

Seminole County Public Schools

# Ucp Seminole Child Development



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>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>13</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>17</b> |

## Ucp Seminole Child Development

756 N SUN DR, Lake Mary, FL 32746

<http://www.ucpcdc.org/>

### Demographics

**Principal: Marife Gomez**

Start Date for this Principal: 9/4/2019

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>KG-2  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Alternative Education  |
| <b>2018-19 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 89%  |
| <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) |  |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: No Grade<br>2017-18: F (27%)<br>2016-17: No Grade<br>2015-16: No Grade<br>2014-15: No Grade |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | CS&I   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |  |

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Seminole County School Board.

## 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>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>13</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>17</b> |

## Ucp Seminole Child Development

756 N SUN DR, Lake Mary, FL 32746

<http://www.ucpcdc.org/>

### 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) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>KG-2                        | No                     | %  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| Alternative Education                            | Yes                    | %  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|
| Grade | F       |

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Seminole County School Board.

### 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 UCP Seminole Charter School is to empower children with and without disabilities to achieve their potential by providing individualized support, education and therapy services in an inclusive environment.

To create a fully inclusive learning community where all students, parents, and education professionals appreciate and value diversity in all forms. We will educate students to become conscientious, responsible citizens whereby they assume the role of life-long learners as they reflect upon and contribute to the cultural and civic life of the community. All students are supported to achieve high standards in both their academic and personal development through a research-based educational program utilizing an inquiry/project- based program integrating arts and technology.

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

UCP Seminole Campus is a place that fulfills the needs of our students. We are creating a community where everyone touched by a disability can excel, without limitations. There is evidence-based research that supports the belief that children with and without disabilities in an inclusive classroom achieve similar or better academic outcomes than their peers in non-inclusive classroom environments. Studies have shown that when placed in a classroom with their peers with disabilities, children without disabilities score higher on problem solving skills and empathy than those students who are not exposed to such a diverse environments. UCP Seminole is educating all kids differently. All students will be supported to achieve high standards in both their academic and personal development through a research-based educational program utilizing brain based and constructive approaches that are designed to engage students in problem solving activities at levels appropriate to their individual needs.

### 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   |
|---------------|-----------|---|
| Gomez, Marife | Principal | <p>The primary role of the Principal is oversight of campus-based instructional programs. This includes a participatory role in the selection and implementation of English Language Arts, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies programs; training of staff in the use of the program; oversight of data collection and MTSS processes; development of the campus tutoring program: formation and oversight of professional learning communities; implementation of agency teachers mentor-ship programs; and oversight of preparation for state standards-based assessments.</p> <p>Another vital role of the School Administrator is oversight of compliance with the individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA). A large percentage of students with disabilities at the UCP Seminole Campus PK-3rd (approximately 80%) are supported by an Individualized Education Program, or IEP; the school administrator works closely with staff to ensure that the IEP plans are carried out, that IEP timelines are fulfilled with fidelity, and that IEP goals, benchmarks, services, and accommodations are met to the greatest extent possible.</p> <p>A third role of the school administrator is to work with all school stakeholders, including students, parents, teachers, and UCP administration to ensure that the school fulfills all applicable health, safety, educational and therapeutic best practices and compliance requirements.</p> <p>The School Administrator monitors overall student achievement and determines if there are students in danger of not making learning gains that are predicted Level 1 and 2 students. The School Administrator, ensures their enrichment needs, resources, teacher support are appropriate, to share in the common goal of improving instruction as well as developing Professional Development courses that align with the school-wide Professional Development Plan.</p> |

## 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     | 17          | 13 | 13 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 53    |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 5           | 5  | 1  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11    |
| One or more suspensions         | 4           | 0  | 0  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 9  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 9  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |

#### 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 | 6           | 13 | 11 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 40    |

#### 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           | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6     |
| 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)

12

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

Wednesday 9/4/2019

#### Prior Year - As Reported

#### 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     | 2           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |
| 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 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |

#### 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 | 2           | 1 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11    |

#### 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     | 2           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |
| 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 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |

**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 | 2           | 1 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11    |

## 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             | 0%     | 67%      | 57%   | 0%     | 65%      | 55%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 0%     | 61%      | 58%   | 0%     | 60%      | 57%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 0%     | 51%      | 53%   | 0%     | 52%      | 52%   |
| Math Achievement            | 0%     | 70%      | 63%   | 0%     | 67%      | 61%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 0%     | 66%      | 62%   | 0%     | 61%      | 61%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 0%     | 50%      | 51%   | 0%     | 47%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 0%     | 62%      | 53%   | 0%     | 60%      | 51%   |

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator                       | Grade Level (prior year reported) |        |        | Total  |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
|                                 | K                                 | 1      | 2      |        |
| Number of students enrolled     | 17 (0)                            | 13 (0) | 13 (0) | 43 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 5 (2)                             | 5 (1)  | 1 (2)  | 11 (5) |
| One or more suspensions         | 4 (0)                             | 0 (0)  | 0 (0)  | 4 (0)  |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0 (0)                             | 0 (0)  | 0 (0)  | 0 (0)  |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 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 |

| MATH  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |

| SCIENCE |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |

### 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 |
| SWD                                       | 27       |        |             | 36        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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 |
| SWD                                       | 20       |        |             | 40        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 20       |        |             | 40        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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 |

### 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)  | CS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 30   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | YES  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 1    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency |      |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 60   |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 2    |
| Percent Tested  | 94%  |

| Subgroup Data  |     |
|--|-----|
| Students With Disabilities   |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     | 32  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?             | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%      |     |
| English Language Learners  |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      |     |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | N/A |
| 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  |     |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | N/A |
| 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 |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%            |     |
| Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students                                      |     |

| 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                                |     |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | N/A |
| 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.**

The area of lowest performance based on the indicators in this School Improvement Plan is that students achievement of the Florida Standards Assessment. Nine third graders obtained a Level 1 on the ELA assessment and nine students obtained a Level 1 on the mathematics assessment. One trend can be the transition to IReady as the students were learning how to use it. The year of 2018-19 was the second year that UCP Seminole assessed third grade students for the FSA and FSAA. Another trend could be that 10 out the 13 students that took the FSA ELA and FSA Math have disabilities.

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

None, because this is the first year that UCP Seminole have comparable data.

**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.**

On the FSA ELA assessment, 8% of students were proficient (levels 3). On the FSA Math test 23 % of students were proficient (levels 3) during the 2018-19 school year. The 3rd grade ELA had the largest gap between the school performance and the state performance on FSA. Both ELA and Math show the same gap between school percentile and state average.

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

None, because this is the first year that UCP Seminole have comparable data.

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

One concern is the type of students that UCP Seminole Charter enrolls based on our mission and vision. Currently 87% of the students at UCP Seminole Charter are students with disabilities. Although our attendance last year was 89%, this year the trend appears to be lower.

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

1. Increase attendance rate.
2. Increase FSA ELA scores for 3rd grade.
3. Increase FSA Math scores for 3rd grade.
- 4.
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

| #1  |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Title</b>  | Attendance  |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | The average quarterly attendance across all elementary school classrooms will be at least 91%.  |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | Increase attendance from 89.86% to 91% for the entire school year.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Marife Gomez (mgomez@ucpcf.org)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | <p>Use PBIS strategies such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Make school a welcoming and engaging place.</li> <li>2. Connect with at risk students.</li> <li>3. Involve parents.</li> <li>4. Award PBIS point for attendance achievement.</li> </ol>   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PBIS can be use at all grade levels, their is no equipment to purchase.</li> <li>2. It integrate to student information systems.</li> </ol>   |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |   |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teachers will monitor and communicate attendance concerns (excessive tardiest or absences) to School Administrator and Family Case Manager on a weekly basis; concerns will be logged and addressed immediately.</li> <li>2. Teacher will set conference with parents to discuss students attendance and the impact absences and tardies affect the learning gains of their students.</li> <li>3. During weekly attendance meetings, School Administrator and Family Service Case Manager will used a tiered system of communications to contact parent and communicate attendance concerns (phone, informal meetings, truancy meetings).</li> <li>4. School Administration will design and send home flyers in English and Spanish that discuss the positive correlation between academic performance and attendance.</li> <li>5. School Administrator obtain school-wide attendance levels from Agency Registrar once a month.</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | Marife Gomez (mgomez@ucpcf.org)   |

| #2  |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Title</b>  | Learning Gains-FSA English Language Arts  |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | The goal for the 2019-20 school year is for grade 3 student performance on FSA and FSAA assessments to show at least 26-49 percent of points on ELA. The school intends to obtain a School Improvement Rating of at least "maintaining" on 2020 standardize test.   |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | All elementary students will increase learning gains to at least 26-49 percent of points in ELA   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Marife Gomez (mgomez@ucpcf.org)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | Follow the Florida Multi Tier System of Support to increase student achievement.  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | We choose this strategy because it provides high quality instruction and interventions matched to student need using learning rate over time and level of performance to inform instructional decisions.<br>Resources: The Florida Multi Tiers System of Support website which includes educator and parent resources such as: guides and tools, opportunities for professional development, myths and truths for both for educators and parents.             |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |   |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Implement Tier 1 using: Book Source Mentor Texts, Zoo Phonics, Phonics 1st, Words Their Way and IReady.</li> <li>2. Implement Tier 2 using: Leveled Readers, IReady ,Fast Forward, Guided Reading and Core Connections</li> <li>3. Implement Tier 3 using: One on one intensive instruction, research based materials based on deficit found on Cpalms or UCP Education Website.</li> <li>4.</li> <li>5.</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | Marife Gomez (mgomez@ucpcf.org)   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>#3</b>   |   |
| <b>Title</b>  | Learning Gains-FSA Math   |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | The goal for the 2019-20 school year is for grade 3 student performance on FSA and FSAA assessments to show at least 26-49 percent of points on Math. The school intends to obtain a School Improvement Rating of at least "maintaining" on 2020 standardize test.  |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | All elementary students will increase learning gains to at least 26-49 percent of points in Math.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Marife Gomez (mgomez@ucpcf.org)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | Follow the Florida Multi Tier System of Support to increase student achievement.  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | We choose this strategy because it provides high quality instruction and interventions matched to student need using learning rate over time and level of performance to inform instructional decisions.<br>Resources: The Florida Multi Tiers System of Support website which includes educator and parent resources such as: guides and tools, opportunities for professional development, myths and truths for both for educators and parents. |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |   |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Implement Tier 1 using: IReady Math student work books.</li> <li>2. Implement Tier 2 using: IReady, Interventions at ability level, small leveled groups</li> <li>3. Implement Tier 3 using: One on one intensive instruction, research based materials based on deficit found on Cpalms or UCP Education Website.</li> <li>2.</li> <li>3.</li> <li>4.</li> <li>5.</li> </ol>                           |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | Marife Gomez (mgomez@ucpcf.org)   |

### 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.**

No longer Title 1.

#### **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.**

No longer Title 1

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

No longer Title 1.

**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.**

No longer Title 1.

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

No longer Title 1.

## **Part V: Budget**

**The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.**

|        |        |  |        |
|--------|--------|--|--------|
| 1      | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Attendance                               | \$0.00 |
| 2      | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Learning Gains-FSA English Language Arts | \$0.00 |
| 3      | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Learning Gains-FSA Math                  | \$0.00 |
| Total: |        |  | \$0.00 |