

School District of Osceola County, FL

# Victory Charter School K 5



## 2021-22 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>16</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>25</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>26</b> |

## Victory Charter School K 5

2880 N. ORANGE BLOSSOM TRAIL, Kissimmee, FL 34741

<https://victorycharterk5.org/>

### Demographics

**Principal: Mark Viera**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/10/2021

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <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-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2020-21 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | English Language Learners*<br>Hispanic Students*<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: No Grade<br>2017-18: No Grade<br>2016-17: No Grade                              |
| <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>   |  |
| * 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 Osceola 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>16</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>26</b> |

## Victory Charter School K 5

2880 N. ORANGE BLOSSOM TRAIL, Kissimmee, FL 34741

<https://victorycharterk5.org/>

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>KG-5                        | Yes                    | 84%  |
| 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                    | 97%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2020-21 |
|-------|---------|
| Grade |         |

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Osceola 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 the School is to implement a curriculum that integrates the skills and strategies that students need to be ready to learn and express themselves positively with a solid core academic program while inculcating, respect, ethics and mindfulness. Scholars will reach their full potential and become valuable citizens in their community, state, and country.

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

Empower each scholar to become his or her best self through achieving balance in the social, emotional, physical and intellectual capacities required to positively lead their lives and influence others in the community.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

| Name           | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|----------------|----------------|--|
| Burgos, Jazmin | Principal      | <p>Oversees operations of the school.</p> <p>Oversees all professional development for faculty and staff.</p> <p>Sets vision and mission for school.</p> <p>Leads data analysis.</p> <p>Oversees grade level team for lesson planning and data analysis Monitors weekly data meetings and discusses expectations with teachers.</p> <p>Requires teachers to identify their lowest 25% and those projected to perform below grade level in Reading, Writing, Math, and Science Requires teachers to identify their students' areas of need, requiring data to support their decisions.</p> <p>Requires teachers to identify the types of intervention being provided for those students and the research based materials being used Monitors student growth with the use of benchmarks, mini assessment, and other classroom data provided by the teachers as well as all progress monitoring done with intervention groups Provides teachers with resources and assistance analyzing data Offers support for effective ways to progress monitor students and make decisions about their academic need.</p> |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Tuesday 8/10/2021, Mark Viera

**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.*

0

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

14

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

300

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.**

3

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.**

18

### Demographic Data

## Early Warning Systems

### 2021-22

**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 | 48 | 60 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 166   |
| 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  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 3  | 14 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 39    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 25 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 46    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 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 | 2 | 9 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 26    |

**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 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

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

Tuesday 10/5/2021

**2020-21 - 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               | 29          | 45 | 36 | 39 | 33 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 221   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 10          | 16 | 8  | 8  | 13 | 9  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 64    |
| 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  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4  | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3  | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |

**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 | 3 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14    |

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

**2020-21 - 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               | 29          | 45 | 36 | 39 | 33 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 221   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 10          | 16 | 8  | 8  | 13 | 9  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 64    |
| 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  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4  | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3  | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |

#### 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 | 3 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14    |

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

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data Review

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      | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       | 2018   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             |        |          |       |        | 53%      | 57%   |        | 51%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       |        | 56%      | 58%   |        | 54%      | 55%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       |        | 51%      | 53%   |        | 46%      | 48%   |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       |        | 55%      | 63%   |        | 54%      | 62%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       |        | 59%      | 62%   |        | 56%      | 59%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       |        | 45%      | 51%   |        | 42%      | 47%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       |        | 49%      | 53%   |        | 51%      | 55%   |

### Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

**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 |
| 03                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

### Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

**Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.**

The school used the iReady universal screener to compile the data below.

| Grade 1               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 23%  | 27%    | 40%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |      |        |        |
| Mathematics           | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 25%  | 13%    | 22%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |      |        |        |
| Grade 2               |                            |      |        |        |
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 24%  | 25%    | 28%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |      |        |        |
| Mathematics           | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 20%  | 11%    | 29%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |      |        |        |

| Grade 3               |   |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency  | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students  | 31%  | 36%    | 37%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners |      |        |        |
| Mathematics           | Number/% Proficiency  | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students  | 0%   | 20%    | 34%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners |      |        |        |
| Grade 4               |   |      |        |        |
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency  | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students  | 16%  | 9%     | 10%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners |      |        |        |
| Mathematics           | Number/% Proficiency  | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students  | 19%  | 13%    | 31%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners |      |        |        |

| Grade 5               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 11%  | 24%    | 29%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |      |        |        |
| Mathematics           | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 0%   | 14%    | 40%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |      |        |        |
| Science               | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               |      |        |        |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      |        |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |      |        |        |

## Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 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 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| ELL                                       | 30       | 52     |             | 28        | 43      |              | 5        |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 32       | 50     |             | 26        | 43      |              | 8        |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 31       | 33     |             | 19        | 29      |              | 11       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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 |
|   |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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 |
|   |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |

## ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index  |     |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  |     |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 31  |
| 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 | 38  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 188 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 6   |
| Percent Tested  | 99% |
| 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                                       | 33  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | YES |
| 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  | 33  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | YES |
| 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 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                                | 27  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |

## Analysis

### Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

#### What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Meaningful growth was seen in some grade levels and content areas. However, the school overall did not substantially improve outcomes for students across all grade levels and content areas.

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

N/A this school has no data prior to 2021 State Assessment Data.

#### What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

N/A this school has no data prior to 2021 State Assessment Data.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

N/A this school has no data prior to 2021 State Assessment Data.

**What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

N/A this school has no data prior to 2021 State Assessment Data.

**What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?**

Instructional focus on Tier 1 Reading and Math instruction will be needed. Adopting the Wit and Wisdom curriculum along with fidelity of implementation of the Eureka math curriculum will strengthen the core instruction across all grade levels. Given how low proficiency scores and learning gains were across all domains and grade levels it is also necessary to focus on the implementation of a research based MTSS program.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

Teachers will be provided on going professional development; beginning with the pre-service weeks in August 2021 and continuing through a robust PLC program (common planning, early release PD and Saturday Morning Round Tables); in maximizing Tier 1 Instruction through fidelity of implementation of the Wit and Wisdom (ELA) and Eureka (math) curriculums. This PD will be provided by a combination of the publisher and instructional coaches well versed in the use of the curriculums.

**Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.**

The school, due to an increase in enrollment, has hired an instructional coach and an Assistant Principal to provide additional coaching to teachers to ensure fidelity of implementation of the schools chosen research-based curriculums.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:



**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | Victory Charter School K-5 opened in August 2020; therefore, only 1 year of standardized assessment results are on file for analysis. School leadership utilized data points from the School average of 32% in reading accountability areas to determine area of focus. Data indicates a need to strengthen Tier one instruction and a structured Tier two intervention program followed with fidelity to improve reading comprehension skills.  |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | Victory Charter School K-5 will achieve a minimum of 51% proficiency rate in reading comprehension as evidenced by the 2022 FSA administration.  |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | This area of focus will be monitored through universal screener data (iReady) along with in house developed benchmark assessments using mastery connect. Universal screeners are conducted three times a year and the benchmark assessments are conducted twice a quarter.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Jazmin Burgos (jburos@victorycharterschools.org)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | The school will utilize a research-based suite of curriculum and instructional tools to form a comprehensive MTSS process driven by a backwards-design approach to lesson planning informed by formative and summative assessments. The Universal Screeners utilized by the school will drive not only student tiering but their specific instructional programs at the Tier 2 and Tier 3 levels. Tier one instruction will be based on the curriculum, Wonders and ReadingPlus. Tier two instruction will be based on the utilization of i- Ready Online Instruction. Tier three instruction will be based on the utilization of i-Ready Toolbox. Given the school's high number of Tier two students, the assessment results will be used particularly to design specific standard-based lessons for intervention-based instruction. |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | Studies show that the analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in the teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessments to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Marzano (2003), Reeves (2010), Dufour, et al (2010).  |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Provide teachers with professional development on instructional planning and methodology.
2. Provide teachers with professional development on the Wit and Wisdom Curriculum (August 2021 and ongoing).
3. Administer three i-Ready Diagnostics assessments (September 2021, December 2021 and May 2022)
4. Implement the MTSS tiered instructional program with fidelity.
5. Departmentalize the elementary schedule for grades K-5, so that one teacher instructs reading and social studies and the other teacher instructs mathematics and science. This will allow teachers to become experts in content (August 2021).
6. Conduct data chats for students/teachers on the baseline data acquired from the 2021 FSA and the ongoing progress monitoring assessments from i-Ready.

**Person Responsible** Jazmin Burgos (jburos@victorycharterschools.org)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | Victory Charter School K-5 opened in August 2020; therefore, only one year of standardized assessment results are on file for analysis. School leadership utilized data points from the school average of 27% in math accountability areas to determine area of focus. Data indicates a need to strengthen Tier one instruction and a structured Tier two intervention program followed with fidelity to improve math skills.  |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | Victory Charter School K-5 will achieve a minimum of 51% proficiency rate in math as evidenced by the 2021 FSA administration.   |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | This area of focus will be monitored through universal screener data (iReady) along with in house developed benchmark assessments using mastery connect. Universal screeners are conducted three times (September 2021, December 2021, May 2022) a year and the benchmark assessments are conducted twice a quarter.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Jazmin Burgos (jburos@victorycharterschools.org)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | <p>Evidence- based Strategy:<br/> Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy:<br/> Victory Charter School K-5 will achieve a minimum of 62% proficiency rate in math as evidenced by the 2021 FSA administration.<br/> Guillermo Moreno (gmoreno@victorycharterschools.org)<br/> The school will utilize a research-based suite of curriculum and instructional tools to form a comprehensive MTSS process for mathematics driven by a backwards-design approach to lesson planning informed by formative and summative assessments. The Universal Screeners utilized by the school will drive not only student tiering but their specific instructional programs at the Tier 2 and Tier 3 levels. Tier one instruction will be based on the curriculum, Eureka. Tier two instruction will be based on the utilization of i-Ready Online Instruction. Tier three instruction will be based on the utilization of i- Ready Toolbox.</p>       |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | In order for students to meet grade level expectations, it is important to determine their level in each Math Strand and when necessary, intervene accordingly. Assessing students with researched-based programs, will provide teachers a guide to enhance the curriculum to meet students' needs. Eureka Math's strong, research-based curriculum, which comes with its own unit and standard-based formative and summative assessments, will ensure all teachers have a strong base of curriculum and assessment tools in mathematics. Research illustrates a correlation between student achievement and the development of an achievable, rigorous and aligned curriculum. Additionally, schools that consistently utilize common assessments have the greatest student achievement. The use of common formative assessments, when well implemented, can effectively double the speed of learning, (William. 2007), (Marzano, 2003) |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Provide teachers with professional development on instructional planning and methodology.
2. Provide teachers with professional development on the Eureka Math curriculum from the company (August 2021).
3. Administer three i-Ready Diagnostics assessments (September 2021, December 2021 and May 2022) for progress monitoring throughout the year (August 2021-June 2022).
4. Implement the MTSS tiered instructional program with fidelity.
5. Departmentalize the elementary schedule for grades K-5, so that one teacher instructs reading and

social studies and the other teacher do mathematics and science. This will allow teachers to become experts in content (August 2021).

6. Conduct data chats for students and teachers on the baseline data acquired from the 2021 FSA and the ongoing progress monitoring assessments from i-Ready.

7. Provide professional development to all the Math teachers on the implementation of Eureka by Math Coach experienced using this curriculum (August 2021).

**Person Responsible** Jazmin Burgos (jburgos@victorycharterschools.org)

**#3. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | Strengthen collaborative processes to ensure that the learning needs of all students are met and that educators can share best practices so that the strength of some may become the strength of the entire instructional staff.<br>Research states, that if teachers participate in authentic collaborative teams, that produce engaging lessons using high yield strategies and best practices and are monitoring the progress to guide the instruction, then the student achievement will increase.  |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | ELA, Math proficiency and gains will be at least at 51% in all subgroups. Science proficiency will be at least at 51% in all subgroups  |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | This area of focus will be monitored through universal screener data (iReady) along with in house developed benchmark assessments using mastery connect. Universal screeners are conducted three times (September 2021, December 2021, May 2022) a year and the benchmark assessments are conducted twice a quarter.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Jazmin Burgos (jburos@victorycharterschools.org)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | When using the PLC strategy, department teams meet weekly, they: analyze student data, plan together, and learn from each other approaches, strategies, and techniques in order to increase student achievement. This strategy will be enhanced with the Instructional Rounds process for the 2020-2021 school year which will take collaboration beyond planning and allow teachers to view one another's approaches to instruction in an actual classroom setting (either digital or face-to-face). PLCs will be specifically structured to ensure targeted outcomes such as a mutual and collaborative understanding of student challenges, targeted and memorialized next steps that assess key gaps indicated by formative and summative assessments, and the memorialization of additional questions or inquiries from each session that will drive the focus of subsequent PLC meetings and efforts.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | With effective PLCs, educators within the organization embrace high levels of learning for all students as both the reason the organization exists and the fundamental responsibility of themselves. To achieve this purpose, PLC members create and are guided by a clear and compelling vision of organizational goals for student learning. They make collective commitments clarifying what each member will do to create such an organization, and they use results-oriented goals to mark their progress. Members work together to clarify exactly what each student must learn, monitor each student's learning on a timely basis, provide systematic interventions that ensure students receive additional time and support for learning when they struggle, and extend and enrich learning when students have already mastered the intended outcomes. Teachers may be more willing to openly discuss concerns and doubts if they have the opportunity to play the role of leader (Dufour, 2010). |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Create a Master Schedule in which teachers have the same common planning.
2. Administrator will meet with the teachers weekly to work as a PLC for the purpose of assessing, analyzing, reflecting, and revising plans on course progression of individual student's needs as a Collaborative team.
3. Norms are created and followed.
4. Standards are analyzed for a clear expectation.
5. Administrator will monitor all accountability area of collaborative teams to ensure time is
6. To enhance the PLC process with real-time instructional examples, teachers will utilize their planning periods and/or be provided coverage to observe one another's lesson for specific "Look Fors" based on

the topic of analysis for that segment of the PLC sequence. Targets will include digital instruction strategies, student engagement techniques, and the utilization of higher-level questioning and rigor.

**Person**  
**Responsible** Jazmin Burgos (jburgos@victorycharterschools.org)

**#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus</b>                              | ESSA requires that school's sub groups should not be below 41 %. When schools are below this percentage, it affects the proficiency and student achievement as seen throughout the state reporting of school data.   |
| <b>Description and Rationale:</b>                 |  |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | Victory Charter School K-5 will achieve a minimum of 41% proficiency rate in all ESSA Subgroups (Hispanic, ELL, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students) as evidenced by the 2021 FSA administration.  |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | This area of focus will be monitored through universal screener data (iReady) along with in house developed benchmark assessments using mastery connect. Universal screeners are conducted three times (September 2021, December 2021, May 2022) a year and the benchmark assessments are conducted twice a quarter.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Jazmin Burgos (jburgos@victorycharterschools.org)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | Teachers will differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms seeking to provide appropriately challenging learning experiences for all their students.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | Tomlinson and Imbeau (2010) describe differentiation as creating a balance between academic content and students' individual needs. They suggest that this balance is achieved by modifying four specific elements related to curriculum:<br>Content- the information and skills that students need to learn<br>Process- how students make sense of the content being taught<br>Product- how students demonstrate what they have learned<br>Affect - the feelings and attitudes that affect students' learning |

**Action Steps to Implement**

- 1) Members of all subgroups will be identified for teachers so that a data analysis of their universal screener can be conducted to identify areas of needs in reading and Math.
- 2) For all subgroups, a comprehensive profile analysis will be conducted to determine the students that comprise each ESSA group and their gaps will be identified i.e. credit acquisition, grades etc.
- 3) For ESE, an analysis of the Individual Educational Plan goals and objectives will be conducted and classroom performance cross references will be done to ensure that the student is accessing the general education in a least restrictive environment but still is being successful.
- 4) For all subgroups, the implementation of MTSS will be done with fidelity and appropriate Tier 2 and 3 services will be provided to meet the needs noted in their Universal Screener.

**Person Responsible** Jazmin Burgos (jburgos@victorycharterschools.org)

- 5) For all subgroups, through participation in ReadingPlus and MyPath Edgenuity is part of Tier 1, an additional pathway with academic support will be provided to ensure an increased rate of growth in reading and math. For example, in ReadingPlus, members of the subgroup will do an extra SeeReader a week at their independent level.
- 6) For all subgroups, using school site authored course flowcharts, an emphasis will be placed on providing them the opportunity to participate in higher level courses to enrich and challenge their academic performance.
- 7) For all subgroups, after school tutorial programs will be made available to further close their data driven academic gaps in reading and math.

**Person Responsible** Jazmin Burgos (jburgos@victorycharterschools.org)

8) For ESE, general education teachers will be provided consultation and professional development on how to effectively implement accommodations in the general education classes to ensure students acquire standards taught and are able to successfully demonstrate an understanding of the lessons via assessments and classwork.

9) For ESE students, support facilitation specialists will receive training on how to support students with various ESE strategies including multiple means of expression for specific mathematics and reading standards.

**Person Responsible** Jazmin Burgos (jburgos@victorycharterschools.org)

**#5. Other specifically relating to School-Wide Post Secondary Culture for all Students****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

A college-going culture builds the expectation of postsecondary education for all students—not just the best students, including at the elementary level. It inspires the best in every student, and it supports students in achieving their goals. Students who have the parental, school, and community expectations that college is the next step after high school see college as the norm. However, the idea that college is the next step after high school may seem unrealistic for those students who are from one or more of the following groups: low achievers, middle to low-income levels, underrepresented minorities, disabled youth, and families where no one has attended college before.

**Measurable Outcome:** Victory Charter School K-5 will be closely monitoring students grades. In 2021-2022, VCS K-5 will see an increase by 10% in grades A, B, and C after each marking period.

**Monitoring:** The school will use quarterly progress reports and report cards to monitor for the desired outcome.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jazmin Burgos (jburgos@victorycharterschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Schools with a strong future orientation, that engage all students in planning for life after graduation, even at the elementary grade levels. With effective school-based teams that are anchors of implementing postsecondary work. Which shape a culture of success in which students aspire to a quality life beyond school. Then in such schools, students will fully participate in their academic and personal development to access a variety of opportunities to meet their needs.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Students should be supported in their efforts to reflect on their future and should have multiple opportunities to do so. A school culture committed to promoting students' aspirations for continuing their education must expand beyond just lessons student lessons alone (Poliner & Lieber 2004).

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Students will be supported, advised, and encouraged in an environment that fosters post secondary college and career readiness for success in school and in life.
2. The school will participate in an articulated set of grade-level sequenced activities that focus on personal development and career exploration as well as the discussion of how they can plan their secondary school career to ensure that college is an option.
3. Teachers will enhance study skills and metacognitive skills that promote goal setting, self-assessment, time management, and planning.
4. Teachers will plan to incorporate activities that will practice 21st-century life skills (STEM Projects).

**Person**

**Responsible** Jazmin Burgos (jburgos@victorycharterschools.org)

5. The school will create a plan that creates all environment that develops greater bonds with peers, usually cutting across the exclusionary social groups.
6. VCS K-5 students will participate in career day. Students will dress up in careers that they would like to have when graduating high school.

**Person**

**Responsible** Jazmin Burgos (jburgos@victorycharterschools.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**



Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

**The school opened during the 2020-2021 school year. Therefore no data for the 2019-2020 school year is available. However, the school leadership team has met extensively to account for the fact that students returning to school after the pandemic after being out of a school building for so long, as well as those students that were in face-to-face instruction last year but in a much less populated building may also have an adjustment period. High-level infractions and/or major incidents that may require suspensions will be treated on a case by case basis given the unprecedented level of environmental factors. Adding to this, the school will take into account the possibility of a home life impacted by the pandemic such as family member loss of work, geographic displacement and mobility due to the pandemic, health issues in the family, and more.**

#### **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.**

Instilling an appreciation of the value of higher education will be a priority at the school. The school climate will be a positive one that promotes shared values, mutual respect, and mindfulness. The school will embody the skills and values the students will be expected to adopt, and therefore, all school stakeholders will work to implement an academic program where all curriculum and activities are geared toward the vision and mission of the school.

##### **Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports**

An integral aspect of maintaining a positive and "Ready to Learn" learning environment is a school's structured effort towards promoting positive behavior and addressing discipline issues in a structured, fair, and consistent manner. Given the need for behavioral training and many of our students' lack of ability to express themselves in a way that is conducive to a positive learning environment for social, emotional, psychological, environmental, and other reasons:

- Designing and structuring a well-sequenced and comprehensive classroom behavior escalation process and ensuring that discipline is addressed consistently across the school
- Adjust the counseling, preventative, and support services provided to ALL students as part of PBIS Tier I supports
- Further differentiating and more frequently communicating the student incentives for positive behavior within the classroom
- Creating a more structured monitoring process and provide further guidance on how teachers use system

to communicate students' positive behavioral and academic accomplishments to parents and families.

A positive and safe school culture and climate will be a key priority for the school accomplished through a comprehensive MTSS process for behavior and empowered further through the Smiling Minds curriculum which provides intensive emotional and social support for students. Parent and community involvement will also be highly prioritized via a structured parent communication plan and consistent, planned touch points between parents, teachers, and administrators for both student behavior and academic progress.

### Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

School Leadership - holding all stakeholder accountable to the fidelity of implementation and follow through in the use of the schools PBIS.

Teachers - implementing the PBIS within their classrooms with fidelity. Educating students on the schools PBIS and encouraging students to participate appropriately.

Students - following the schools rules and PBIS

Parents - supporting the schools PBIS and rules at home, working together with teachers and school leadership to encourage their children to participate in the PBIS.

## Part V: Budget

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

|          |               |  |  |                |     |                    |
|----------|---------------|--|--|----------------|-----|--------------------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA</b>               |  |                |     | <b>\$46,033.00</b> |
|          | Function      | Object   | Budget Focus   | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22            |
|          | 5100          | 500-Materials and Supplies                                       | 0203 - Victory Charter School K 5  | General Fund   |     | \$37,163.00        |
|          |               |  | <i>Notes: Wit and wisdom digital curriculum, digital teacher's edition, and physical books for grades K-2.</i> |                |     |                    |
|          | 5100          | 500-Materials and Supplies                                       | 0203 - Victory Charter School K 5  | General Fund   |     | \$8,870.00         |
|          |               |  | <i>Notes: I-Ready reading Universal Screener and digital intervention program for grades K-5.</i>              |                |     |                    |
| <b>2</b> | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math</b>              |  |                |     | <b>\$9,605.00</b>  |
|          | Function      | Object   | Budget Focus   | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22            |
|          | 5100          | 500-Materials and Supplies                                       | 0203 - Victory Charter School K 5  | General Fund   |     | \$9,605.00         |
|          |               |  | <i>Notes: Eureka math</i>  |                |     |                    |
| <b>3</b> | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team</b> |  |                |     | <b>\$3,840.48</b>  |
|          | Function      | Object   | Budget Focus   | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22            |
|          | 5100          | 120-Classroom Teachers   | 0203 - Victory Charter School K 5  | General Fund   |     | \$3,000.00         |
|          |               |  | <i>Notes: Team Leader Stipend</i>  |                |     |                    |
|          | 6500          | 529-Technology-Related Textbooks                                 | 0203 - Victory Charter School K 5  | Other Federal  |     | \$840.48           |
|          |               |  | <i>Notes: ESSER funds used for OnCourse lesson planning software.</i>  |                |     |                    |

|        |        |  |             |
|--------|--------|--|-------------|
| 4      | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups             | \$0.00      |
| 5      | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Other: School-Wide Post Secondary Culture for all Students | \$0.00      |
| Total: |        |  | \$59,478.48 |