

Polk County Public Schools

Gause Academy Of Leadership 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	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	24
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	26

Gause Academy Of Leadership

1395 POLK ST W, Bartow, FL 33830

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/gause>

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.

The mission of Gause Academy is to provide a nurturing environment where students can reach their full potential, with a major focus on graduation.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Gause Academy envisions meeting our mission by:

Fostering a small learning community.

Enabling students to build relationships among staff members, families and students.

Providing individualized daily support.

Creating academic plans tailored to student needs.

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
Costine, MaryJo	Principal	Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensures that the school-based team implements sound instructional practices, conducts evaluations of school staff, ensures implementation/documentation of a multitiered system of interventions and supports, ensures adequate professional development opportunities exist and that these opportunities represent research-based, educational best practices that serve to enhance both the depth and breadth of the school's abilities both academic and beyond. The principal ensures that appropriate and diverse methods of communication are in place to inform parents and other community stakeholders of school-based plans and activities.
Shweil, Mahammad	Assistant Principal	Assist and facilitate the common vision for the use of databased decision making, ensure that the school-based team is implementing research-based, effective instructional strategies, conduct both informal and formal assessments of school staff, ensure implementation/documentation of a multi-tiered system of interventions and supports, ensure that adequate professional development opportunities exist and these opportunities represent research-based, educational practices that serve to enhance both the depth and breadth of the campus' instructional capacity, and communicate with parents regarding school-based plans and activities.
Armstrong, Audrey	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach is instrumental in knowing the instructional practices and capacity of the teachers and providing input regarding professional development themes/design that would be beneficial for all staff. She will lead campus induction for new teachers and ensure they are monitored, encouraged, and provided necessary supports. She will collaborate with teachers in an effort to ensure seamless instruction and to maximize literacy-based efforts.
Hughes, Devondalyn	Teacher, K-12	Instructional facilitator responsible for providing classroom input and representing the role of a classroom teacher.
Carrier, Cindy	Instructional Technology	Ensure the quality and quantity is adequate to meet 1:1 protocols and support instructional technology needs. Keeps track of student and teacher devices, updates, and repairs as needed.

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.

We utilize a S.A.C. committee to fulfill these requirements. Our committee will meet according to our bylaws.

During this time we will review the SIP and make the necessary corrections based on students' needs and the committee's recommendations.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The leadership team will utilize our meetings to monitor and track the SIP using data acquired throughout the year. During our meetings data will be made available and summarized by the department heads for the team. We will then make corrections to our SIP based on this data.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK, 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	76%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	Yes
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)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP)* White Students (WHT)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: MAINTAINING 2018-19: COMMENDABLE 2017-18: MAINTAINING 2016-17: MAINTAINING
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	0	4	9	12	25	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	6	19	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	6	19	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	7	23	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4	17	
	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	0	4	12	10	26

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

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	9	14	32	55	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	22	39	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	13	

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	6	16	29	51

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	8

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*	9	48	53	20	51	55	14		
ELA Learning Gains				35			32		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				30					
Math Achievement*	7	49	55	5	37	42	6		
Math Learning Gains				47			18		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*	7	47	52	15	48	54	8		
Social Studies Achievement*	41	68	68	22	53	59	29		
Middle School Acceleration		61	70		43	51			
Graduation Rate	44	54	74	37	46	50	49		
College and Career Acceleration	13	39	53	7	71	70	29		
ELP Progress		50	55		55	70			

* 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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	20
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	121
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	77
Graduation Rate	44

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	24

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	218
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	78
Graduation Rate	37

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	3	Yes	4	4
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	0	Yes	4	4
HSP	16	Yes	4	2
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	31	Yes	4	1
FRL	17	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	14	Yes	3	3
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	20	Yes	3	3
HSP	28	Yes	3	1

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	40	Yes	3	
FRL	27	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	9			7			7	41		44	13	
SWD	0			6							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	0			0							2	
HSP	7			12							3	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	29			14							3	
FRL	8			7			0	36		10	6	

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	20	35	30	5	47		15	22		37	7	
SWD	7	8		0	40							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK	13	22		0	44		13			27		
HSP	19	44		0	38			27		38		
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	50			31						38		
FRL	19	37	30	8	47		19	30		28		

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	14	32		6	18		8	29		49	29	
SWD	0	31		0	25							
ELL										64		
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	14	33		4	23			31		44		
HSP	0	20		8						71	25	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	31			8			18			21		
FRL	15	31		6	19		8	24		50	43	

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	0%	40%	-40%	50%	-50%
07	2023 - Spring	0%	36%	-36%	47%	-47%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	*	39%	*	47%	*
09	2023 - Spring	19%	39%	-20%	48%	-29%
06	2023 - Spring	*	35%	*	47%	*

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	*	38%	*	54%	*
07	2023 - Spring	13%	35%	-22%	48%	-35%
08	2023 - Spring	12%	42%	-30%	55%	-43%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	*	33%	*	44%	*

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	0%	37%	-37%	50%	-50%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	0%	37%	-37%	48%	-48%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	0%	50%	-50%	63%	-63%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	46%	65%	-19%	66%	-20%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	49%	*	63%	*

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.

Based on our review of PM test 3

We found that our 6th grade students in reading and math score the lowest in proficiency. Although these students are in a specialized program utilizing Edgnuity coursework.

Our 7th grade students scored 100% below proficiency in reading and 86% below proficiency in math

Contributing factors include a lack of foundational skills in early grades due to being one or more years behind their peers. Core instruction needs to be improved across all content areas with frequent formative assessments to monitor mastery of standards. In addition, students need to be scheduled according to individualized plans to get on track for graduation.

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

Algebra and Geometry were both below proficiency with no growth between PM1 and PM3. Students did not have the foundational skills to meet the standards.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The greatest gap between PM 1 and PM3 was in math. ELA had 6% growth comparatively.

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

Our civics students scored our highest proficiency levels at 46%

Our 9th grade students had the greatest reading proficiency at 20%

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

Attendance , and course failure in Reading and Math in middle school grades

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

Attendance

Course requirements/acceleration

Standards based instruction

Strategic implementation of formative assessments

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 Early Warning System**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.

Positive culture and environment was selected based on identifying attendance as an area of concern. Students continue to struggle following their plan to catch up academically due to non-attendance or inconsistent attendance. Students must want to attend school in order to achieve academically and score proficiently on assessments.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Current data shows that 74% of our students have an absentee rate of 10% or higher. We will decrease this number to 70% of our students by the end of the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

A bi-weekly report will be ran by our attendance secretary/AP and students will be identified for intervention.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mahammad Shweil (mahammad.shweil@polk-fl.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.)

Students identified through the monitoring process will be tracked and given the opportunity to improve using an incentive program based on rate of increased attendance. Each Friday, all students are identified who have been in attendance for the week. Students are provided an incentive during lunch and one student is selected per month for an additional accolade.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To reach our full potential of the student experience we need students to attend school more consistently.

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 3 - Promising 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. Report will be ran on EWS to help identify students with attendance issues.
2. The attendance manager will identify and track students weekly and report back to Admin.
3. Admin will implement incentive program during our lunches.

Person Responsible: Mahammad Shweil (mahammad.shweil@polk-fl.net)

By When: Reports are run weekly.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**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.

Student proficiency in ELA was less than 24% in all grade levels according to Star Assessments, while learning gains were 39%. Proficiency remained stagnant as learning gains dropped 15%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Progress monitoring will show a minimum of 1% proficiency increase for ELA as well as 5% of the students below the proficiency line increasing to proficient.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring data offered by district level assessment platforms will be used to ensure students are mastering Benchmarks being taught after planning is properly implemented.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

MaryJo Costine (maryjo.costine@polk-fl.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.)

1. Monitor students engaged in equivalent experiences aligned to state expectations using SWT.
2. Engage teachers in standards-based planning protocol using the Learning Arc Framework

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

TNTP's The Opportunity Myth speaks to the relationship between academic success and ensuring students are able to engage in grade level standards-based expectations. It is imperative we both monitor for aligned and plan for teacher's understanding of the Benchmarks and aligned tasks and assessments.

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 3 - Promising 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.

Strategy 1 - Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring

Action Step 1 - Create a calendar for leadership team calibration walks.

Strategy 1 - Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring

Action Step 2 - Train Leadership Team on walkthrough tool in first two calibrated walks.

Person Responsible: Mahammad Shweil (mahammad.shweil@polk-fl.net)

By When: June 2023

Strategy 2 - Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 1 - Create master schedule that includes intentional collaborative planning.

Strategy 2 - Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 2 - Provide coaching and support to teachers

Strategy 2 - Assign Instructional Coach to support benchmark-aligned instruction

Action Step 2 - Assign and train facilitators

Strategy 2 - Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 3 - Add planning results findings to leadership team meeting agenda

Strategy 2 - Planning with Arc Framework

Action step 4 - Conduct planning protocol on a "weekly" basis

Strategy 2 - Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 5 - Review planning findings during leadership team meetings on a routine basis

Strategy 2 - Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 6 - Conduct correlation analysis between SWT findings and Benchmarks planned for using ARC

Strategy - Ensure students have ability to access materials

Action Step 7 - Purchase technology peripheral devices to aid in student achievement

Person Responsible: MaryJo Costine (maryjo.costine@polk-fl.net)

By When: September , 2023

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement**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.

Students need to be provided opportunities for productive struggles to master tasks related to content standards. Following the previous instructional review and classroom walkthrough observation, it was noted students were given information more often than allowing students wait-time needed to derive answers.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Data will show an increase of students engaged in productive struggles in 2 out of 3 classroom observations.

Monitoring:

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

Classroom walkthroughs will monitor student responses and note students given the opportunity to engage in inquiry, problem-solving, and perseverance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Gradual Release training will be provided to demonstrate instructional strategy.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The theory is if a student works through the steps on his or her own, that student has a higher likelihood of retaining the information than if he or she were simply given steps to follow.

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. Professional development will be provided in Gradual Release with Productive Struggle
2. Teachers will engage in implementing the gradual release strategy to the students during lessons.
3. Perform SB Walk throughs to monitor progress towards goal.

Person Responsible: MaryJo Costine (maryjo.costine@polk-fl.net)

By When: Data analyzed quarterly.

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)).

- Title I/UniSIG Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA)
- Data Com
- Summer Leadership Academy/Retreat
- School Improvement Plan Meetings/Trainings
- PURE Process
- Regional and Office of School Transformation review SIP plans

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

N/A

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Monitoring**Monitoring**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

N/A

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs**Description:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/a

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step**Person Responsible for Monitoring**

N/A

Title I Requirements**Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

School webpage

Pen Notebook

Parent/Family/Community Input Meetings

Annual Parent Meeting

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The school will disseminate information and build positive relationships through various communication outlets listed. Student conferences are held by administration/guidance regarding course and program completion. Information is shared with parents to include individual progress along with specific barriers to achieve academic goals.

School Website

Building Capacity Events

Staff Capacity Building Professional Development

Conferencing

Family/School Relationships

Family/Community Input

Annual Meeting Preventing Barriers

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(ii))

Concentration on the quality of academic content is held through a review of Qualtrics and instructional walkthrough data. Teachers are tiered for necessary supports and provided professional development by administration and school/district instructional coaching. Standards based planning is held to ensure the appropriate tasks are presented and equivalent experiences are afforded to all students.

Supplemental Staff : Instructional Coach

Supplemental Resources

Extended Learning

Professional Development

Collaborative Planning

Learning Arc

Equivalent Experiences

RTD

MOU Planning

MTSS Supports

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Information and data obtained from the following is used to determine the supports for programs and teachers within the school to achieve progress and increase student achievement.

Data Com

School Improvement Planning

Regional (area) meetings

Summer Leadership Academy

Title I Technical Assistance - Use of Funds, PFE Input, Back to School Meeting

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Technical Assistance

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

The school provides counseling to students through itinerant behavioral supports from mental health services. <https://polkschoolsfl.com/mentalhealth/>

Individual counseling

School consultations

Collaboration with community providers - Peace River Center, Watson Clinic Behavioral Health, Sweet Center, Winter Haven Hospital

Support Groups

Greif Support

Children's Home Society

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Opportunities are available to students who qualify for Dual Enrollment through PVS. Students are scheduled into career academies as appropriate in their schedules. Vocational School is offered to students who are interested in career options. Students take part in transition events and are exposed to postsecondary opportunities through Building Capacity Events.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

A structured PBIS program is in place that is tracked weekly. Daily intervention is provided dependent on student support needs. The school also tracks and supports students following RTI and MTSS data. Mental Health Counselors and School Counselors are available to provide needed interventions.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Professional Learning Communities are in place to improve instruction according to data provided from data reviews, instructional reviews, data com, and response to data. Mentoring and instructional supports are provided to support and retain teachers.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Early Childhood - <https://polkschoolsfl.com/earlychildhood/>

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: Early Warning System				\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction				\$45,836.15
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	6400	130	1491 - Gause Academy Of Leadership	UniSIG	0.5	\$30,717.74
			Notes: Other Certified Instructional Personnel - School based/ Instructional Coach who co-teaches, coaches, and assists with the instruction of students in classrooms			
	6400	210	1491 - Gause Academy Of Leadership	UniSIG		\$4,454.20
			Notes: Retirement - 13.57% -Coaches - School based /School paid			

	6400	220	1491 - Gause Academy Of Leadership	UniSIG		\$2,511.03
			Notes: Social Security -7.65% -Instructional Coach			
	6400	231	1491 - Gause Academy Of Leadership	UniSIG		\$5,844.84
			Notes: Health and Hospitalization - School based Coaches - Instructional Coach			
	6400	232	1491 - Gause Academy Of Leadership	UniSIG		\$11.45
			Notes: Life Insurance - Coaches - School based /School paid- Instructional Coach			
	6400	240	1491 - Gause Academy Of Leadership	UniSIG		\$183.81
			Notes: Workers Compensation .56% - School based Coaches - Instructional Coach			
	5100	519	1491 - Gause Academy Of Leadership	UniSIG		\$528.28
			Notes: Technology-Related Supplies (Vendor- Smileys; Unit Cost- \$9.95; Quantity- 53 headsets for students)			
	6400	160	1491 - Gause Academy Of Leadership	UniSIG	0.03	\$1,584.80
			Notes: Cost sharing- Senior Coordinator of Instruction - individual will support multiple schools focusing on student learning by providing support and assistance to teachers and school-based administration. Provides extensive support and coaching services related to content-area instruction.			
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement				\$0.00
					Total:	\$45,836.15

Budget Approval

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

No