

Brevard Public Schools

# Gardendale Separate Day School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>                                   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>I. School Information</b>                                       | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>                            | <b>10</b> |
| <b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>                               | <b>15</b> |
| <b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>                       | <b>22</b> |
| <b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>                                    | <b>22</b> |
| <b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>                       | <b>23</b> |

## Gardendale Separate Day School

301 GROVE BLVD, Merritt Island, FL 32953

[www.brevardschools.org](http://www.brevardschools.org)

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

#### Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

#### Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

#### Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections   | Title I Schoolwide Program                                      | Charter Schools        |
|--|---|------------------------|
| I-A: School Mission/Vision   |   | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)   |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)   |                        |
| I-E: Early Warning System  | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)                                    | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)   |
| II-A-C: Data Review  |   | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)   |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring  | ESSA 1114(b)(3)   |                        |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection                                    | ESSA 1114(b)(6)   | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)   |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus  | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)                                       |                        |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities   |   | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements   | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5),<br>(7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B)<br>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 Gardendale Separate Day School is to promote commendable conduct which leads to academic and personal success.

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

Gardendale Separate Day School [GSDS] inspires accountability without excuses. We strive to provide an atmosphere of love, respect and acceptance, along with maintaining the feeling of a public school. Students at GSDS receive individualized education and counseling in a highly structured environment, while developing an appreciation for learning and consistency. Students learn and apply coping skills to solve every day, real world problems. We offer strategic interventions to help each student achieve their "personal best" academically, socially and behaviorally. Our focus is to foster a positive relationship between parent, school and student with emphasis on family values in the spirit of altruism.

### 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  |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|
| Bland, Mary     | Principal           | Mrs. Bland is responsible for Gardendale oversight as well as all agency partners. She works directly as liaison between Student Services (Chief of Schools) and Gardendale and serves as principal.                               |
| Poley, Danielle | Assistant Principal | Mrs. Poley serves as an instructional leader by collaborating with the administrative team, teacher leaders, district leaders, SAC committee, and community members to implement research-based strategies to reach our SIP goals. |
| Reda, Julie     | Assistant Principal | Ms. Reda serves as an instructional leader by collaborating with the administrative team, teacher leaders, and district leaders to implement research-based strategies to reach our SIP goals.                                     |

**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.

- + Behavior and Academic Data shared with parents/families via IEP meetings.
- + Twice a year (December and May), the District Behavior Support Systems Resource Teachers will, in conjunction with the school lead, create an Implementation Report. The Implementation Report is a summary of the work and progress the school has made. It lists significant data, as well as an assessment of the strengths and growth areas of PBIS at the school. A copy of the Implementation Report is sent to the team lead, school principal, and area assistant superintendent.
- + PBIS strategies, theory of action and progress monitoring tools will be shared with teachers and staff on early release Fridays.
- + PBIS strategies, theory of action and progress monitoring tools will be shared with students via modeling, non-examples, visuals and positive reinforcement.
- + PBIS strategies, theory of action and progress monitoring tools will be shared with parents via newsletters and social media communications.

### **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))

**MONITORING IMPLEMENTATION:** Administration will monitor implementation via classroom walkthroughs to inspect instruction and culture. Walkthrough data is used to determine trends which may need to be addressed via PD or through coaching. School based structures which support the implementation of the SIP include ongoing PD, Instructional Expectations, and Decision Trees. Also, there will be student success team meetings to review core data, monitoring and implementation of supplemental technology, and interventions.

**MONITORING IMPACT:** FAST, along with i-Ready/Read 180/System 44 data, are used to start data conversations at the school level. Administration reviews data with teachers and develop an action plan for responding to the data. Through coaching conversations, teachers are asked to utilize the small group segment of instruction to leverage up achievement. Data chats are encouraged to engage and empower students to "own" their future achievement.

### **BEHAVIOR INTERVENTION PLANS**

- + Data is collected on individual students as part of the Functional Behavioral Assessment (FBA) and is used to monitor the effectiveness of a Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP).
- + A baseline of the target behavior(s) to increase or decrease behavior will be established allowing for the comparison of behavior pre and post intervention.
- + The analysis of data tells us whether the interventions are effective and should guide the decisions on making changes to a program, including whether to continue with an intervention.
- + Data is used to support/monitor IEP goals whether behavioral or academic.

### **ACADEMICS:**

- + Student grades (and course completion) are recorded and tracked in FOCUS throughout each semester.
- + Student progress in each course is monitored and discussed bi-weekly with Administration monthly. Completed high school courses result in credit awarded to the student.
- + EWS data helps to identify students that are at risk for not graduating. By identifying them as early as possible, we are able to mitigate their risk factors, and help them graduate. We will provide guided intervention strategies, including instruction differentiation.

**Demographic Data**

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

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2023-24 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Combination School<br>KG-12  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Special Education  |
| <b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>   | Yes  |
| <b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>   | 56%  |
| <b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>   | 100%   |
| <b>Charter School</b>  | No   |
| <b>RAISE School</b>  | No   |
| <b>ESSA Identification</b><br>*updated as of 3/11/2024   | CSI  |
| <b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)*<br>Black/African American Students (BLK)*<br>White Students (WHT)*<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)* |
| <b>School Grades History</b><br>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.  |  |
| <b>School Improvement Rating History</b>   | 2021-22: UNSATISFACTORY<br>2018-19: UNSATISFACTORY<br>2017-18: MAINTAINING<br>2016-17: UNSATISFACTORY  |
| <b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>   |  |

**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 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 18    |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 25    |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1     |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 19    |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 19    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 20    |

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 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 22    |

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 | 0     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 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 |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|----|-------|
|   | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7 | 8  |       |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 0           | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4  | 0 | 4  | 22    |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 8  | 3 | 11 | 57    |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0 | 5  | 13    |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0 | 6  | 15    |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 8  | 4 | 9  | 53    |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 10 | 6 | 10 | 51    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0  | 2     |

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           | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 36    |

**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 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 27    |

**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 days   | 0           | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4  | 0 | 4  | 16    |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 8  | 3 | 11 | 36    |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0 | 5  | 5     |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0 | 6  | 6     |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 8  | 4 | 9  | 31    |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 10 | 6 | 10 | 35    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0  | 2     |

**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           | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 21    |

**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 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6     |

**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*                | 2      | 58       | 53    | 3      | 63       | 55    | 2      |          |       |
| ELA Learning Gains              |        |          |       | 24     |          |       | 14     |          |       |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile      |        |          |       |        |          |       |        |          |       |
| Math Achievement*               | 4      | 62       | 55    | 3      | 40       | 42    | 8      |          |       |
| Math Learning Gains             |        |          |       | 29     |          |       | 44     |          |       |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile     |        |          |       |        |          |       |        |          |       |
| Science Achievement*            | 0      | 61       | 52    | 0      | 64       | 54    | 11     |          |       |
| Social Studies Achievement*     |        | 72       | 68    | 7      | 61       | 59    | 21     |          |       |
| Middle School Acceleration      |        | 70       | 70    |        | 51       | 51    |        |          |       |
| Graduation Rate                 |        | 87       | 74    |        | 62       | 50    | 8      |          |       |
| College and Career Acceleration |        | 75       | 53    |        | 76       | 70    |        |          |       |
| ELP Progress                    |        | 47       | 55    |        | 68       | 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           | 2   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | Yes |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 4   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 6   |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 3   |
| Percent Tested                                 | 67  |
| Graduation Rate                                |     |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index           |     |
|--------------------------------------|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)     | CSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 11  |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index                     |     |
|--|-----|
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | Yes |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 4   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 66  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 6   |
| Percent Tested                                 | 90  |
| Graduation Rate                                |     |

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY |                                 |                    |   |   |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup                      | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD                                | 3                               | Yes                | 4   | 4   |
| ELL                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| AMI                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| ASN                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| BLK                                | 8                               | Yes                | 4   | 4   |
| HSP                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| MUL                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| PAC                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| WHT                                | 4                               | Yes                | 4   | 4   |
| FRL                                | 2                               | 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                                | 11                              | Yes                | 3   | 3   |
| ELL                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| AMI                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| ASN                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| BLK                                | 9                               | Yes                | 3   | 3   |
| HSP                                |                                 |                    |   |   |

| 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                                | 5                               | Yes                | 3   | 3   |
| FRL                                | 11                              | 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                                   | 2        |        |             | 4         |         |              | 0        |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| SWD  | 3        |        |             | 5         |         |              | 0        |         |           |                   | 3                   |              |
| ELL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 8        |        |             | 7         |         |              |          |         |           |                   | 2                   |              |
| HSP  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| MUL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 0        |        |             | 7         |         |              |          |         |           |                   | 2                   |              |
| FRL  | 0        |        |             | 4         |         |              |          |         |           |                   | 2                   |              |

| 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                                   | 3        | 24     |             | 3         | 29      |              | 0        | 7       |           |                   |                     |              |
| SWD  | 3        | 24     |             | 3         | 29      |              | 0        | 9       |           |                   |                     |              |
| 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  | 8        | 20     |             | 0         |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| MUL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 0        |        |             | 9         |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 3        | 25     |             | 4         | 25      |              | 0        | 10      |           |                   |                     |              |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups                                      | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 | ELP Progress |
| All Students                                   | 2        | 14     |             | 8         | 44      |              | 11       | 21      |           | 8                 |                     |              |
| SWD  | 2        | 14     |             | 8         | 44      |              | 11       | 21      |           | 8                 |                     |              |
| ELL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 0        | 18     |             | 13        | 55      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| MUL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 6        | 17     |             | 0         | 33      |              | 10       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 0        | 12     |             | 9         | 45      |              | 13       | 21      |           | 9                 |                     |              |

**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 | *      | 54%      | *                          | 50%   | *                       |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | *      | 59%      | *                          | 54%   | *                       |

| ELA   |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 07    | 2023 - Spring | *      | 53%      | *                          | 47%   | *                       |
| 08    | 2023 - Spring | 0%     | 52%      | -52%                       | 47%   | -47%                    |
| 09    | 2023 - Spring | *      | 56%      | *                          | 48%   | *                       |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | *      | 61%      | *                          | 58%   | *                       |
| 06    | 2023 - Spring | *      | 61%      | *                          | 47%   | *                       |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | *      | 56%      | *                          | 50%   | *                       |

| MATH  |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06    | 2023 - Spring | *      | 67%      | *                          | 54%   | *                       |
| 07    | 2023 - Spring | *      | 58%      | *                          | 48%   | *                       |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | *      | 60%      | *                          | 59%   | *                       |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | *      | 61%      | *                          | 61%   | *                       |
| 08    | 2023 - Spring | *      | 38%      | *                          | 55%   | *                       |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | *      | 55%      | *                          | 55%   | *                       |

| SCIENCE |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08      | 2023 - Spring | *      | 48%      | *                          | 44%   | *                       |
| 05      | 2023 - Spring | *      | 57%      | *                          | 51%   | *                       |

| ALGEBRA |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A     | 2023 - Spring | *      | 51%      | *                          | 50%   | *                       |

| GEOMETRY |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|----------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade    | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A      | 2023 - Spring | *      | 50%      | *                          | 48%   | *                       |

### 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.**

Last year's scores showed the greatest academic need is ELA achievement of 3% in 2022. Students at Gardendale Separate Day School struggle with behaviors, which negatively affect their academics. Students of all subgroups entering our facility are coming in with both Reading and Math deficiencies. Many are also deficient in acquiring credits needed to graduate with their cohort. Students enter the program at any given moment and may only stay with us for a school year.

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

The 2022 - 2023 school year was the first year of operation for Gardendale Separate Day School as a Brevard Public School. Prior to the 22-23 school year school number 0089 was Fieldston Preparatory School as a contracted location. The data from 2019 was only one site, but we now have students from two different sites. This should be taken into account when reviewing any previous data.

Last year's scores showed the greatest academic need is ELA achievement which dropped from 16% in 2019 to 3% in 2022. Gardendale's academic declines are directly linked to the number of behavior incidents. Students of all subgroups at GSDS demonstrate chronic absenteeism and task avoidance. Even when students are present, they often refuse to participate in class, and/or complete academic tasks. This is a huge concern as the rate of Failure due to absences and failing grades has historically caused students to be off-track for graduation.

**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.**

ELA and Math Proficiency showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The major contributing factor that causes the gap is the students' continued struggles with behaviors that impede their learning.

Gardendale Separate Day School serves Students with Disabilities with the goal of transitioning back to their home school supported or EBD units. To achieve this outcome, behaviors must be decreased and sustained.

Currently on 21-22 data all subgroups are underperforming. We will focus on developing teacher skills to see an increase in academic achievement. Data: (22-23 data coming soon)

\*Overall Federal Index 21-22 is 11

\*21-22 ELA Proficiency 3%

\*21-22 Math Proficiency 3%

Students who are successful at this school in achieving behavioral goals return to their home school, which impacts this data.

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

The data component that showed improvement was math learning gains, which went from 11% to 29%. Last year was the first year the Gardendale Separate Day School was operated as a Brevard Public School, so no information was provided about previous curriculum and/or teaching strategies to determine any new actions that were taken.

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



Attendance for Gardendale Separate Day School students has historically been an issue due to the fluid enrollment of the student population. Students in grades 06-12 may have outside factors (i.e. court cases, probation violations, DJJ incarceration, etc) that due to the outside factors that effects the overall attendance of each student and overall student attendance percentage. In reviewing the EWS, there is a strong connection between Attendance below 90 percent, Course failure in ELA or Math, and Level 1 on statewide assessment. With several students included in two or more early warning indicators, it becomes apparent that Gardendale has to identify the barriers that hinder the major data point of Attendance and therefore continue to negatively impact student achievement in ELA/Math and earning a Level 2 or higher on statewide assessments.

This is the first year we will be able to have accurate behavior data that reflects the true number of daily behaviors that interfere with the learning environment. That data will be used to modify individualized behavior intervention plans, with a goal of reducing the loss of instructional time.

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

1. Behavior
2. Attendance
3. ELA and Math growth towards proficiency and credit retrieval

#### **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.

Students of all subgroups at GSDS demonstrate chronic absenteeism and task avoidance as evidenced by their individualized behavior plan data. Even when students are present, they often refuse to participate in class, and/or complete academic tasks.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

Staff will track task avoidance and attendance to ensure that all students in all subgroups show a 10% increase in participation in school and a decrease in number of students with chronic absenteeism (missing more than 10% of school days).

### Monitoring:

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

Data behavior sheets and attendance logs will be monitored weekly by the behavior and leadership teams for needed interventions and proactive measures for student involvement. Individualized behavior plans will be amended as needed based on the data collected.

Leadership team will meet weekly to review behavior data and conduct classroom walkthroughs to ensure interventions are being provided with fidelity.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Danielle Poley (poley.danielle@brevardschools.org)

### Evidence-based Intervention:

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

TEACCH - (Treatment and Education of Autistic and related Communication-handicapped Children) is a clinical service and professional training program that has incorporated and contributed to the evidence base of autism interventions.

PBIS - Creating safe, supportive learning environments for children and youth with disabilities is a critical responsibility of all school personnel. To ensure a high-quality education prepares them for further education, employment, and independent living, students with disabilities need to be part of an inclusive school-wide system of positive behavior support. When implemented school-wide, the tiered framework of PBIS benefits all students – including students with disabilities. In order to provide an appropriate education to students with severe disabilities, teachers of these students must have sufficient preparation. To date, PBIS offers the most effective approach for improving serious challenging behaviors of students with severe disabilities.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

TEACCH - The TEACCH method provides the individual with structure and organization. This method relies on five basic principles; physical structure, scheduling, work system, routine and visual structure.

By implementing evidence-based practices within a PBIS framework, schools support their students' academic, social, emotional, and behavioral success, engage with families to create locally-meaningful and culturally-relevant outcomes, and use data to make informed decisions that improve the way things work for everyone.

Establishing school-wide expectations and structures with students sets the tone for the classroom. When you spend time getting to know students and use strategies to deepen connections every day, you are building a healthy classroom environment. When students have clear expectations, are regularly acknowledged for the things they do well, and receive instructional consequences more often than exclusionary ones, they are going to spend more time in class than out of it.

### **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.

PBIS implementation.

1. Pre-planning - Train teachers and instructional assistants on the rationale and implementation of PBIS. add additional review of data (quarterly/monthly/semester) retraining.....
2. Conduct weekly classroom visits to provide positive and constructive feedback on implementation of PBIS.
3. Differentiate support to classroom teachers based on observations.
4. Monitor behavior and attendance data weekly to determine next steps.
5. Schedule events at school throughout the year as incentives for students' positive behavior choices.
6. Purchase supplies needed by teachers to support implementation of interventions and support classroom instruction.

**Person Responsible:** Danielle Poley (poley.danielle@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** On-going

To build stronger connections with students, teachers will take a charter bus ride to see where students are coming from. The goal of the bus ride is to build community within the school by deepening relationships within the school and learning more about where each student comes from. Teachers will use the knowledge of student challenges and community assets to build relationships.

**Person Responsible:** Danielle Poley (poley.danielle@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** Second semester

To support students' needs, a counseling room will be set up with calming tools and furniture. This room will be used for student to student and student to staff mediations to repair relationships and/or preventative counseling sessions.

**Person Responsible:** [no one identified]

**By When:** End of first semester

Give teachers a budget to purchase/replace classroom supplies to support the implementation of PBIS and instructional programs. Classroom supplies to include printer paper, pencils, construction paper, markers, crayons, art supplies, lamination, velcro, wipes, math manipulatives, white boards, and science experiment materials to support the Florida Standards.

**Person Responsible:** Danielle Poley (poley.danielle@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** Winter 2024

**#2. 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.

Gardendale Separate Day School serves Students with Disabilities with the goal of transitioning back to their home school supported or EBD units. To achieve this outcome, behaviors must be decreased and sustained.

Currently on 21-22 data all subgroups are underperforming. We will focus on developing teacher skills to see an increase in academic achievement. Data: (22-23 data coming soon)

\*Overall Federal Index 21-22 is 11

\*21-22 ELA Proficiency 3%

\*21-22 Math Proficiency 3%

Students who are successful at this school in achieving behavioral goals return to their home school, which impacts this data.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Overall Federal Index will increase to 41%. ELA proficiency for students of all subgroups (SWD, BLK, FRL) will increase to 41%. These targets are challenging to achieve due to the nature of the school. Students achieving behavioral success may return to their home school prior to taking the end of the year assessments.

By the end of the first semester 100% of teachers will implement at least two strategies presented during the bi-weekly trainings.

**Monitoring:**

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

Administration will monitor:

\*FAST and iReady testing results through PM1, PM2, and PM3 for all subgroups

\*students on access points using their UNIQUE curriculum quarterly

\*all students individualized behavior intervention plan data weekly

\*credit retrieval to ensure students are on track for high school graduation

\*staff attendance at all required trainings via sign-in sheets

Administration will conduct classroom walkthroughs and provide feedback to teachers on their implementation of strategies presented in trainings.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Danielle Poley (poley.danielle@brevardschools.org)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

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

Staff will have on-going training (some after-hours), coaching, and feedback from district staff on communication (LATS) tools, behavior tools, and teaching procedures and expectations (TEACHH).

Teachers will utilize Engenuity to monitor students' progress towards credit retrieval.

Due to extreme staff shortages and the inability to hire new employees, some staff will have extra-duty pay to support the needs of students by attending trainings outside of their contracted hours.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Once teachers have been trained in classroom procedures and expectations, they can decrease behaviors in the classroom which will help students increase academically and help them move back to their traditional schools.

If teachers are trained in LATS they will be able to help students use communication tools to get their wants and needs met so that they don't have to resort to using behaviors (hitting kicking, etc.).

TEACCH - The TEACCH method provides the individual with structure and organization. This method relies on five basic principles; physical structure, scheduling, work system, routine and visual structure. When students are in structured classrooms there is a lower incidence of negative behaviors.

**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.

Professional development to build teacher capacity.

1. ESE Pathways - Teachers attended training over the summer to strengthen their background knowledge of ESE procedures and teaching strategies.
2. ESE Symposium - All new ESE teachers attended a summer training to introduce ESE supports available through the district and introductions to best teaching practices for self-contained ESE classrooms.
3. ACCESS Project - All teachers who are teaching students on the Access points attended a training during pre-planning to increase their knowledge of the curriculum and resources available.
4. 3. Bi-weekly training - Through the entire first semester to support teachers using TEACCH strategies in their classrooms.
5. After-hours training to continue to support staff knowledge of ESE teaching strategies.

**Person Responsible:** Danielle Poley (poley.danielle@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** On-going

Teachers will utilize strategies learned and access resources shared from trainings to increase engagement and instruction in their classrooms. Teachers will be supported by district staff on campus during bi-weekly visits throughout the first semester.

Purchase of technology for use by students for assistive communication devices to improve access to core instruction. (T1)

**Person Responsible:** Danielle Poley (poley.danielle@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** On-going

TEACCH implementation.

1. Summer training - Two teachers were trained in TEACCH strategies to create model classrooms.
2. Preplanning training - All teachers participated in a training to view the model classrooms.
3. Purchase and implementation of materials to implement TEACHH strategies including: room dividers, headphones, sensory globes, sensory walls, and light covers. (T1)

**Person Responsible:** Danielle Poley (poley.danielle@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** On-going

Due to extreme staff shortages and the inability to hire new employees, some staff will have extra-duty pay to support the needs of students.

**Person Responsible:** Danielle Poley (poley.danielle@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** On-going

Purchase four student iPads to use with online learning programs for our students on access points.

**Person Responsible:** Danielle Poley (poley.danielle@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** Winter 2023

### 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).

Gardendale completes a comprehensive needs assessment to determine resource alignment to needs. One of our primary needs is teacher retention and recruitment funding beyond what we are allocated from ESSER/ ARP. IDEA funding is used to secure positions, such as behavior analysts, behavior technicians, and teachers in high needs areas when we are unable to secure through district funding. Title I money is used to fund supplies needed for our students on access points such as sensory tools, padding, and instructional materials. From district support/ capital outlay furniture has been purchased that supports the sensory and instructional needs of all subgroups including students with disabilities.

## 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.

Our Family Engagement Plan, school website, and social media page will be shared with stakeholders through a school-wide email.

**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))

We will invite parents on campus for family nights and offer virtual meetings for families with transportation concerns. Our Family Engagement Plan will outline specific events that will be held this year.

Our social media page was recently created and will promote information sharing with stakeholders to foster positive relationships.

**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)**

Teachers will participate in various trainings and have district staff as coaches throughout the school year to increase their skills in classroom management and instruction. This growth in classroom management and instruction skills will strengthen the academic program for students. The increased engagement will lead to more students completing required tasks and credits for graduation.

**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))**

This SIP is developed in coordination and integration with Title I, ESSR, and IDEA. Gardendale completes a comprehensive needs assessment to determine resource alignment to needs. One of our primary needs is teacher retention and recruitment funding beyond what we are allocated from ESSER/ ARP. IDEA funding is used to secure positions, such as behavior analysts, behavior technicians, and teachers in high needs areas when we are unable to secure through district funding. Title I money is used to fund supplies needed for our students on access points such as sensory tools, padding, and instructional materials. From district support/ capital outlay furniture has been purchased that supports the sensory and instructional needs of all subgroups including students with disabilities.

## 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.**

|          |               |  |   |                |     |                    |
|----------|---------------|--|---|----------------|-----|--------------------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>III.B.</b> | <b>Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System</b>               |   |                |     | <b>\$23,100.00</b> |
|          | Function      | Object   | Budget Focus  | Funding Source | FTE | 2023-24            |
|          | 5200          | 510  | 0089 - Gardendale Separate Day School   | UniSIG         |     | \$23,100.00        |
|          |               |  | <i>Notes: Give teachers a budget to purchase/replace classroom supplies to support the implementation of PBIS and instructional programs. Classroom supplies to include printer paper, pencils, construction paper, markers, crayons, art supplies, lamination, velcro, wipes, math manipulatives, white boards, and science experiment materials to support the Florida Standards.</i> |                |     |                    |
| <b>2</b> | <b>III.B.</b> | <b>Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning</b> |   |                |     | <b>\$25,900.00</b> |
|          | Function      | Object   | Budget Focus  | Funding Source | FTE | 2023-24            |
|          | 5200          | 140  | 0089 - Gardendale Separate Day School   | UniSIG         | 1.0 | \$12,000.00        |
|          |               |  | <i>Notes: This is extra duty pay for two pre-identified full-time substitute teachers in middle school classrooms for students with Emotional Behavioral Disabilities to increase academic proficiency for students in all subgroups including students with disabilities. This is needed due to extreme staffing shortages an inability to hire new employees. An</i>                  |                |     |                    |

|  |      |     |  |        |               |                    |
|--|------|-----|--|--------|---------------|--------------------|
|  |      |     | <i>additional \$5 an hour for 6.5 hours a day for 180 student school days, plus an additional two 8 hour days of training.</i>   |        |               |                    |
|  | 5200 | 150 | 0089 - Gardendale Separate Day School  | UniSIG | 0.4           | \$5,000.00         |
|  |      |     | <i>Notes: This is extra duty pay for an instructional assistant in a supported level classroom up to 15 hours per week to increase teacher to student ratio in a high needs classroom. This is needed due to extreme staffing shortages an inability to hire new employees. An additional 3 hours per day at \$22.50 per hour for 180 student school days and fringe benefits.</i> |        |               |                    |
|  | 6400 | 120 | 0089 - Gardendale Separate Day School  | UniSIG |               | \$4,000.00         |
|  |      |     | <i>Notes: Pay staff to attend after-hours training to support student engagement and behavior support strategies. Five, one-hour training sessions at approximately \$33.00 per teacher for 19 teachers.</i>   |        |               |                    |
|  | 6500 | 644 | 0089 - Gardendale Separate Day School  | UniSIG |               | \$4,700.00         |
|  |      |     | <i>Notes: Purchase four student iPads to use with online learning programs for our students on access points.</i>  |        |               |                    |
|  | 6500 | 519 | 0089 - Gardendale Separate Day School  | UniSIG |               | \$200.00           |
|  |      |     | <i>Notes: iPad cases</i>   |        |               |                    |
|  |      |     |  |        | <b>Total:</b> | <b>\$49,000.00</b> |

**Budget Approval**

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

No