

Seminole County Public Schools

Seminole Science Charter School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Seminole Science Charter School

3580 N US HIGHWAY 17-92, Lake Mary, FL 32746

www.seminolescience.org

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Seminole Science Charter STEM School offers a K-8 experience devoted to enriching the lives of students with a Tuition Free Public Charter School for Seminole County residents with an integration of Science, Technology, Engineering and Math, S.T.E.M., curriculum and a diverse student population that seeks to achieve a well-rounded educational experience. SCSS' offers a fulltime Gifted program, Hands on and Project based learning along with a Research Based Curriculum to encourage students to think above and beyond to reach their highest educational goals. Seminole Science Charter School is an AdvanceED (SAC) accredited school, a designated High Performing school and an "A" rated school in the State of Florida.

Provide the school's vision statement.

SSCS has multiple offerings to challenge and enhance your child's educational goals with Academic competition teams involving Science, Math and Robotics along with special areas such as Art, Music and Drama to create a "whole" student educational experience.

Seminole Science understands the social challenges of the 21st century and has a strong Character Education curriculum to instill the strong values that are created at home and to bring them into student's daily activities. We want for our children to be bright in mind and bright in character.

Give your child the education they deserve, give them Seminole Science Charter STEM School.

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
Aksu, Yunus	Principal	

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.

Every year, we send out stakeholder surveys to staff, students and parents to have their feedback. Also, we have in-person townhall meetings for all these three groups as well.

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))

Our monthly data chat meetings and PLC meetings with teachers will help us to monitor the effectiveness of our SIP implementation. Based on the data and feedback from teachers, we will revise the SIP if it is necessary.

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 KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	67%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	32%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	7	6	7	3	7	3	9	14	56
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	6	6	6	4	26
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	3	1	15
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	1	1	1	1	5

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Absent 10% or more school days		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more school days	7	7	7	3	7	5	9	14	0	59
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	3
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	6	6	6	4	3	26
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	4	6	3	1	1	18
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	6

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	76	66	53	80	69	55	85		
ELA Learning Gains				70			69		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				57			61		
Math Achievement*	84	67	55	85	48	42	79		
Math Learning Gains				79			58		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				65			38		
Science Achievement*	75	61	52	80	63	54	72		
Social Studies Achievement*	76	78	68	95	63	59	83		
Middle School Acceleration	86	76	70	90	49	51	85		
Graduation Rate		71	74		64	50			
College and Career Acceleration		35	53		83	70			
ELP Progress	50	60	55		79	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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	75
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	524
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	78

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	701
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100
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	31	Yes	2	1
ELL	69			
AMI				
ASN	89			
BLK	46			
HSP	78			
MUL	89			
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	64			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	40	Yes	1	
ELL	67			
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK	55			
HSP	73			

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	100			
PAC				
WHT	77			
FRL	68			

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	76			84			75	76	86			50
SWD	33			29							2	
ELL	67			89							3	50
AMI												
ASN	85			93			88	86	96		6	
BLK	47			67			25				3	
HSP	72			78			78	76	84		5	
MUL	100			77							2	
PAC												
WHT	75			85			76	73	86		6	
FRL	65			71			61	62	62		5	

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	80	70	57	85	79	65	80	95	90			
SWD	24	39	31	33	56	54						
ELL	47	71	60	80	79							
AMI												
ASN	91	79	77	96	92	85	97	100	95			

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	57	48	36	67	69	47	58					
HSP	76	70	47	83	73	54	72	100	85			
MUL	100			100								
PAC												
WHT	78	68	61	81	78	69	77	89	88			
FRL	64	64	54	71	68	53	71	85	85			

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	85	69	61	79	58	38	72	83	85			
SWD	54	69	55	33	44							
ELL	62	80		69	70							
AMI												
ASN	94	78	76	93	72		70	94	100			
BLK	65	68	50	60	48							
HSP	90	74	78	70	57	41	66	89	72			
MUL	93	85		100	62							
PAC												
WHT	79	56	45	75	49	25	78	67	74			
FRL	72	60	57	62	46	28	58	77	88			

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	67%	61%	6%	54%	13%
07	2023 - Spring	76%	53%	23%	47%	29%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	79%	50%	29%	47%	32%
04	2023 - Spring	84%	66%	18%	58%	26%
06	2023 - Spring	78%	52%	26%	47%	31%
03	2023 - Spring	71%	60%	11%	50%	21%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	85%	66%	19%	54%	31%
07	2023 - Spring	87%	67%	20%	48%	39%
03	2023 - Spring	88%	66%	22%	59%	29%
04	2023 - Spring	84%	68%	16%	61%	23%
08	2023 - Spring	71%	31%	40%	55%	16%
05	2023 - Spring	67%	44%	23%	55%	12%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	74%	55%	19%	44%	30%
05	2023 - Spring	73%	64%	9%	51%	22%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	54%	44%	50%	48%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	53%	47%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	76%	71%	5%	66%	10%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component with the lowest performance are Students with Disabilities (SWD). The contributing factors to last year's low performance were students returning to school from pandemic learning with learning gaps, new students to SSCS with foundational skill gaps incurred during pandemic learning, along with student and teacher absences due to pandemic and illness. Due to the pandemic (illness, death, student and family impact) we also prioritized additional factors, such as: health, financial supports, social work needs, emotional and mental health support for all students, families and teachers and staff. These factors were on the forefront as families and students at times were in crisis more frequently and needed more additional supports than previously. This impacted education as a whole, however we implemented various programs during that time that are helpful now, such as Summer Recovery Camps and re-organizing and adding an additional teachers and staff who work with our SWD population, and our who also provide coaching of our teachers, and additional interventions specialists for students with SWDs.

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

The data components that showed the greatest decline from the prior year in school data was SWD Math Learning gains and for SWD component was ELA Achievement and ELA Learning gains. Coming back from pandemic learning with Math and ELA gaps in learning and student and teacher absences due to the pandemic contributed to this decline. We were filling in Math and ELA foundational gaps that they would have learned previously and taking longer to build upon skills due to absences and illness. This year we have more re-teach moments along with skill scaffolding and practice and slower build of growth upon concepts, especially with SWD who benefit exponentially from consistent attendance and building slowly and consistency with learning foundational concepts, which include multi-modal teaching strategies.

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 data components that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average are SWD ELA and Math Achievement. Coming back from pandemic learning with Math and ELA gaps in learning and student and teacher absences due to the pandemic contributed to this decline. We were filling in Math and ELA foundational gaps that they would have learned previously and taking longer to build upon skills due to absences and illness. This year we have more re-teach moments along with skill scaffolding and practice and slower build of growth upon concepts, especially with SWD who benefit exponentially from consistent attendance and building slowly and consistency with learning foundational concepts, which include multi-modal teaching strategies.

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

The data components that showed the most improvement was Math Learning Gains from 58 (2021) to 79 (2022) and Math Lowest 25th percentile grew from 38 (2021) to 65 (2022). Our current practices have been reviewed and modified, with a continued focus on students with disabilities having universal opportunities on campus and experiencing successful outcomes, as reflected below. The new actions

taken are as follows: Our ESE Support Facilitator moved from part time to full time employee in 2022. We added an Reading Intervention Specialist and teacher coach and now have a teacher coach in Math with expertise pertaining to this and a teacher coach in ELA with that expertise. We added extended service times and duration of intensive individualized work time with students having special needs, dependent on the need. This includes additional opportunities for school tutoring in ELA and Math and homework help clubs. We added additional resources/curriculum specifically for our students with disabilities, including Read180 and Leveled Literacy Intervention, Math Successmaker, with the goal of increasing reading and math gains for students with disabilities. We added more high interest, low level readers in our media center and classrooms to help encourage student engagement. We provided parents with a list of additional outside resources, such as Reading IQ app, Learning Ally, and related free guided reading resources and online math resources. We have made changes to our MTSS system to reflect on the ESE data/progress on each student each meeting, meeting for the disabilities subgroup of estimated every 2- 3 weeks, rotating for academic and behavior. We have utilized our School Social Worker and District Mental Health Counselor to assist this subgroup with additional support, per individual student and family regarding meeting social, emotional, behavioral and financial needs. We have added an additional Summertime Recovery Camp geared toward closing the gap in achievement for students with disabilities and specific learning challenges. Our optional Saturday Learning Academy has added an additional ESE staff member as support. We updated the School Best Practices for Inclusive Education (BPIE) through the Florida Inclusion Network as a team and implemented the changes that benefit all students, including those with disabilities, such as more involvement with outside agencies and stakeholders.

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

Potential areas of concern are SWD Achievement in both Math and ELA. This learning subgroup traditionally takes longer to show gains, as they need varied means of multi-modal teaching, more scaffolding and practice, and the learning process tends to be a more gradual build. SWDs also tend to have more additional needs, such as independent functioning, emotional and behavioral, and familial need for supports such as counseling or financial supports.

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

The highest concerns are: SWD Math and SWD ELA Achievement, including growth with the students scoring in the lowest 25 percentile. The additional area of focus is positive culture and environment, specifically relating to teacher attendance. We would like teacher attendance to be more reflective of pre-pandemic times or 1% higher than this last school year, as well as more seamless instruction when a substitute is needed. Teacher health and well-being are important components to having a positive culture and environment and critical to student success.

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**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.

The areas of focus are Math and ELA Learning Gains of Students with Disabilities, including the lowest 25th percentile.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The school plans to achieve an outcome of above 41 percent for SWDs, including scoring above the State average in both ELA and Math SWD Learning Gains, including growth with the lowest 25 percentile of students.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored in monthly MTSS meetings, weekly teacher and instructional coach data chats, student with teacher data chats, student portfolio reviews, and through diagnostic tests and growth monitoring assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Yunus Aksu (aksu@seminolescience.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The evidence-based intervention being implemented for the area of focus is: FAST Testing, i-Ready diagnostics and growth checks, and IXL diagnostics, LLI reading Interventions, Successmaker Math interventions. This is being reviewed more often in MTSS meetings every 2- 3 weeks, rotating academic and behavior.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

More frequent review of assessments and data as noted above will encourage quicker implementation of scaffolding to teach specific skills individualized for students that may be filling in foundational learning gaps and building expertise in new concepts, including SWDs.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Attendance

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.

The area of focus is positive culture and environment specifically relating to teacher attendance. We would like teacher and staff attendance to be more reflective of pre-pandemic times or 1% higher than this last school year, as well as more seamless instruction when a substitute is needed. This was recognized as a crucial need from the data reviewed before, during, and after pandemic times that show the student data increases with student and teacher attendance and consistency in the classroom, along with seamless transition to substitute teaching or online instruction if need be. Teacher health and well-being are important components to having a positive culture and environment and critical to student success.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The outcome we plan to achieve is consistent teacher attendance of 97%. Teachers have 201 work days in a year and 2022-23 school year average teacher attendance is 194 or 96%. We want more seamless transition if a teacher must be out for an extended period, such as more than 3 days.

Monitoring:

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

We monitor teacher attendance via a clock in and clock out system. We monitor teacher well-being by having regular teacher coach check-ins and meetings with Administration and teachers. Teacher goals and success are monitored in regularly scheduled Professional Improvement Plan meetings. Additionally, we have staff surveys and town hall meetings with questions that address teacher well-being and school culture and environment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Yunus Aksu (aksu@seminolescience.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The teacher contracts were adjusted for this school year to help encourage better teacher attendance via incentives. The employees have a set number of sick days, however if they do not use the days, they will receive a financial payout at the end of the school year. We also have included more preventative health opportunities in the teacher and staff health insurance plans. We have substitutes with online Google Classroom substitute plans readily available (ahead of time) to provide consistent coverage with little interruption for ill teachers, and we now also have online learning platforms where teachers are able to provide students learning assistance at home and SWDs may have online push-in services through their service providers into those classrooms as well, if needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale is that a combination of factors may help with more consistent teacher attendance and limited educational interruption, thereby encouraging student consistency and academic growth, including our SWD population. These factors include teachers wanting to be at work in an encouraging and empowering environment, along with being provided extra motivation (financially), having substitutes and well created online substitute plans though Google Classroom ahead of time, and a focus on preventative positive well-being will help create a culture of wanting to be in consistent attendance for everyone.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

All the necessary resource purchases have been made based on the SIP. ESSER II and ESSER III funds have been used for these support materials and they have been implemented starting 22-23 school year.