

Martin County School District

Spectrum Academy



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Spectrum Academy

800 SE BAHAMA AVE, Stuart, FL 34994

martinschools.org/o/sa

Demographics

Principal: Janice Mills

Start Date for this Principal: 8/18/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Martin County School Board on 8/18/2020.

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.

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Spectrum Academy

800 SE BAHAMA AVE, Stuart, FL 34994

martinschools.org/o/sa

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 6-12	Yes	%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year

Grade

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Martin County School Board on 8/18/2020.

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.

Achieve academic success for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Provide a quality supportive environment.

Belief statements:

1. All students have the right to a quality education and can achieve academic growth.
2. Education is a continuous learning process.
3. The community offers resources that enhance global awareness and support a safe learning environment.
4. Continuous communication and support exist among parents, students, and school.
5. Provide new beginnings for all students
6. Employ a dedicated staff who set high standards for academic growth and success.
7. We will create and support a school environment in which all students have a positive successful learning experience.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Mills, Janice	Principal	
Kaufman, Elaine	Dean	
Neller, Kris	School Counselor	
Wrocklage, Liz	Teacher, K-12	
Adriel, Robert	Teacher, ESE	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/18/2020, Janice Mills

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

9

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	24	9	11	18	26	92	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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	4	24	9	11	18	26	92

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	4	12	0	0	0	0	16	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	0	0	0	0	16	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/18/2020

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		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	19	10	19	15	28	109	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	19	10	19	15	28	109	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	19	10	19	15	28	109	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	11	0	0	0	3	26	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	15	9	15	16	9	75	

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	3	15	19	10	19	15	28	109	

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	2	10	11	0	0	0	3	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	11	0	0	0	3	26

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	19	10	19	15	28	109
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	19	10	19	15	28	109
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	19	10	19	15	28	109
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	11	0	0	0	3	26
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	15	9	15	16	9	75

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	3	15	19	10	19	15	28	109

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	2	10	11	0	0	0	3	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	11	0	0	0	3	26

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%	71%	56%	0%	67%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	59%	51%	0%	56%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	55%	42%	0%	40%	41%
Math Achievement	0%	69%	51%	0%	63%	49%
Math Learning Gains	0%	52%	48%	0%	62%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	46%	45%	0%	59%	39%
Science Achievement	0%	82%	68%	0%	76%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	84%	73%	0%	79%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	0%	57%	-57%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	10%	53%	-43%	52%	-42%
	2018	0%	57%	-57%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
08	2019	11%	62%	-51%	56%	-45%
	2018	19%	63%	-44%	58%	-39%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
09	2019	9%	61%	-52%	55%	-46%
	2018	9%	62%	-53%	53%	-44%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
10	2019	8%	59%	-51%	53%	-45%
	2018	10%	59%	-49%	53%	-43%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	0%	64%	-64%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	18%	60%	-42%	54%	-36%
	2018	0%	65%	-65%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				
08	2019	5%	67%	-62%	46%	-41%
	2018	6%	66%	-60%	45%	-39%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	0%	58%	-58%	48%	-48%
	2018	5%	57%	-52%	50%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	19%	74%	-55%	67%	-48%
2018	13%	73%	-60%	65%	-52%
Compare		6%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	77%	-77%	71%	-71%
2018	0%	79%	-79%	71%	-71%
Compare		0%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	18%	78%	-60%	70%	-52%
2018	21%	74%	-53%	68%	-47%
Compare		-3%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	7%	75%	-68%	61%	-54%
2018	0%	70%	-70%	62%	-62%
Compare		7%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	11%	65%	-54%	57%	-46%
2018	0%	61%	-61%	56%	-56%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		11%			

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
HSP											
WHT											
FRL											
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
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	14
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	81
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	76%

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%	0

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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	0
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
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%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	0
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

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.

Although the data available is limited, the staff at Spectrum believes the component that is showing the lowest performance is ELA. This has been the case for a number of years and continues to be so. Students are coming to Spectrum and are missing critical reading skills.

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

Although the data available is limited, the staff at Spectrum believes the component that continues to have the greatest decline from prior years is ELA. This has been the case for a number of years and continues to be so. Students are coming to Spectrum and are missing critical reading skills.

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.

Although the data available is limited, the staff at Spectrum believes the component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is ELA. This has been the case for a number of years and continues to be so. Students are coming to Spectrum and are missing critical reading skills.

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

Although the data available is limited, the staff at Spectrum believes the component that is showed the most improvement was the graduation rate.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

1. The high number of middle school students who have been retained in elementary school and again in middle school.
2. The high number of students who do not have the literacy skills to pass the required 10th grade reading FSA for graduation requirement.

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

1. Systemic approach to providing academic and emotional supports to students impacted by trauma.
2. School wide literacy approach with a laser focus on English Language Learners.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Systemic approach to providing academic and emotional supports to students impacted by trauma. Students impacted by trauma are lacking in five key areas: connection, security, achievement, autonomy, and fulfillment. When a systemic approach is in place for all stakeholders supporting students who are impacted by trauma then academic achievement can be attained.

Measurable Outcome: The outcome is intended to increase the number of students meeting the required graduation requirements therefore helping to decrease the districts overall drop out rate.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Janice Mills (millsj@martin.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Working with the National Dropout Prevention Center on 15 researched based strategies to support students impacted by trauma.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research that the National Dropout Prevention Center has done over the years regarding students impacted by trauma. Following a systemic approach to being a Trauma-Skilled School.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: School wide literacy approach with a laser focus on English Language Learners. The demographic population has changed over the years and there has been a significant increase in servicing students where English is not their primary language. The district as a whole is performing below the state average for success of this subgroup. With the district performing below state average with the ELL subgroup the majority of students attending Spectrum have deficits in literacy skills across all groups of students.

Measurable Outcome: Increase the number of students reaching mastery on the FSA ELA and / or meeting the required concordance score on the ACT/SAT/PSAT meeting the graduation requirement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Janice Mills (millsj@martin.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Research that the National Center on Improving Literacy (NICL) has done over the years has been able to support educators and parents in understanding that reading skills lay the foundation for academic success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Learning to read in English requires teaching students how the alphabetic system works. Three issues are critical: 1. Understanding that each word when spoken consists of smaller units of sounds, and it is important to learn to hear and identify these discrete sounds; 2. Learning that the letters of the alphabet are symbols for these sounds; 3. Knowing that the purpose of reading is to understand the text, and understanding requires concentration and practice. Some words rarely used in everyday conversations are commonly used in academic settings. Learning the meaning of academic vocabulary is essential to understanding and applying new content. Teaching both unconditional reading skills and academic vocabulary need to be connected.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Hispanic

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: School wide literacy approach with a laser focus on English Language Learners. The demographic population has changed over the years and there has been a significant increase in servicing students where English is not their primary language. The district as a whole is performing below the state average for success of this subgroup. With the district performing below state average with the ELL subgroup the majority of students attending Spectrum have deficits in literacy skills across all groups of students.

Measurable Outcome: Increase the number of students reaching mastery on the FSA ELA and / or meeting the required concordance score on the ACT/SAT/PSAT meeting the graduation requirement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kris Neller (nellerk@martin.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Research that the National Center on Improving Literacy (NICL) has done over the years has been able to support educators and parents in understanding that reading skills lay the foundation for academic success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Learning to read in English requires teaching students how the alphabetic system works. Three issues are critical: 1. Understanding that each word when spoken consists of smaller units of sounds, and it is important to learn to hear and identify these discrete sounds; 2. Learning that the letters of the alphabet are symbols for these sounds; 3. Knowing that the purpose of reading is to understand the text, and understanding requires concentration and practice. Some words rarely used in everyday conversations are commonly used in academic settings. Learning the meaning of academic vocabulary is essential to understanding and applying new content. Teaching both unconditional reading skills and academic vocabulary need to be connected.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to White

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	School wide literacy approach. Spectrum have deficits in literacy skills across all subgroups of students.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the number of students reaching mastery on the FSA ELA and / meeting the required concordance score on the ACT/SAT/PSAT meeting the graduation requirement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kris Neller (nellerk@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Research that the National Center on Improving Literacy (NICL) has done over the years has been able to support educators and parents in understanding that reading skills lay the foundation for academic success.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Learning to read requires teaching students how the alphabetic system works. Three issues are critical: 1. Understanding that each word when spoken consists of smaller units of sounds, and it is important to learn to hear and identify these discrete sounds; 2. Learning that the letters of the alphabet are symbols for these sounds; 3. Knowing that the purpose of reading is to understand the text, and understanding requires concentration and practice. Some words rarely used in everyday conversations are commonly used in academic settings. Learning the meaning of academic vocabulary is essential to understanding and applying new content. Teaching both unconditional reading skills and academic vocabulary need to be connected.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	School wide literacy approach. Spectrum have deficits in literacy skills across all subgroups of students.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the number of students reaching mastery on the FSA ELA and / meeting the required concordance score on the ACT/SAT/PSAT meeting the graduation requirement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kris Neller (nellerk@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Research that the National Center on Improving Literacy (NICL) has done over the years has been able to support educators and parents in understanding that reading skills lay the foundation for academic success.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Learning to read requires teaching students how the alphabetic system works. Three issues are critical: 1. Understanding that each word when spoken consists of smaller units of sounds, and it is important to learn to hear and identify these discrete sounds; 2. Learning that the letters of the alphabet are symbols for these sounds; 3. Knowing that the purpose of reading is to understand the text, and understanding requires concentration and practice. Some words rarely used in everyday conversations are commonly used in academic settings. Learning the meaning of academic vocabulary is essential to understanding and applying new content. Teaching both unconditional reading skills and academic vocabulary need to be connected.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Spectrum has established school wide behavioral expectations that are designed to create a positive learning environment based on demonstrating and rewarding appropriate behaviors, and taking responsibility for one's actions. The Positive Behavior Intervention Support collaborative learning team keeps all staff abreast regarding incidents on campus, discusses ways to minimize distractions and to keep students engaged during instructional time. Students who need more intensive social-emotional interventions are seen by contracted licensed counselors who maintain an office on campus. Mindset training and goal-setting skills are integrated into the curriculum to provide holistic education. Spectrum provides staff and parents with a clear MTSS process to ensure the school is meeting the academic and social-emotional needs of all students. A safe and secure learning environment at Spectrum has been established through our Student Handbook as well as the county's District Code of Conduct. By having only one entry and exit, we are able to control who enters campus. Once on campus, all students and guests have a single entry point, which is located in the front office. All visitors must be background checked and have a visible guest pass. In addition, all faculty, staff, and students must properly display their identification badges on lanyard at all times. Before, during, and after school there is a high visibility of administration, support staff, teachers, and the School Resource Officer -- all of which carry radios for communication. The school works on building positive relationships with families by using a variety of ways to communicate with families. Parents are informed of the schools mission and vision by means of the school website and school newsletters. Parents receive automated calls with pertinent school information and also receive personal calls with critical school information. Spectrum partners with local businesses to support the students and school. The students benefit from local partnerships that donate their time and other resources. Community partners are welcome and have an opportunity to witness the learning occurring in the school.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The school actively constructs positive relationships by using a variety of ways to communicate with families. Parents are informed of the schools mission and vision, upcoming events, and any schedule changes by means of the school website and monthly newsletters, as well as receiving pre-recorded phone calls regarding special events or pertinent information. Personalized phone calls are also made daily regarding a students being tardy or absent from school, in order to build trust and a relationship with parents/guardians. Lastly, parents and students are given access to FOCUS to better track student grades and attendance, and to be able to communicate with staff via email as needed.

We have several nights where we welcome families on campus. Curriculum Night is held in August shortly after school has started and parents/guardians are invited to meet the staff and discuss individual concerns. Additionally, parent/teacher conference nights will be held in November and April to assist parents/guardians in the use of FOCUS, ClassLink, and Edgenuity; those nights will also be used to discuss the general transition process, requirements to return to a comprehensive campus. Parent/teacher/student conferences are also scheduled throughout the school year as needed.

One "Little Free Library" has been placed off campus in the local community. The library is maintained by students/staff at Spectrum and is designed to increase literacy in the community. We are hopeful the library will strengthen the positive connection between school and our neighbors.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems				\$6,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	310-Professional and Technical Services	0073 - Spectrum Academy	Title, I Part A		\$6,000.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$10,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0073 - Spectrum Academy	Title, I Part A		\$10,000.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Hispanic				\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: White				\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Economically Disadvantaged				\$0.00
Total:						\$16,000.00