# Island Park High School

**2023-24**

**Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)**

## Table of Contents

# Island Park High School

## 16520 S TAMIAMI TRAIL STE 190, Fort Myers, FL 33908

### http://www.islandparkhs.com/

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lee County School Board on 9/20/2023.

### 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:<br><br>1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;<br>2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;<br>3. Have a school grade of D or F; or<br>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 Island Park High School is to help at-risk students earn a standard diploma and prepare for post-secondary success.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Island Park High School understands that at-risk students have different needs, learn at different rates, and have diverse learning styles, which cause many of these at-risk students to drop out of school. We believe that everyone deserves a quality education that meets his or her individual needs and aligns to their personal goals and ambitions. All students can be successful in high school and in life regardless of their life circumstances.

## 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Nauss, Arthur | Principal | The principal provides educational leadership, contractual accountability, and day to day leadership of educational and operational activities throughout the school. |
| Shoopman, Joseph | Assistant Principal | The AP supports and supervises the instructional staff, course completions, school-wide testing, and rate of credit earning. |
| Caldwell Papp, Sunshine | Teacher, K-12 | English/Reading Teacher who instructs student 9-12 and provides test coaching. |
| Piccirillo, Francis | | Math Teacher who instructs student 9-12 and provides test coaching. |

**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.

At IPHS we have a School Advisory Council that meets regularly and includes a variety of stakeholders. At each meeting we provide the opportunity to hear about our SIP, provide input, and share current school data. We invite members of the community, parents, students, teachers, and school staff.

**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 is developed at the beginning of the school year with input from all stakeholders. It is also discussed at quarterly faculty meetings with staff. Based on student performance data as well as attendance data, we monitor our growth towards the achievement of our goals. The plan will be revised as needed to ensure 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) | High School 9-12 |
| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | Alternative Education |
| **2022-23 Title I School Status** | No |
| **2022-23 Minority Rate** | 72% |
| **2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** | 19% |
| **Charter School** | Yes |
| **RAISE School** | No |
| **ESSA Identification** *updated as of 3/11/2024 | CSI |
| **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)* Hispanic Students (HSP)* White Students (WHT)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)* |
| **School Grades History** *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | |
| **School Improvement Rating History** | 2021-22: MAINTAINING 2018-19: COMMENDABLE 2017-18: COMMENDABLE 2016-17: COMMENDABLE |
| **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* | 5 | 47 | 50 | 0 | 49 | 51 | | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | | | | | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | | | | | |
| Math Achievement* | 10 | 34 | 38 | 0 | 33 | 38 | | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | | | | | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | | | | | |
| Science Achievement* | 25 | 54 | 64 | | 35 | 40 | | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 31 | 58 | 66 | 23 | 40 | 48 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 38 | 44 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | 14 | 84 | 89 | 14 | 49 | 61 | 21 | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | 30 | 65 | 65 | 17 | 60 | 67 | 39 | | |
| ELP Progress | 26 | 36 | 45 | 25 | | | 8 | | |

*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](https://www.floridacims.org).

**ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)**

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | CSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 20 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | Yes |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 6 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 141 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| Percent Tested | 88 |
| Graduation Rate | 14 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | CSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 13 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | Yes |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 5 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 79 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 6 |
| Percent Tested | 95 |
| Graduation Rate | 14 |

**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 | 11 | Yes | 4 | 4 |
| ELL | 17 | Yes | 4 | 4 |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 10 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| HSP | 12 | Yes | 4 | 4 |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 31 | Yes | 4 | 4 |
| FRL | 10 | Yes | 4 | 4 |

| 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 | 16 | Yes | 3 | 3 |
| ELL | 20 | Yes | 3 | 3 |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | | | | |
| HSP | 13 | Yes | 3 | 3 |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 21 | Yes | 3 | 3 |
| FRL | 18 | Yes | 3 | 3 |

## 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 | 5 | | | 10 | | | 25 | 31 | | 14 | 30 | 26 |
| SWD | 10 | | | | | | | | | | 2 | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | 2 | 26 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | |
| HSP | 0 | | | 0 | | | | 22 | | | 5 | 26 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | 42 | | 31 | 3 | |
| FRL | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | |

| **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 | 0 | | | 0 | | | | 23 | | 14 | 17 | 25 |
| SWD | | | | | | | | | | 16 | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | 14 | | 25 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 0 | | | | | | | | | 13 | 14 | 25 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | 21 | | |
| FRL | | | | | | | | | | 13 | 23 | |

| **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 | | | | | | | | | | 21 | 39 | 8 |
| SWD | | | | | | | | | | 20 | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | 5 | | 8 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | | | | | | | | | | 9 | | 10 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | 39 | 33 | |
| FRL | | | | | | | | | | 17 | 31 | |

**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 | 12% | 45% | -33% | 50% | -38% |
| 09 | 2023 - Spring | 5% | 46% | -41% | 48% | -43% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 3% | 39% | -36% | 50% | -47% |

| GEOMETRY | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 4% | 43% | -39% | 48% | -44% |

| BIOLOGY | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 7% | 50% | -43% | 63% | -56% |

| HISTORY | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 29% | 54% | -25% | 63% | -34% |

## 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.**

Compared with our related ALS schools (20 of them), Island Park ranks last in average daily attendance at 55.5%. This average doesn't really tell the whole story because approximately half of our students attend at 80% or better, while the other half struggles to attend at 30%. Clearly, we have a "half-the-school" problem. Many of our students work part- or full-time, take public transportation, or care for younger siblings. As an alternative school, we enroll students for whom traditional public schools didn't work for various reasons, attendance among them. These are not excuses but lived realities. We think the biggest incentive that we offer for strong attendance is greater course completion and expedited

graduation. These rewards, we recognize, may be too long term for some students. Creating short term incentives we hope will move the needle on student attendance this year.

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

The ELA retake component showed the greatest decline from spring 2022 to spring 2023. Island Park dropped from an average of 319 to an average of 313. The number of test takers in 2022 may account for some of the differences in scores, where 145 students tested compared to 182 in 2023. We were more thorough in our 2023 re-testing, so this is one factor. The month from late September to late October was particularly challenging due to Hurricane Ian, which shut schools for the better part of four weeks.

**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.**

When considering 11th and 12th grade ELA retakes for the 2022-23 school year, it is obvious that Island Park has work to do. The state averaged 13.5% passing among 84,000 re-testers, which is significantly higher than Island Park's 3.5% pass rate for 182 students. While it would be easy to acknowledge our student population's difference from--and homogeneity compared to-- the state as a whole, that does not absolve us of responsibility for their success. Objectively, our challenges come from low interest in school and reading/academics. Our ELL population also struggles on these tests due to their lack of fluency and facility with unfamiliar texts. Although we use Reading Plus school-wide, we recognize that our ELL students need something else, so we are rolling out Wilson Reading in the coming months to help grow their capacity.

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

Algebra retakes showed modest improvement from 2022 to 2023. While student scaled score averages rose only from 455 to 459, the passing rate increased from 2% to 5%. The utilization of small groups and intentional test preparation allowed us to target students and modestly build skills. Saturday study sessions were built into the year with students being invited based on need.

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

In 2022-23, ALS-Education had 21 high schools in its organization. Based upon approximately 7-10 metrics, Island Park ended the school year ranked 11th overall. We are proud of this ranking, but, of course, we want to do better. It cannot be overlooked that Island Park finished where it did DESPITE being last in the organization in percentage of daily attendance, a major metric in determining overall school success. The entire school community--all stakeholders--must work collaboratively to get our students to come to school on a more consistent basis. We strongly feel that all other metrics upon which we are judged would rise precipitously with improved attendance such as rate of credit earning, graduates, and standardized test scores.

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

1..Improve attendance from 56% to 65%.
2. Increase number of graduates.
3. Increase Rate of Credit Earning
4. Improve pass rate on both (FAST, BEST, FSA) ELA and Algebra.

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

**#1. Graduation specifically relating to Graduation**

**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.

Attendance at Island Park High School has been less than optimal within a range of 55-59% over the past 5 years. The school has had approximately 56% daily attendance since 2021-22.

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

At Island Park, we are realistic, and optimistic, about improving the rate of daily attendance. Many of our students have outside obligations like work and taking care of children/siblings, transportation challenges, and in some cases a general apathy toward school. A fair, reasonable, and measurable outcome would be to cross the 60% daily attendance mark for the 2023-24 school year. IPHS will increase students daily attendance from 56% in FY23 to 60% in FY24.

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

1. Attendance is monitored daily by the teacher, Data Specialist, and Administration.
2. A phone call, email, and text message communication is made daily for each absent student.
3. Staff communicate with students about the importance of regular and productive school attendance.
4. Staff communicate with parents about the importance of their child attending school regularly in order to meet the expectations for graduation and schedule a meeting with administration if the child falls short of meeting the expectation.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Arthur Nauss (arthurnj@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.)

We will continue to be positive in our approach to attendance. Island Park will create a series of positive reinforcements to acknowledge good attendance and productivity.

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

Good attendance is going to look slightly different from student to student depending on their life situations. We want to see students here 100% of the time, but we are realistic in that this probably isn't reasonable for most students, though we have some who come very close. A positive approach to reinforcing good attendance will create more buy-in from students because nearly everyone likes to be acknowledged for successes while hardly anyone will long tolerate being chastised or ridiculed. Our students range in age from 15-21, but they are still "kids." Building an inviting culture that promotes and rewards personal responsibility will yield better results than punishment.

**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. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**

**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.

Building a positive culture is critical to the stability and retention of staff and students at IPHS. Because of the students that attend our school, we focus on having the staff build relationships with them. If we have staff turnover, it creates a challenge to begin the process all over again. The climate and culture of our school needs to remain positive to impact both teachers and students.

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

Island Park High School has 8 teaching staff and two administrators. At the end of FY23, 2 of the 8 teaching staff left us with vacancies to fill. Our goal for the FY24 school year is to retain at least 7 of the 8 teaching staff.

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

IPHS currently surveys students each year. In order to monitor the desired outcome to retain teachers, we will develop a survey to allow them to provide feedback about the climate, feeling supported, teamwork and celebrating achievements. The survey will be given in the fall and spring.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Arthur Nauss (arthurnj@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.)

Building an environment of trust and open communication leads to encouraging staff to provide input for growth and improvement. It provides an opportunity for all staff to participate in building a positive work environment and promote retention. Listening to staff and sharing the results of the surveys while using the input to adjust and make improvements will assist us in retaining happy teachers.

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

This strategy of improving communication and input via a survey will help build a positive culture and retain staff. This in turn, will support student retention because of the relationships between staff and 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*

**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).

Island Park's administration analyzes data during the summer and creates plans based on need. Our budget is created with a collaborative team, and there are monthly meetings with the finance team and grants department. The principal develops the areas of focus, based on data and surveys. After the area of focus is determined, the principal determines what interventions are needed. We purchase programs for interventions, as well as make instructional decisions, that are evidence-based and vetted through our educational platforms team and regional directors.