Orange County Public Schools

Renaissance Charter At Crown Point



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Renaissance Charter At Crown Point

83 WEST RD, Ocoee, FL 34761

www.charterschoolsusa.com

Demographics

Principal: Brett Taylor

Start Date for this Principal: 4/23/2024

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-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)	65%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info	rmation*
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 Orange 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.

Page 4 of 20

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Renaissance Charter At Crown Point

83 WEST RD, Ocoee, FL 34761

www.charterschoolsusa.com

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)		2020-21 Title I Schoo	l Disadvan	Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3)				
Combination School KG-8		No		60%				
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)		Charter School	(Reporte	Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2)				
K-12 General E	ducation	Yes		86%				
School Grades History								
Year Grade	2020-21	2019-20 B	2018-19 B	2017-18 C				

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange 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.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Pending, Brett Taylor

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

Total number of students enrolled at the school

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

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

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

Number of students enrolled

Attendance below 90 percent

One or more suspensions

Course failure in ELA

Course failure in Math

Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment

Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment

Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency

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

Indicator Grade Level Total

Students with two or more indicators

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator Grade Level Total

Retained Students: Current Year

Students retained two or more times

Date this data was collected or last updated

Pending

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator Grade Level Total

Number of students enrolled

Attendance below 90 percent

One or more suspensions

Course failure in ELA

Course failure in Math

Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment

Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment

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

Indicator Grade Level Total

Students with two or more indicators

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator Grade Level Total

Retained Students: Current Year

Students retained two or more times

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator Grade Level Total

Number of students enrolled

Attendance below 90 percent

One or more suspensions

Course failure in ELA

Course failure in Math

Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment

Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment

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

Indicator Grade Level Total

Students with two or more indicators

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator Grade Level Total

Retained Students: Current Year

Students retained two or more times

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 Grade Component	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				52%	62%	61%	49%	60%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				60%	60%	59%	44%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	55%	54%	49%	54%	52%
Math Achievement				44%	61%	62%	49%	60%	61%
Math Learning Gains				47%	60%	59%	48%	60%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	54%	52%	44%	55%	52%
Science Achievement				44%	56%	56%	31%	56%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				76%	74%	78%	85%	74%	77%

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 Comparisor
03	2021					
	2019	54%	55%	-1%	58%	-4%
Cohort Co	mparison					
04	2021					
	2019	58%	57%	1%	58%	0%
Cohort Co	mparison	-54%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	54%	-6%	56%	-8%
Cohort Co	mparison	-58%				
06	2021					
	2019	42%	52%	-10%	54%	-12%
Cohort Co	mparison	-48%				
07	2021					
	2019	49%	48%	1%	52%	-3%
Cohort Co	mparison	-42%			•	
08	2021					
	2019	61%	54%	7%	56%	5%
Cohort Co	mparison	-49%			-	

			MATH			
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	48%	62%	-14%	62%	-14%
Cohort Co	mparison				•	
04	2021					
	2019	54%	63%	-9%	64%	-10%
Cohort Co	mparison	-48%			•	
05	2021					
	2019	35%	57%	-22%	60%	-25%
Cohort Co	mparison	-54%				
06	2021					
	2019	31%	43%	-12%	55%	-24%
Cohort Co	mparison	-35%				
07	2021					
	2019	42%	49%	-7%	54%	-12%
Cohort Co	mparison	-31%				
08	2021					
	2019	38%	36%	2%	46%	-8%
Cohort Co	mparison	-42%	'		<u>'</u>	

	SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison		
05	2021							

	SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison		
	2019	44%	54%	-10%	53%	-9%		
Cohort Con	nparison							
08	2021							
	2019	17%	49%	-32%	48%	-31%		
Cohort Comparison -4		-44%						

		BIOLO	GY EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	80%	67%	13%	67%	13%
		CIVIC	S EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	75%	66%	9%	71%	4%
•		HISTO	RY EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
<u>'</u>		ALGEE	RA EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	68%	63%	5%	61%	7%
		GEOME	TRY 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.

		Grade 1		
	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			
		Grade 2		
	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			

		Grade 3		
	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			
		Grade 4		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

		Grade 5		
	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			
		Grade 6		
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities	Fall	Winter	Spring
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

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

		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			

Subgroup Data Review

		2021	SCHOO	DL GRAD	E COMF	PONENT	S BY SU	JBGRO	UPS		
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	12	30	31	14	35	39	16	20			
ELL	36	43	37	36	43	47	19	20			
ASN	42	47		55	35						
BLK	38	43	38	26	34	43	18	42	41		
HSP	48	49	38	38	36	41	28	34	79		
MUL	59	56		59	61		55				
WHT	49	41	40	45	42	64	44	80	57		
FRL	36	40	37	28	38	46	23	41	50		
		2019	SCHO	OL GRAD	E COMF	ONENT	S BY SU	JBGRO	UPS		
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	23	40	28	18	33	31		60	_		
ELL	45	52	50	35	50	50	36	61			

		2019	SCHOO	DL GRAD	E COMF	PONENT	S BY SU	JBGRO	UPS		
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
ASN	60	45		63	59		30				
BLK	42	53	54	35	42	39	35	67			
HSP	54	64	59	45	50	51	50	74			
MUL	72	38		44	43						
WHT	66	71	59	54	53	32	55	89	83		
FRL	47	57	58	37	44	42	35	75	83		
		2018	SCHO	OL GRAD	E COMF	ONENT	S BY SU	JBGRO	UPS		
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	15	32	35	21	34	30	10				
ELL	25	53	65	36	50	50					
ASN	62	60		64	55						
BLK	38	43	50	37	41	39	16	92			
HSP	49	45	45	48	49	46	28	75			
MUL	86			64							
	T 4	00	40	0.4		Ε0	47	0.E			1
WHT	54	39	40	61	52	58	47	85			

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	42
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	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	423
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	95%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
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	37
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	45
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	39
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%	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% Multiracial Students	
	58
Multiracial Students	58 NO
Multiracial Students Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Federal Index - Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	
Multiracial Students Federal Index - Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students Federal Index - Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% Pacific Islander Students	
Multiracial Students Federal Index - Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% Pacific Islander Students Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	NO
Multiracial Students Federal Index - Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? 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?	NO
Multiracial Students Federal Index - Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? 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? Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	NO
Multiracial Students Federal Index - Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? 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? Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% White Students	NO N/A

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	39
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?

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

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

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

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

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

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.

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

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

No activities were entered for this section.

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, 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.

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.

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

Part V: Budget

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