
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	12
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 7/1/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	English Language Learners* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: D (39%) 2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: 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	CSI
* 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 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.

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	12
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Victory Charter School K 5

2880 N. ORANGE BLOSSOM TRAIL, Kissimmee, FL 34741

<https://victorycharterk5.org/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	97%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21
Grade	D	

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.

To awaken and develop the socially responsible, technologically literate, and self-motivated leader within ALL students via an innovative, internationally focused, and student-centered curriculum that challenges students intellectually, creatively, and personally in a nurturing and safe environment that promotes the development of the total child so that they can be successful in an interconnected global community.

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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
	Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Mark Viera

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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

15

Total number of students enrolled at the school

279

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

2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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	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	0
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 7/31/2022

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	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	

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	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	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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	30%	48%	56%					53%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	48%							56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%							51%	53%
Math Achievement	30%	44%	50%					55%	63%
Math Learning Gains	48%							59%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%							45%	51%
Science Achievement	21%	46%	59%					49%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
ELL	26	46	44	30	48	37	14				
HSP	25	45	50	29	48	45	18				
FRL	30	47		24	39	47	22				

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				

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
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

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	324
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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%	0
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%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	

Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	37
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Our overall population does not demonstrate significant proficiency levels in ELA (26%) or Math (33%). However, 3rd grade showed a 17% increase in Mathematics proficiency from the Spring 2021 FSA Assessment. Our ELL students were our lowest performing subgroup, with all subcategories in ELA falling within the D range. The ELL students make up 95% of our student population, having a great impact on our overall performance levels, dropping 10% in comparison to the previous year and 17% below the district average.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Data components indicated that the greatest need for improvement was in 3rd grade ELA given the 28% proficiency in comparison to 2021. Science proficiency for 5th graders also shows a tremendous need for improvement with only 21% of 5th grade science students scoring proficiency on the 2022 state assessment.

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

Third grade faced instability since the beginning of the 2021-2022 academic year due to shifts in classes and changes to teachers. To improve, we need to make shifts in ELA small groups, place emphasis on remediating ELA standards during the MTSS block which is embedded into the elementary master schedule, and teach test taking strategies to students. Additionally, extended day learning opportunities will be offered to students. Lastly, students will receive additional supports in ELA through the Learning Lab which targets Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Horizontal grade to grade analysis (i.e. 4th grade in 2021 to 4th grade in 2022) of the 2022 data as compared to the 2021 results indicated that fourth grade student proficiency rates had a 12% increase in ELA and a 8% increase in Math. Despite this increase, the 4th grade scores were still below district average by 13% in ELA and 14% in mathematics.

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

All 4th grade courses had consistency in teachers and utilization of the pacing guide, as well as the implementation of the curriculum with fidelity which included Wit & Wisdom, GreatMinds Eureka Math and iReady. Moreover, the largest percentage of students in 4th grade attended after-school tutoring. We implemented a learning lab schedule, and an "extended learning block" where students received additional support on the standards that data reflected they were deficient on.

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 (ELA/Reading) 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 intervention program which the school is doing via Istation for math and Lexia for reading.

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.

All teachers were already trained in the BEST standards during a summer academy to ensure quality, standards-aligned Tier 1 instruction. Teachers will be provided ongoing professional development; beginning with the pre-service weeks in August 2022 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 professional development will be provided by a combination of the publisher and instructional coaches which are well versed in the use of these curriculums.

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

Professional development opportunities will include ongoing coaching support, modeling, and accountability measures. There will be a more robust tutoring program this upcoming year that will focus on student remediation and acceleration. Additionally, there will be more opportunities for tutoring during the school day through the use of interventionists, push-in/pull-out groups, and student groups/activities before school.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

ELA achievement in grades 3rd through 5th has made no progress over the past few FSA data cycles, remaining at a 26% proficiency in the 2021 and 2022 Spring FSA. Students need to be taught foundational skills to make up for deficits and loss of learning from online instruction during the 2020-2021 school year, but also need to be accelerated in learning current year B.E.S.T standards. Shifts in instructional practice will be made across grade levels to accelerate student learning in ELA, as students must become proficient readers in order to become highly effective in all areas.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Victory Charter School K-5 will achieve a minimum of 50% proficiency rate in reading comprehension as evidenced by the 2023 S.T.A.R administration and FAST administration.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This area of focus will be monitored through universal screener data (Istation) 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. Weekly monitoring through instructional walkthroughs conducted by school-based coaches and administration will take place. Additionally, student achievement data will be monitored at regular school-based data meetings and with charter school network personnel (led by instructional leaders from the ESP) at network data meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being

Given the high number of Tier 2/3 students, assessment results from the MTSS/Universal Screener process will be used to design specific standard-based lessons for interventions during designated, daily intervention blocks. Teachers will effectively implement small group reading instruction aligned to the students' level of need. Students below grade level will receive a combination of instruction at their proficiency level (during the MTSS block in a small group setting) and standards-based instruction (during whole group instruction). Collaborative analysis of assessments to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for students, including those with disabilities. Marzano (2003), Reeves (2010),

implemented for this Area of Focus.

Dufour, (2010). Per. a John Hopkins study, Istation Early Reading program is designated ESSA Tier 3 Promising Evidence. Lexia Core5 Reading now have Evidence for ESSA Strong (Tier 1) rating. Foundations® core instruction implementation is associated with better performance in reading with a rating of “Promising Evidence” / ESSA Tier 3.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The approach of focusing teacher instruction on student grade level while also providing intense standards-based instruction in a small group setting at the students’ individual achievement level will both help increase learning gains for students at all levels and increase the number of students achieving proficiency on grade level material. Small group instruction has a high effect size of .47 per John Hattie. Analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in the teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Collaborative analysis of assessments to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for students, including those with disabilities. Marzano (2003), Reeves (2010), Dufour, (2010). Per. a John Hopkins study, Istation Early Reading program is designated ESSA Tier 3 Promising Evidence. Lexia Core5 Reading now have Evidence for ESSA Strong (Tier 1) ratings as evidenced by dozens of additional peer-reviewed studies confirm products’ efficacy (Lexia Learning).

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Hire an instructional coach with focus on Literacy.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Extend the day for all students for additional learning by 30 minutes daily.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Purchase Foundations to increase phonemic awareness in all students in grades K-3.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Purchase and implement iStations as a Tier 1 adaptive learning platform for all students in grades K-5.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Purchase and implement Lexia Core 5 as a Tier 2 and 3 direct instruction and adaptive tool for all students in grades K-5 who are classified in these Tiers.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Implement incentive an annual stipend of \$750 for teachers to increase Reading Endorsed teachers within the staff.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Implement an MTSS Learning Lab for reading to service Tier 3 students in small groups with a reading endorsed teacher.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Provide a four day summer institute for all teachers to train them on the new BEST Standards.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Math data increased gradually through the 2021-2022 school year however the overall proficiency per grade level is below the district average. Victory Charter School K-5 will need to implement additional strategies to maintain proficient math students and increase learning gains amongst all student.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

70% of Victory Charter School K-5 students will exceed their baseline score throughout the year on iStation, demonstrating one year's worth of learning gains at the conclusion of the 2022-2023 school year in the area of math.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This area of focus will be monitored weekly through instructional focus walks conducted by school-based coaches and administration and weekly monitoring of Istation math intervention platform by teachers and administration to ensure weekly usage requirements are met. Additionally, student achievement data will be monitored at regular school-based data meetings and with district personnel at district data meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Teachers will collaboratively plan for and effectively implement standards-based instruction during the math block and will use the intervention/MTSS block to target students' below grade level skills. Students will receive daily practice on their current grade level standard. Fluency strategies will be targeted through the use of targeted online programs and tutoring programs.

In addition, Istation will be used for all Tier 2 and Tier 3 math students both at school and at home as an adaptive-learning based intervention program specifically targeting and addressing student needs as determined by the Universal Screener assessment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Students need a combination of instruction at their level and at the level of the standard to be successful. The approach of focusing teacher instruction on student needs while also providing intense standards-based instruction will both help increase learning gains for students at all levels and increase the number of students achieving proficiency on grade level material.

In addition, Istation Usage Leads to Growth on national math assessments per an independent quasi experimental study by John Hopkins which meets ESSA Tier 2 evidence standards (Cook, Ross 2021).

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Hire an MTSS Interventionist focused on supporting Tier 2 and Tier 3 students with gaps in numeracy via an MTSS Learning Lab.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Implement i-Station Math as an adaptive learning tool for Tier 2-3 students.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Implement a daily 30 minute MTSS block for mathematics and a 60 minute Tier 1 instructional block.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Provide a four day summer institute for math for teachers to learn the new BEST Standards.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Purchase and utilize Great Minds Equip AND MasteryConnect for the development of standard-based common assessments to determine acquisition of taught standards. Data utilized to adjust instruction.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Over 52% of the student population is designated as English Language Learners and, furthermore, the school's Lowest 25% of student performers on state assessments is entirely ELL and struggle with English/Reading.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

70% of Victory Charter School students will maintain their baseline through the year on iStation, demonstrating one year's worth of learning gains at the conclusion of the 2022-2023 school year in the area of literacy.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Principal and Instructional Coach will collaborate with teachers to regularly monitor IStation Spanish reports for reading progress for designated ELL Students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Dual language is a form of education in which students are taught literacy and content in two languages. They are considered “additive” bilingual programs because they “add” a second academic language for students, instead of trying to extinguish a minority language and move a student to exclusively use English. Dual language programming ensures that student learning of content skills/standards is not hindered by a student's challenges with language acquisition and is thus a proven tool and strategy for remediating/instruction ELL students. All ELL students will also be using iStation digital adaptive reading intervention program.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for

Tier 2 ESSA standards indicate that Istation's reading assessment shows moderate evidence of being an effective digital learning tool that helps students close significant reading achievement gaps.

In addition, ESSA also defines a quality Dual Language program as "Strong" evidence

selecting this specific strategy.

Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy. of impact on student learning, specifically the "offering of long term bilingual programming for language learners."

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Purchase and implement iStation Spanish for all Tier 1-3 students in grades K-5.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Implement Dual Language Program allocating a 60-minute Spanish Language Arts block, 30 minute content area in home language (science) and a 30-minute math block in home language.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Allocate an ELL interventionist to provide support in small groups to newcomers with 1.2 years or less in the country in the acquisition of language.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

**Area of Focus
Description
and Rationale:
Include a
rationale that
explains how
it was
identified as a
critical need
from the data
reviewed.**

The school's Science proficiency (5th grade) was only 21% for the 2021-2022 school year which shows a critical need for this content area.

**Measurable
Outcome:
State the
specific
measurable
outcome the
school plans
to achieve.
This should be
a data based,
objective
outcome.**

The school will achieve a minimum of 35% proficiency rate in Science for the 2022-2023 school year as measured by the Science state assessment (FCAT 2.0), a 14% increase from the previous school year.

**Monitoring:
Describe how
this Area of
Focus will be
monitored for
the desired
outcome.**

Instructional practices for Science will be monitored by student progress on Mastery Connect-based assessments to ensure that they're making progress between each administration of the screener. In addition, classroom walkthroughs will take place to observe for quality core instruction, including the appropriate usage of instructional differentiation and student-centered, high-yield, instructional strategies at the appropriate rigor levels with fidelity-driven usage of the StemScopes core science instructional materials. Lastly, the usage of digital instructional programs pertaining to the content areas (i.e. Gizmos) will be monitored weekly by teachers and administration.

**Person
responsible
for monitoring
outcome:**

[no one identified]

**Evidence-
based
Strategy:
Describe the
evidence-
based strategy
being
implemented
for this Area
of Focus.**

The science curriculum will be made more relevant and engaging to students by contextualizing lessons that give facts meaning, explore concepts that are applicable to students' lives, and provide opportunities for solving complex problems through the utilization of the Scientific Method in alignment to the StemScopes curriculum. StemScopes is embedded with hands on labs which make the curriculum come to life and thus science standards become more digestible for students. The 5E concept for scientific inquiry will also be utilized.

**Rationale for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

Students who manipulate scientific ideas using hands-on/minds-on strategies and activities are more successful than peers who are taught by teachers relying primarily on lecture and the textbook (Lynch & Zenchak, 2002). Since its inception at Rice University, STEMscopes has conducted research to inform product development and to evaluate

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

the effectiveness of STEMscopes on teachers and students. Based on this research conducted over several years, the evidence of STEMscopes effectiveness is solidly in Tier 2 (moderate evidence).

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Provide teacher training on the Tier I Science Curriculum (from StemScopes) to ensure that it is utilized with fidelity for science education is hands-on, relevant, and aligned to the Next Generation Science Standards

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Teachers will attain and break down achievement data from vendor-created diagnostic and summative assessments (Mastery Connect and StemScopes) and school-based assessments during common planning PLCs.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Teachers will learn and implement standards based stations and implement differentiated instruction as an instructional strategy to breakdown student data and content mastery.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Teachers will provide individual student data chats at the beginning, middle, and end of year based on the results of MasteryConnect summative benchmark assessments.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

For grades K-2, Victory Charter School K-5 (0203) will implement a research-based reading program titled Wit and Wisdom which addresses all five areas of reading. This program will be implemented in a 90 minute uninterrupted block of ELA taught daily. In addition, a 30-minute uninterrupted block will be allocated for writing taught daily using the incorporated writing program. Lastly, a phonics based companion will be used, Foundations, for grades K-3 to increase phonics, phonemic awareness and vocabulary skills in the students. This program will be complimented with Geodes which provides real text to do Close Reading. Furthermore, a 30-minute MTSS block has been allocated for reading daily for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. To address the adaptive needs of our students, iStation will be used for online instruction during the day and extended beyond the bell for Tier 1 students and Lexia Core 5 will be used for Tier 2 and Tier 3. Due to the large ELL population, Dual Language instruction (50/50) will be implemented allocating a 60 minute block of Spanish Language Instruction using research based program titled Adelante and 30 minutes of content area, Science, will be also be taught in Spanish. This will ensure the home language of the students is developed as they transition to English the standards learned within those two blocks. Using funds allocated, an extended learning program will be allocated to provide additional on-task learning and intervention. K-3 teachers who are endorsed are prioritized to teach reading.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

For grades 3-5, Victory Charter School K-5 (0203) will implement a research-based reading program titled Wit and Wisdom which addresses all five areas of reading. This program will be implemented in a 90 minute uninterrupted block of ELA taught daily. In addition, a 30-minute uninterrupted block will be allocated for writing taught daily using the incorporated writing program. This program will be complimented with Geodes which provides real text to do Close Reading. Furthermore, a 30-minute MTSS block has been allocated for reading daily for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. To address the adaptive needs of our students, iStation will be used for online instruction during the day and extended beyond the bell for Tier 1 students and Lexia Core 5 will be used for Tier 2 and Tier 3. Due to the large ELL population, Dual Language instruction (50/50) will be implemented allocating a 60 minute block of Spanish Language Instruction using research based program titled Adelante and 30 minutes of content area, Science, will be also be taught in Spanish. This will ensure the home language of the students is developed as they transition to English the standards learned within those two blocks. Using funds allocated, an extended learning program will be allocated to provide additional on-task learning and intervention. 3-5 teachers who are endorsed are prioritized to teach reading.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Victory Charter School will achieve a minimum of 50% proficiency rate in reading comprehension for students in grades K-2, as evidenced by the 2023 S.T.A.R administration.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Victory Charter School will achieve a minimum of 50% proficiency rate in reading comprehension for students in grades 3-5, as evidenced by the 2023 FAST administration.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Leadership will conduct daily classroom walkthroughs to ensure fidelity of implementation of the strategies mentioned within the RAISE Plan. Furthermore, reports for iStation and Lexia will be printed weekly to determine on-track usage and performance. Modifications will be made as data indicates need.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Collaborative analysis of assessments to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for students, including those with disabilities. Marzano (2003), Reeves (2010), Dufour, (2010). Per. a John Hopkins study, Istation Early Reading program is designated ESSA Tier 3 Promising Evidence. Lexia Core5 Reading now have Evidence for ESSA Strong (Tier 1) ratings as evidenced by dozens of additional peer-

reviewed studies confirm products' efficacy (Lexia Learning). An independent analysis of data from a Florida district determined that Foundations® core instruction implementation is associated with better performance on four of six tested DIBELS scores in first grade and DIBELS Letter Naming Fluency (LNF) subtest in Kindergarten - The study is sufficient for a rating of "Promising Evidence" / Tier 3 on the U.S. Department of Education's Every Students Success Act (ESSA) evidence scale. All curricular programs for reading are aligned to B.E.S.T. ELA standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The targeted MTSS approach and extended Tier 2/3 intervention time matches the identified intensive reading support needs of students in grades K-5. For the programs selected for K-5 ELA, Foundations (Tier 3, Promising evidence per ESSA), Istation (Tier 3, Promising evidence per ESSA) and Lexia Learning (Tier 1, Strong evidence per ESSA) all not only correlate to statistically higher reading improvement as per ESSA evidence guidelines, these program are also particularly with English Language Learner (ELL) students which comprise more than 50% of the school's population.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
-------------	-----------------------------------

1) Implement an MTSS Learning Lab for reading to service Tier 3 students in small groups with a reading endorsed teacher, groups will be based on Istation universal screener assessment and the reading endorsed intervention teacher will have bi-weekly meetings with the school's literacy coach to ensure the program is implemented with fidelity including the use of Lexia Learning (Tier 1, Strong evidence per ESSA) and small-group reading intervention.

2) Extend the day for all students for additional learning by 30 minutes daily to embed guaranteed intervention time - the literacy coach will push in, model, co-teach, and/or provide feedback during the MTSS blocks as well as the use of key literacy curricula i.e. Foundations (Tier 3, Promising evidence per ESSA) and Wit&Wisdom.

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

The school is very intentional about create a positive culture through the design and implementation of a comprehensive and precise Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) Framework. The foundation of this framework is that teachers train the 10 learner profile characteristics or skills in their classrooms using mini-lessons trained by a PBIS consultant that break down each profile/skill into tangible, every-day application friendly behaviors and strategies students should use to better engage with one another, their instructor, and the instructional process overall. Some examples include teachers train students to “BE Knowledgeable” by taking a stance on a local/global issue that relates to a concept being studied in class and connecting classroom concepts to local/global issues. Teachers train students to “BE Reflective” by allowing Students time to think critically and reflect on their behavior, whether positive or otherwise, and analyze prior experiences and determine whether their response led to a positive outcome. Teachers train students to “BE Caring” by establishing a positive and welcoming environment not just in the classroom but in the entire school as well, modeling for Students how to be respectful of individuals and how students can be sensitive to other’s ideas and opinions. Teachers and administrators collaborate to establish a safe and respectful learning environment that allows others’ opinions to be valued and respected. Students are also trained and taught how to “BE Principled” and empower with Ownership with accountability, taking initiatives when it comes to their education and commitment to the school and class and their peers for success, taking pride in their education and commitment to growth

By teaching and modeling appropriate positive, prosocial behaviors, the students have a clearer understanding of what is expected. Teachers are trained that students need to be shown and told what to do, rather than telling them “don’t do something.” Positively stating and acknowledging appropriate behaviors gives the students concrete behavioral guidelines. Behavioral response systems are more likely to be effective when the students expect the same response across classrooms and in other common settings in their schools. The school encourages and rewards consistent behaviors which elicit the same responses from staff, regardless of the student is in the school building.

Using positively stated and easy-to-remember norms that are used schoolwide helps both students and staff use universal language when discussing behavior.

Teachers and students are provided with a table that lists the school norms and necessary skills to display the norms that are expected in every setting in the building. Posters/signs are utilized in each setting listing the norms and skills for that location.

Teaching guides were also trained and provided to teachers teach norms to students with setting specific examples.

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

School administrators and team members from the ESP with experience in positive culture and PBIS framework design and implementation designed the PBIS policies including teaching guides, norms, skills, and frameworks and trained teachers on not only the frameworks, but how to implement them.

Classroom teachers teach the students the norms and skills they need to engage positively in the learning process and with one another, reward students for following the expected norms and behaviors, and redirect behaviors using specifically trained strategies and cues. Teachers also form partnerships with parents both as a celebration of students making good choices and to collaborate on behavioral challenges that students may have.

Auxiliary personnel (i.e. hall monitors, front office staff, etc.) also refer to the norms, skills, and behaviors that comprise the school's PBIS framework to ensure there is a consistent culture and vocabulary around the positive environment.