

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Kids Community College Southeast Middle Charter



2021-22 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	16
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	17

Kids Community College Southeast Middle Charter School

11513 MCMULLEN RD, Riverview, FL 33569

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Brandy Tackett

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2022-06-30
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: D (39%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

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	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Kids Community College Southeast Middle Charter School

11513 MCMULLEN RD, Riverview, FL 33569

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>15%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>79%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		D	D	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

Kid's Community College Southeast Middle School is dedicated to the well-being and educational success of every child. We aim to foster internationally-minded, lifelong learners who will help shape our global community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

KCC Southeast will use the Guiding Principles for charter schools as established by F.S. 1002.33(2)(a) in the following ways. We will:

a. Set, meet, and exceed high standards of student academic success and achievement while providing parents flexibility to choose among diverse educational opportunities within the state's public school system.

KCC SE will provide students with challenging curriculum founded in a transdisciplinary approach using the Next Generation Sunshine Standards and the PYP. This school will provide an additional diverse choice option not currently available in this geographic area of the county. KCC SE will meet and exceed these standards through our assessment program.

b. Demonstrate enhanced academic success and financial efficiency by combining responsibility with accountability-- the school district and parents will view KCC SE as an academic, administrative, and financially viable educational choice to send their children within the public school system.

c. Provide parents with sufficient information on whether their child is reading at grade level and whether the child gains at least a year's worth of learning for every year spent in the charter school by doing the following:

-Use a continuous progress program that combines foundational academics with individual student-centered performance measures. Student progress will be monitored and reported through individual development and education plans (IDEP's), parent-teacher and student-led conferences, portfolio reviews, student performance es and standardized testing. At all times, KCC SE will aim to support the family values and beliefs and to this end we endeavor to provide continual communication with parents and guardians in all aspects of the student's education and life. We will encourage interaction between family and school nu having a Board level parent liaison, a toll-free number to receive improvement suggestions, the creation of a Campus Advisory Committee, one-on-one orientation meetings with every enrolled student family (in order prior to set high expectations at the beginning of the school year) and monthly Board meetings with the staff, parents and community.

We will provide parents with sufficient information on their child's progress through compliance with Florida State Statutes and School District of Hillsborough County Policies in reading through timely assessments and reporting.

Parents will be informed in advance of the testing process and testing dates. testing results will be sent home to parents for discussion or explanation of results. Teachers will examine results for patterns of success and to identify areas in which changes are needed (either to curriculum or th the instructional approach.)

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
Bonich, Anna	Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Brandy Tackett

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

10

Total number of students enrolled at the school

220

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.

3

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	0	0	0	66	66	88	0	0	0	0	220
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	4
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	3	4	8	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	13	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	18	12	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	31	52	0	0	0	0	110
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	18	12	0	0	0	0	45

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	4	2	8	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	0	0	0	0	0	3	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

Thursday 9/9/2021

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	0	0	0	0	0	59	78	58	0	0	0	0	0	195
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	8	18	8	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	9	12	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	26	20	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	13	23	0	0	0	0	69

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	33	26	23	0	0	0	0	82

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	59	78	58	0	0	0	0	0	195
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	18	8	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	9	12	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	26	20	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	13	23	0	0	0	0	69

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	33	26	23	0	0	0	0	82

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				37%	51%	54%	47%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				41%	52%	54%	48%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	47%	47%	49%	48%	47%
Math Achievement				27%	55%	58%	51%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains				18%	57%	57%	51%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				35%	52%	51%	49%	52%	51%
Science Achievement				29%	47%	51%	35%	47%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				81%	67%	72%	46%	66%	72%

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
06	2021					
	2019	44%	53%	-9%	54%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	28%	54%	-26%	52%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
08	2021					
	2019	43%	53%	-10%	56%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	24%	49%	-25%	55%	-31%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	31%	62%	-31%	54%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-24%				
08	2021					
	2019	10%	31%	-21%	46%	-36%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	31%	47%	-16%	48%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	79%	67%	12%	71%	8%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	40%	63%	-23%	61%	-21%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady, Spring FSA, DIBEL/ORF

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

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
SWD	27	17		7	8						
ELL	28	38	42	14	31	42	10	45			
BLK	48	50	50	22	17	30	29	50	50		
HSP	38	36	32	26	36	52	31	61	60		
WHT	58	42		35	32			64			
FRL	41	33	26	18	28	37	19	44			
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	16	42	40	11	16						
ELL	24	35	25	19	17	25					
BLK	25	32	36	20	17	20		76			
HSP	40	42	47	30	24	47	28	85	45		

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
WHT	39	50	47	23	13	31	40	69			
FRL	50	55		30	20						
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	20	42	45	26	33						
ELL	22	44	50	22	33						
BLK	42	46	50	46	44	50		44			
HSP	49	49	38	48	48	41		46			
WHT	47	43		53	52			55			
FRL	38	38	50	43	41	33		42			

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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	447
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	15
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	36
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	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	46
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	31
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?

Math Proficiency is below state and district levels.

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

Math proficiency overall. Math Gains for all subgroups.

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

COVID cause us to have 45% of our students distance learning.

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

Reading Proficiency, Reading Gains, Math Proficiency, Math Gains.

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

45% of learners were online during the 2020-2021 school year. In spite of this, we grew from a school grade of a D to a C. Modifying intervention block to include remediation. Incorporating boot camps utilizing ESSER funds to include small groups and Saturday school and after-school tutoring.

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

Modification of math/reading intervention time to include targeting student needs. Incorporating iReady diagnostic and learning path.

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.

iReady training 3 times per year to ensure that we are cashing clean data and utilizing this data to drive instruction. Fidelity of implementation. Weekly PD to support instructional needs based on observation data and student deficiency.

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

Intervention block incorporating reading and math instructional standards. iReady utilization with diagnostic and learning path to target areas of need and acceleration for all learners.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

No activities were entered for this section.

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.

Anecdotal data. Discipline Data.

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.

Incorporating PD as appropriate for student need and teacher need. Teacher mentor program to support new teachers.

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

Assistant Campus Directors, Campus Directors, Instructional Leadership.

Part V: Budget

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

Total:	\$0.00
---------------	---------------