

The School District of Lee County

Gateway Charter School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Gateway Charter School

12770 GATEWAY BLVD, Fort Myers, FL 33913

www.gatewaycharterschool.org

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lee County School Board on 9/26/2023.

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.

Empowering Lifelong Learners and Leaders

Provide the school's vision statement.

All stakeholders will share the commitment to develop students, who are reflective, life-long learners prepared to contribute to society.

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
Jensen, Amber	Principal	<p>Serve as Educational Leader of the School</p> <p>Serve as a Chief Administrator of the School</p> <p>Supervise and Develops Staff; Cultivate leadership in others</p> <p>Communicate with Stakeholders</p> <p>Shape the vision of success for all students within the CSUSA framework</p> <p>Lead the team, including all stakeholders, on a journey to sustainable success through long-term planning with ongoing monitoring, support and measurable milestones.</p> <p>Create a climate conducive to student success</p> <p>Improve teacher practice through ongoing observations, coaching, feedback and support</p> <p>Manage people, data and processes with the goal of school improvement</p> <p>Professional Standards for Educational Leaders</p> <p>Develop, advocate, and enact a shared mission, vision, and core values of high-quality education and academic success and well-being of each student</p> <p>Act ethically and according to professional CSUSA norms</p> <p>Strive for equity of educational opportunity and culturally responsive practices</p> <p>Develop and support intellectually rigorous and coherent systems of curriculum, instruction, and assessment</p> <p>Cultivate an inclusive, caring, and supportive school community</p> <p>Develop the professional capacity and practice of school personnel</p> <p>Foster a professional community of teachers and other professional staff</p> <p>Engage families and the community in meaningful, reciprocal, and mutually beneficial ways</p> <p>Manage school operations and resources</p> <p>Act as agents of continuous improvement</p>
Colon, Jason	Dean	<p>ESSENTIAL DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES</p> <p>Professional Development</p> <p>Topic specific in-service training as needed within deadlines</p> <p>Coaching and mentoring instructional staff</p> <p>Modeling lessons and instructional planning</p> <p>Collaborates well in a supportive environment that foster relationships with leadership teams, colleagues, and other stakeholders</p> <p>Curriculum and Instruction</p> <p>Research and development of curriculum resources and trainings</p> <p>Has a comprehensive knowledge of the state standards, instructional best practices, courses offered within the state, and all state assessments</p> <p>Researches and identifies appropriate instructional resources, based on data, through the budget priorities process</p> <p>Data Analysis</p> <p>State assessment understanding; including purpose, calculation of scores, disaggregation and aggregation of data, instructional preparation, etc.</p> <p>CSUSA assessment understanding; including purpose, scores and reports, disaggregation and aggregation of data, informed instructional decision making, etc.</p> <p>Provides training on appropriate student/teacher/grade-level data analysis and how to drive instructional plans</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Actively participates in the strategic planning process to support the school with developing academic plans		

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.

Utilized surveys from staff, parents, and students from Fall and Spring to develop goals to improve areas that were low in rating. Met together with leadership team to discuss and improve on the goals during summer.

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))

We will continue to monitor the SIP during IPAAS which is when we come together to go over school data and surveys to adjust our actions plans to ensure achievement of the goals set in place.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Closed:
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	76%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	57%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
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)
<p align="center">School Grades History</p> <p>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.</p>	2021-22: C
	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	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	3	4	25
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	9	17	10	10	46
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	4	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	32	63	80	79	254
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	31	78	72	61	242
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

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	0	0	0	16	50	52	42	160

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	0	0	0	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	1	13

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*	34	47	50	43	49	51	42		
ELA Learning Gains				47			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			42		
Math Achievement*	29	34	38	31	33	38	24		
Math Learning Gains				41			21		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49			18		
Science Achievement*	56	54	64	53	35	40	23		
Social Studies Achievement*	50	58	66	59	40	48	60		
Middle School Acceleration					38	44			
Graduation Rate	87	84	89	95	49	61	93		
College and Career Acceleration	53	65	65	48	60	67	42		
ELP Progress	45	36	45	59			60		

** 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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	354
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	87

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	569
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	95

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	14	Yes	4	4
ELL	34	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	48			
HSP	48			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	62			

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%
FRL	44			

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	29	Yes	3	3
ELL	38	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	51			
HSP	49			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	48			

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	34			29			56	50		87	53	45
SWD	5			10			27				3	
ELL	13			24			36	15		40	7	45
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30			21			65	42		47	6	
HSP	28			28			51	46		56	7	42
MUL												

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
PAC												
WHT	53			36			67	65		59	6	
FRL	28			22			44	40		49	7	38

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	43	47	44	31	41	49	53	59		95	48	59
SWD	11	53		21	29							
ELL	14	18	20	19	38	45	27	59		79	40	59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37	56	69	32	43	47	50	50		96	27	
HSP	40	44	35	27	41	50	50	57		91	49	60
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	57	47		42	42		62	70		98	60	
FRL	38	45	45	27	37	48	45	55		94	45	46

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	42	45	42	24	21	18	23	60		93	42	60
SWD												
ELL	29	58	80	12	33	42	29	45		90	72	60
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	49	50	11	18	18	16	53		100	14	64
HSP	38	39	38	19	20	19	20	59		90	53	59
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	52	46		43	25		32	75		93	47	
FRL	36	34	41	14	15	19	21	52		90	40	54

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	47%	45%	2%	50%	-3%
09	2023 - Spring	44%	46%	-2%	48%	-4%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	19%	39%	-20%	50%	-31%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	38%	43%	-5%	48%	-10%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	51%	50%	1%	63%	-12%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	47%	54%	-7%	63%	-16%

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.

High school algebra was the lowest data component at 20% proficient. The contributing factor was that we had prior knowledge skill gaps among the students. Additional intervention was needed for these students to be successful.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the year prior was US history from 59% to 48%. Due to the month of instructional time that was lost from Hurricane Ian teachers weren't able to complete all units before testing as well as having a first year content teacher in the classroom.

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.

High school algebra was the greatest gap compared to the state average. Our high school average was 479 and the state was 494. Students need additional interventions and teachers need PDs on engagement strategies for teaching high school algebra.

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

Middle school geometry showed the most improvement from 71% to 84% proficient. Through professional development the teacher improved their knowledge of standards based instruction as well as used a standards tracker for each student.

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

Students who achieved level 1 in ELA in 7th grade
Students who achieved level 1 in ELA in 8th grade

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

1. Math
2. US History
3. ELA overall proficiency

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning

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.

Enhance instructional strategies to improve teacher effectiveness. Based on survey data from students and observations, students are being respectfully unengaged during class.

Measurable Outcome:

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

core subject FAST data increase

Monitoring:

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

observations, surveys, NWEA results, FAST PM 1 and 2 results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jason Colon (jasonco@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.)

Increase tutoring attendance, increase teacher led interventions, progress monitoring for student intervention identification.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students are showing prior knowledge gaps due to lack of consistent progress monitoring, covid, and hurricane Ian.

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.

Analyze survey data from students and classroom observations to pinpoint specific engagement issues.

Person Responsible: Amber Jensen (amberj@leeschools.net)

By When: 10/27/23

Establish clear, measurable goals aligned with educational objectives.

Person Responsible: Amber Jensen (amberj@leeschools.net)

By When: 10/27/23

Provide constructive feedback to teachers, fostering open dialogue for collaboration. Invest in professional development opportunities, focusing on pedagogical methods, classroom management, and engagement techniques.

Person Responsible: Amber Jensen (amberj@leeschools.net)

By When: 10/27/23

Evaluate and adapt the classroom environment to foster interactivity and provide resources that enhance engagement.

Person Responsible: Amber Jensen (amberj@leeschools.net)

By When: 10/27/23

Regular check-ins with teachers, involving parents and the community, ongoing assessment, data analysis, and celebrating successes contribute to a comprehensive strategy.

Person Responsible: Amber Jensen (amberj@leeschools.net)

By When: 10/27/23

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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.

We will refine and improve school wide systems for servicing our ESE and ESOL students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

FAST data and NWEA data

Monitoring:

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

Through ESE and general teacher support and tracking.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jason Colon (jasonco@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.)

Using small group instruction, instruction software, differentiated instruction within the general classroom

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These are research based strategies used to help increase academic 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.

Analyze student data and conduct a comprehensive needs assessment to identify areas for improvement.

Person Responsible: Amber Jensen (amberj@leeschools.net)

By When: 10/27/23

Collaborate with teachers, coordinators, parents, and support staff to gather insights and feedback.

Person Responsible: Amber Jensen (amberj@leeschools.net)

By When: 10/27/23

Provide targeted professional development to educators focusing on inclusive teaching strategies and culturally responsive practices.

Person Responsible: Amber Jensen (amberj@leeschools.net)

By When: 10/27/23

Allocate resources wisely to meet diverse student needs. Regularly review and update Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) and Language Support Plans.

Person Responsible: Amber Jensen (amberj@leeschools.net)

By When: 10/27/23

Establish robust monitoring systems and promote collaborative teaching models.

Person Responsible: Amber Jensen (amberj@leeschools.net)

By When: 10/27/23

Create a culture of continuous improvement by reviewing feedback and ensuring legal compliance.

Person Responsible: Amber Jensen (amberj@leeschools.net)

By When: 10/27/23

Appoint a coordinator or team responsible for oversight and reporting.

Person Responsible: Amber Jensen (amberj@leeschools.net)

By When: 10/27/23

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Improving stakeholder culture and sense of community.

Measurable Outcome:

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

increases in survey data for staff, students, and parents

Monitoring:

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

Will use staff, student and parent survey data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amber Jensen (amberj@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 are improving systems, communications, accountability, Providing all students with opportunities to participate in extracurricular activities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Improving these areas will help with achieving this goal.

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.

assess our current culture through surveys and feedback mechanisms, and then define a clear vision for the desired culture.

Person Responsible: Amber Jensen (amberj@leeschools.net)

By When: 10/27/23

Secure commitment from leadership and establish transparent communication channels.

Person Responsible: Amber Jensen (amberj@leeschools.net)

By When: 10/27/23

Encourage inclusivity, diversity, and shared values among stakeholders, and organize community-building activities that foster relationships.

Person Responsible: Amber Jensen (amberj@leeschools.net)

By When: 10/27/23

Promote collaboration and teamwork while recognizing and appreciating contributions.

Person Responsible: Amber Jensen (amberj@leeschools.net)

By When: 10/27/23

Implement feedback mechanisms and conflict resolution processes, and ensure accountability and transparency in decision-making.

Person Responsible: Amber Jensen (amberj@leeschools.net)

By When: 10/27/23

Celebrate traditions and milestones, and commit to the long-term process of cultural change.

Person Responsible: Amber Jensen (amberj@leeschools.net)

By When: 10/27/23

Regularly assess progress and be willing to adapt strategies based on feedback and evolving needs.

Person Responsible: Amber Jensen (amberj@leeschools.net)

By When: 10/27/23