the state. 4th grade ELA students scored an average scale score of 5 points below the district.

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

Learning gains in math of the lowest 25% showed the most improvement. 100% of 3rd grade and 6th grade SWD made scale score gains on the FAST math exam from PM1 to PM3. Instructional coaches, and ESE teachers meet with grade level teams in data meetings to identify student performance measured by iReady and STAR assessments to monitor progress toward grade level achievement.

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

The first area of concern is the 4th grade math achievement as the school had a 15% decline in student proficiency. A second area of concern is the achievement of subgroup data of our SWD students compared to our Gen Ed students.

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

1. Targeted reading and math interventions tailored to specific needs of students.
2. Fluid PLC meetings to plan standards based instruction, data meetings to plan differentiated instruction, as well as for small group instruction to meet the needs of all learners.
3. Ongoing data monitoring to analyze data trends as a department, as well as trends of student subgroups, in order to use data to make instructional decisions and MTSS interventions.

4. Provide ongoing professional development of research-based reading strategies as well as student engagement strategies for face-to-face and digital settings.

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.

Galileo student survey showed that 11.3% of students believed the work was too hard.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Galileo will see a 5% increase in student's belief that the work is too hard.

Monitoring:

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

Using the MTSS process to monitor appropriate intervention and strategies, Galileo will decrease the percent of students that believe the work is too hard.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Leslie Joyner-Cunningham (leslie.joyner-cunningham@galileogiftedschool.org)

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.)

Leadership, instructional coaches, and teachers will structure, implement, and monitor a Multi-Tiered System of Supports to help struggling students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The student survey showed 11.3% of students felt that the work at Galileo was too hard. By implementing Galileo can provide appropriate student interventions to help support these 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.

1. Use the student survey to identify the students who feel the work is too hard.
2. Determine if the difficulty is due to a knowledge gap, lack of understanding, or other factors.
3. Provide additional instructional support specific to the student.

Person Responsible: Leslie Joyner-Cunningham (leslie.joyner-cunningham@galileogiftedschool.org)

By When: End of 2023-23 school year.

#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.

According to Galileo School for Gifted Learning Annual Student Survey, 9.45% of the student respondents said that the work that they do at school is too hard.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Teachers will discuss student outcomes and progress with students throughout the year as part of their small group work. Teachers will build connections and trust with the students to ensure an open line of communication regarding academic struggles and needs by utilizing morning meetings and small group chats. In March, 2024, students will be surveyed again regarding their perception of the rigor of their work. Galileo will reduce the number of students who feel that the work that they do at school is too hard by 5%.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor this area of focus by observing classroom interactions with teachers and students, speaking with students about academic outcomes, and supports provided in the classrooms.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Nunez (michelle.nunez@galileogiftedschool.org)

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.)

The strategies that we will use to support this area of focus include: Conscious Discipline implementation and parental engagement activities. These include the work of the CARE Team, student chats and monitoring the implementation of Conscious Discipline.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Conscious Discipline is the school-wide program to build positive relationships and connections with students. Galileo encourages parental engagement and builds community where students and their families are an integral part of our community of learners. The rationale is that when families work together with the school, we work together to build connections and increase achievement.

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).

Annually, the Galileo Curriculum Committee evaluates student data outcomes and the impact that our curriculum resources are having on student achievement. The committee will make recommendations to allocate additional resources toward subgroups of students who are showing significant needs or not making annual learning gains. These resources could include additional curriculum, more intervention opportunities and/or additional staff support in the form of tiered instruction.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No