

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# RCMA Wimauma Community Academy



## 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>            | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

# RCMA Wimauma Community Academy

18240 US HIGHWAY 301 S, Wimauma, FL 33598

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

Principal: Mandy Johnson

Start Date for this Principal: 9/12/2019

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Combination School<br>KG-8   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2018-19 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2018-19 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*<br>English Language Learners<br>Hispanic Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: B (57%)<br>2017-18: B (55%)<br>2016-17: B (59%)<br>2015-16: C (51%)<br>2014-15: C (50%)                     |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Central  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | N/A  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |  |

## School Board Approval

N/A

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

## 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 Florida Department of Education 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.

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

## RCMA Wimauma Community Academy

18240 US HIGHWAY 301 S, Wimauma, FL 33598

[ no web address on file ]

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2018-19 Title I School | 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Combination School<br>KG-8                       | Yes                    | 100%   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | Yes                    | 100%   |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | B       | B       | B       | C       |

### School Board Approval

N/A

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

### 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 Florida Department of Education 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.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Redlands Christian Migrant Association (RCMA) is to open doors to opportunity through quality childcare and education provided from crib to high school and beyond. Our goal is to enable children and families to participate fully in the same opportunities for education, health, and social development that other Florida families enjoy to help break the cycle of poverty in rural Florida.

RCMA began opening charter schools in 2000 in order to expand upon the high-quality educational services provided by the non-profit organization in the are of child care since 1965. RCMA owns and operates three charter schools: RCMA Wimauma Academy, a Kindergarten through Fifth Grade school in Hillsborough County, RCMA Leadership Academy, a Sixth through Eighth school in Hillsborough County, and Immokalee Community School, a K-6 school in Collier County. RCMA Leadership Academy was chartered by Hillsborough County Public Schools in 2012.

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

The RCMA Wimauma Academy's programs are designed to help students master important concepts and skills, develop enduring understandings, critical thinking, and habits of mind needed to succeed in school, career and life. Academic, social-emotional, and leadership skills are developed through our innovative programs. The programs also provide opportunities for parents to build their own confidence, skills, and ability to serve as true partners in educating their students.

The school is proud to be a "B-rated" school, and strives to be an "A-rated" school in 2019-20.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

| Name          | Title     | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|---------------|-----------|--|
| Haggett, Mark | Principal | The Principal leads the staff and students at the school in all areas. He oversees the academic performance of the school, all personnel and human resource matters, all budget matters, and the day-to-day functioning of the school. |

### Early Warning Systems

#### Current Year

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

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                 | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled     | 32          | 41 | 35 | 35 | 39 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 221   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**

15

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 9/12/2019

**Prior Year - As Reported**
**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-------|
| Attendance below 90 percent     |             |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |       |
| One or more suspensions         |             |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |       |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   |             |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment |             |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |       |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-------|
| Students with two or more indicators |             |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |       |

**Prior Year - Updated**
**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                 | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component      | 2019   |          |       | 2018   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 44%    | 57%      | 61%   | 46%    | 60%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 57%    | 56%      | 59%   | 56%    | 60%      | 57%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 68%    | 52%      | 54%   | 60%    | 53%      | 51%   |
| Math Achievement            | 78%    | 55%      | 62%   | 88%    | 60%      | 58%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 62%    | 57%      | 59%   | 61%    | 60%      | 56%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 60%    | 49%      | 52%   | 47%    | 54%      | 50%   |
| Science Achievement         | 33%    | 50%      | 56%   | 57%    | 54%      | 53%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 0%     | 77%      | 78%   | 0%     | 78%      | 75%   |

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator                       | Grade Level (prior year reported) |        |        |        |        |        |       |       |       | Total   |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|---------|
|                                 | K                                 | 1      | 2      | 3      | 4      | 5      | 6     | 7     | 8     |         |
| Number of students enrolled     | 32 (0)                            | 41 (0) | 35 (0) | 35 (0) | 39 (0) | 39 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 221 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0 ( )                             | 0 ( )  | 0 ( )  | 0 ( )  | 0 ( )  | 0 ( )  | 0 ( ) | 0 ( ) | 0 ( ) | 0 (0)   |
| One or more suspensions         | 0 ( )                             | 0 ( )  | 0 ( )  | 0 ( )  | 0 ( )  | 0 ( )  | 0 ( ) | 0 ( ) | 0 ( ) | 0 (0)   |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0 ( )                             | 0 ( )  | 0 ( )  | 0 ( )  | 0 ( )  | 0 ( )  | 0 ( ) | 0 ( ) | 0 ( ) | 0 (0)   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 ( )                             | 0 ( )  | 0 ( )  | 0 ( )  | 0 ( )  | 0 ( )  | 0 ( ) | 0 ( ) | 0 ( ) | 0 (0)   |

### Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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 |
| 03                    | 2019 | 40%    | 52%      | -12%                       | 58%   | -18%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 47%    | 53%      | -6%                        | 57%   | -10%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -7%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 50%    | 55%      | -5%                        | 58%   | -8%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 52%    | 55%      | -3%                        | 56%   | -4%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -2%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 3%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 42%    | 54%      | -12%                       | 56%   | -14%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 55%    | 51%      | 4%                         | 55%   | 0%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -13%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -10%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                    | 2019 | 35%    | 53%      | -18%                       | 54%   | -19%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 53%    | 52%      | 1%                         | 52%   | 1%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -18%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -20%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2019 | 43%    | 54%      | -11%                       | 52%   | -9%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 42%    | 52%      | -10%                       | 51%   | -9%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 1%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -10%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2019 | 59%    | 53%      | 6%                         | 56%   | 3%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 43%    | 54%      | -11%                       | 58%   | -15%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 16%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 17%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 95%    | 54%      | 41%                        | 62%   | 33%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 84%    | 55%      | 29%                        | 62%   | 22%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 11%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 68%    | 57%      | 11%                        | 64%   | 4%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 79%    | 57%      | 22%                        | 62%   | 17%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -11%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -16%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 72%    | 54%      | 18%                        | 60%   | 12%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 75%    | 54%      | 21%                        | 61%   | 14%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -3%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -7%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                    | 2019 | 68%    | 49%      | 19%                        | 55%   | 13%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 68%    | 48%      | 20%                        | 52%   | 16%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -7%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2019 | 61%    | 62%      | -1%                        | 54%   | 7%                      |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|                       | 2018 | 44%    | 61%      | -17%                       | 54%   | -10%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 17%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -7%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2019 | 54%    | 31%      | 23%                        | 46%   | 8%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 10%    | 29%      | -19%                       | 45%   | -35%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 44%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 10%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                    | 2019 | 33%    | 51%      | -18%                       | 53%   | -20%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 45%    | 52%      | -7%                        | 55%   | -10%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -12%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2019 | 50%    | 47%      | 3%                         | 48%   | 2%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 30%    | 48%      | -18%                       | 50%   | -20%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 20%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 5%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| BIOLOGY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2018        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| CIVICS EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019        | 73%    | 67%      | 6%                    | 71%   | 2%                 |
| 2018        | 72%    | 65%      | 7%                    | 71%   | 1%                 |
| Compare     |        | 1%       |                       |       |                    |
| HISTORY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2018        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| ALGEBRA EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019        | 86%    | 63%      | 23%                   | 61%   | 25%                |
| 2018        | 92%    | 63%      | 29%                   | 62%   | 30%                |

| ALGEBRA EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| Compare      |        | -6%      |                       |       |                    |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019         | 0%     | 57%      | -57%                  | 57%   | -57%               |
| 2018         | 0%     | 56%      | -56%                  | 56%   | -56%               |
| Compare      |        | 0%       |                       |       |                    |

### Subgroup Data

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| ELL                                       | 41       | 56     | 65          | 79        | 63      | 60           | 32       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 44       | 57     | 68          | 78        | 62      | 60           | 33       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 44       | 57     | 68          | 78        | 62      | 60           | 33       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| ELL                                       | 51       | 56     | 40          | 81        | 68      | 50           | 42       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 52       | 57     | 39          | 82        | 66      | 47           | 46       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 53       | 58     | 39          | 81        | 64      | 44           | 46       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 2017 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| ELL                                       | 42       | 54     | 59          | 88        | 59      | 50           | 53       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 45       | 55     | 60          | 88        | 61      | 47           | 57       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 45       | 55     | 60          | 88        | 61      | 47           | 57       |         |           |                   |                     |

### ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index  |     |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 59  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 0   |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 66  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 468 |

| ESSA Federal Index   |      |
|--|------|
| Total Components for the Federal Index   | 8    |
| Percent Tested   | 100% |
| Subgroup Data  |      |
| Students With Disabilities   |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     |      |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?             | N/A  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%      |      |
| English Language Learners  |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      | 58   |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%       |      |
| Native American Students   |      |
| Federal Index - Native American Students                                       |      |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | N/A  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%        |      |
| Asian Students   |      |
| Federal Index - Asian Students   |      |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | N/A  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                  |      |
| Black/African American Students  |      |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                |      |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | N/A  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% |      |
| Hispanic Students  |      |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 59   |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               |      |
| Multiracial Students   |      |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   |      |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | N/A  |

| Multiracial Students   |     |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%                |     |
| Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                  | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%           |     |
| White Students   |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   |     |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      |     |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 59  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Our students' performance on Science Achievement was the furthest off of the district and state average. Our school was 33% proficient, whereas the district average was 50%, and the state average was 53%. Also, the 33% in Science was our lowest cell in the School Grade calculation. {As a side note, we reviewed 5th grade Science scored throughout the district, and at our other charter school in Collier County, we noticed that many schools had a drop in Science proficiency Spring 2019.} At our school, in past years, the 5th grade Science classes employed many hands-on activities (discovery learning). However last school year, the behavior of the scholars in the class interfered with activities early on in the school year, which decreased the amount of hands-on learning. Some challenges with student behavior patterns also decreased the number of field trips.

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

The data component showing the greatest decline from 2018 to 2019 was the Science Achievement cell, which decreased from 46% to 33% which is a 16% decrease. Refer to II, a. That is where we stated factors that we feel contributed to the decline.

**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 state average for Science Achievement was 53%, while our Science Achievement was 33%, which created the largest gap in comparison (20%). Refer to II, a.

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

The cell for ELA Lowest 25th Percentile increased from 39% to 68%, an increase of 29%. Our school hired a new ESE/Reading Resource teacher Fall 2018, and a former Reading Coach Winter 2018-19 to work for our school as a Reading Resource Teacher. We also had more focused and frequent faculty meetings geared toward the bottom quartile, and strategies to support the scholars in the bottom quartile.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

Our potential area of concern is the academics, behavior and the social emotional well being of the fifth grade groups. This will help support the full scope of science instruction which will thus help improve Science Achievement.

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

1. Earn a School Grade of A. If all cells increase by 5 points, our school will earn an A.
2. Better support Third Graders on their ELA performance, particularly those who are struggling readers and/or reluctant readers.
3. Better support Fifth graders and their families for the transition to middle school. Better monitor Fifth Grader's attitude and effort towards school-work.
4. Move more quickly with the RtI/MTSS file of who scholars who are receiving Tier 2/3 support and yet still struggle with learning, to the Child Study Team meeting.
5. Further extend and deepen our programs to support social-emotional learning in the school.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

| #1  |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Title</b>  | Science Performance will increase   |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | Our students' performance on Science Achievement was the furthest off of the district and state average. Our school was 33% proficient, whereas the district average was 50%, and the state average was 53%. Also, the 33% in Science was our lowest cell on our School Grade calculation.  |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | Science performance will increase from 33% proficient to 55% (using the 2018 district average as a goal, since our science performance in 2018 was 46%).  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Mark Haggett (mark.haggett@charter.hcps.net)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | <p>Our strategy will be to use USA Test Prep Science for both practice and assessing the fifth graders Science skills. This year, we are changing curriculum, and we had a change in one of our Fifth Gr teachers due to a retirement. By using the previously mentioned USA Test Prep, we will focus on finding the scholar's weaknesses in Science, and have them practice in their area of need. Also, Science Fusion, our previous text, went out-of-print. We are adopting National Geographic Science, but, the teachers will also use many other curricular resources.</p> <p>We will also hold more PLC's between administration and teachers about aligning the Science instruction with the Standards. With these changes, we feel that Science performance will improve.</p> |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | In the past, we have used other curriculum, so using a new curriculum might bring a fresh new perspective to the teachers as well as the scholars. Using USA Test Prep will allow for practice and growth at a differentiated rate. More team planning with administration will make instruction more strategic. This in combination with the hands on activities will lead to a better prepared scholar.   |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |   |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. More hands-on science activities to supplement learning.</li> <li>2. More strategic use of USA Test Prep - Science to help scholars according to their level.</li> <li>3. Implement National Geographic Science text to replace Science Fusion textbook. Additional materials will also be used.</li> <li>4. More attention placed on academic language development geared towards the English Language Learner profile, as the majority of the Fifth Graders are English Language Learners.</li> <li>5. More Teacher Planning with Admin to strategize aligning instructional content with the SSA content.</li> </ol>   |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | Mark Haggett (mark.haggett@charter.hcps.net)  |

#### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).**

## Part IV: Title I Requirements

### Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

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

RCMA Wimauma Academy has positive relationships with parents and families. They will continue to be positive relationships and will grow through many positive initiatives:

- \* monthly Wed. night parent meetings in which both students and their parents attend together, even though the content is mainly aimed towards the parents; given in both English and Spanish
- \* grade-level specific parent meetings that target areas of interest and need for specific grade levels
- \* monthly parent newsletter; given mostly in Spanish
- \* more frequent parent newsletters, as needed; in English and in Spanish
- \* open door policy with administration in which parents don't need an appointment to come talk to administration

\* frequent use of the robocall system, with calls and texts in both English and in Spanish

RCMA Wimauma Academy has many community partnerships, including but not limited to:

- \* retired professionals volunteer to tutor students
- \* Sun City Community Foundation provides grants
- \* Sun City Center's Interfaith Council provides grants
- \* Feeding America brings fresh vegetables and other foods periodically for parents to pick up twice per year in conjunction with a parent meeting
- \* Suncoast Community Health Care Center provides free dental services for our scholars by bringing their dental coach van to our campus

### PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

**Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.**

- \* There is one school-based "Counseling Coordinator" who is a full-time employee. He is certified as a School Psychologist certification issued from Puerto Rico. As he is bilingual and bicultural, he can better meet the linguistic needs of the school's scholars and their families.
- The school employs a part-time Certified Social Worker to assist with coordination of services between the school, the scholar and their family, and any outside mental health agency being used.
- \* School-based counseling occurs with these two staff members. As needs arise, students are referred to one of three community-based organizations for a higher level of counseling.
- All school staff will receive the Youth Mental Health First Aid training by a certified trainer
- School staff can identify students for placement in Tier 2 via the RCMA Internal Referral Form
- Students can self-identify a need using the Student Request for Services form.
- The School Counseling Coordinator will evaluate using the Children's Functional Assessment Rating Scale (CFARS) screening tool or the Screening, Brief Intervention, and Referral to Treatment (SBIRT)

Assessment for substance abuse.

- Retired professionals tutor and mentor students during After School.

**Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.**

We have a middle school on the same campus. Students see middle school students at areas that are common areas such as the cafetorium and in the office. Some of the middle school scholars have a period of "work" in the middle school classrooms as teacher aides, so there is interaction with the students from both schools.

We hold 5 sessions of Padres Comprometidos, and parent education program for parents that are given in Spanish, for the parents of the Fifth Graders in order to help parents help their child to transition to middle school.

**Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.**

RCMA Wimauma Academy coordinates with federal and state and private programs to integrate services to best meet the needs of students and the school. Title I funds are used to deliver professional development designed to increase student achievement. Title I funds and private grants provide support materials for migrant students, such as bilingual dictionaries, Spanish language reading materials and reading remediation materials.

Title III funds are accessed by linking test results of ELL students' FSA and WIDA results with purchased instructional materials. The Director of Professional Development and Data Analysis coordinates the expenditures of the Title III funds. The Reading Resource teacher assists with the inventory.

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.**

At the elementary level, the way our school implements this looks different from the way our middle school implements this.

We have many community partnerships that extend our scholars real-world experiences, and meeting people of different cultural and socio-economic backgrounds. Our school population is rather homogenous in socio-economic, cultural, and linguistic background. We also have four field trips per year per homeroom, which we fund through a grant. We feel these real-world experiences and interactions with people help our scholars imagine a life beyond their current environment. Due to the economic as well as cultural/linguistic challenges of many of our students' families, our students have limited access to many experiences, so our school feels that including these experiences in their schooling, will prepare them to envision more possibilities for careers for themselves.