

## **Table of Contents**

| School Information<br>Needs Assessment<br>Planning for Improvement | 3  |
|--|----|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP                                     | 4  |
| School Information   | 7  |
| Needs Assessment   | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement   | 15 |
| Positive Culture & Environment                                     | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals  | 0  |

Osceola - 0881 - P. M. Wells Charter Academy - 2022-23 SIP

# P. M. Wells Charter Academy

2426 REMINGTON BLVD, Kissimmee, FL 34744

https://www.pmwellsacademy.org

Demographics

### Principal: Ivonne Sardinas

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

| 2019-20 Status<br>(per MSID File)  | Active  |
|--|---|
| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File)   | Combination School<br>KG-8  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)  | K-12 General Education  |
| 2021-22 Title I School   | Yes   |
| 2021-22 Economically<br>Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 75%   |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an<br>asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students*<br>Economically Disadvantaged<br>Students |
| School Grades History  | 2021-22: C (50%)<br>2018-19: A (69%)<br>2017-18: A (65%)  |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info   | ormation*   |
| SI Region  | Central   |
| Regional Executive Director  | Lucinda Thompson  |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle  | N/A   |
| Year   |   |
| Support Tier   |   |
| ESSA Status  | ATSI  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For  | or more information, <u>click here</u> .  |
|  |   |

### **School Board Approval**

N/A

### **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 <u>www.floridacims.org.</u>

### 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             | 7  |
| Needs Assessment               | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 15 |
| Title I Requirements           | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 0  |

Osceola - 0881 - P. M. Wells Charter Academy - 2022-23 SIP

### P. M. Wells Charter Academy

2426 REMINGTON BLVD, Kissimmee, FL 34744

### https://www.pmwellsacademy.org

**School Demographics** 

| School Type and Gr<br>(per MSID F |                     | ool Disadva    | 22 Economically<br>ntaged (FRL) Rate<br>orted on Survey 3) |  |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|--|--|
| Combination S<br>KG-8             | School              | Yes            |  | 75%  |
| Primary Servic<br>(per MSID F     | ••                  | Charter School | (Repor   | <b>19 Minority Rate</b><br>ted as Non-white<br>n Survey 2) |
| K-12 General E                    | ducation            | Yes            |  | 83%  |
| School Grades Histo               | ry                  |                |  |  |
| Year<br>Grade                     | <b>2021-22</b><br>C | 2020-21        | <b>2019-20</b><br>A  | <b>2018-19</b><br>A  |
| School Board Appro                | val                 |                |  |  |

N/A

### **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 <a href="https://www.floridaCIMS.org">https://www.floridaCIMS.org</a>.

### 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.

At PM Wells Charter Academy, our unique and innovative curriculum and overall instructional program is designed to provide our scholars with CHOICE. Whether it is exposing them to exciting science and mathematics concepts through our STEAM program or providing the latest, research-based curriculum for core subject areas, PM Wells Panther graduates are empowered with the CHOICE to pursue their academic and career goals.

### Provide the school's vision statement.

Our aim is to educate the learner as a whole, therefore, we value the individual experiences, interests, voice, and talents each student adds to the school 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                       |
|-------------------------|---------------------|---|
| Sardinas Darder, Ivonne | Principal           | School Principal.                                     |
| Rosado, Iliana          | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal                                   |
| Williams, Cyndee        | Instructional Coach | Instructional Coach over Mathematics and Science, K-8 |
| Rivera, Melanie         | Instructional Coach | Instructional Coach over Literacy, K-8                |

### Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Ivonne Sardinas

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.

NA

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.

NA

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school** 32

**Total number of students enrolled at the school** 621

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year. 17

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year. 10

**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:

| Indiantar  |   |   |   |   | ( | Gra | ade | ) L | eve | əl |    |    |    | Total |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator  | Κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9  | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 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  |       |
| 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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 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  |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 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                            |   |   |   |   |   | Gr | ade | e Le | ve | I |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                            | Κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6   | 7    | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAI |
| Students with two or more indicators | 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 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |  |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| indicator                           | κ | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |  |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 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  |       |  |

### Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/1/2022

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

| Osceola - 0881 - P. M. | Wells Charter Academy - | 2022-23 SIP |
|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------|
|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------|

| Indicator  |    |    |    |    | C  | Grad | le Le | evel |    |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|----|----|----|----|----|------|-------|------|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator  | Κ  | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5    | 6     | 7    | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 63 | 51 | 80 | 69 | 74 | 73   | 86    | 66   | 85 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 647   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 24 | 19 | 9  | 17 | 35 | 18   | 1     | 0    | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 123   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 1  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 1  | 1    | 1     | 0    | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0    | 20    | 10   | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 30    |
| 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  | 19 | 12 | 21   | 16    | 12   | 6  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 86    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0  | 0  | 0  | 20 | 12 | 18   | 19    | 14   | 12 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 95    |
| 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                            |   |   |   |   |   | Gr | ade | e Le | ve | I |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                            | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6   | 7    | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAI |
| Students with two or more indicators | 5 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 5  | 0   | 4    | 7  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 38    |

### The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indiantar                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator                           | Κ           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |
| 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 |    |       |
|--|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|----|-------|----|-------|
| Indicator  | κ           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11    | 12 | TOLAI |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 63          | 51 | 80 | 69 | 74 | 73 | 86 | 66 | 85 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 647   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 24          | 19 | 9  | 17 | 35 | 18 | 1  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 123   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 1           | 0  | 0  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 5     |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 20 | 10 | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 30    |
| 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  | 19 | 12 | 21 | 16 | 12 | 6  | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 86    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 20 | 12 | 18 | 19 | 14 | 12 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 95    |
| 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 |    |       |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|-------|----|-------|
| indicator                            | κ           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11    | 12 | TOLAT |
| Students with two or more indicators |             | 3 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 38    |

### The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indiantar                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    | Total |    |       |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|-------|----|-------|
| Indicator                           | κ           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11    | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 5     |
| Students retained two or more times | 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 Grade Component      | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |  |  |
| ELA Achievement             | 47%    | 50%      | 55%   |        |          |       | 57%    | 56%      | 61%   |  |  |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 49%    |          |       |        |          |       | 70%    | 57%      | 59%   |  |  |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 45%    |          |       |        |          |       | 85%    | 55%      | 54%   |  |  |
| Math Achievement            | 44%    | 42%      | 42%   |        |          |       | 60%    | 52%      | 62%   |  |  |
| Math Learning Gains         | 52%    |          |       |        |          |       | 70%    | 55%      | 59%   |  |  |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 49%    |          |       |        |          |       | 59%    | 49%      | 52%   |  |  |
| Science Achievement         | 35%    | 45%      | 54%   |        |          |       | 50%    | 49%      | 56%   |  |  |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 65%    | 53%      | 59%   |        |          |       | 82%    | 75%      | 78%   |  |  |

### 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-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 01        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Co | mparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 02        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Co | mparison | 0%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 03        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     | 50%    | 51%      | -1%                               | 58%   | -8%                            |
| Cohort Co | mparison | 0%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 04        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     | 59%    | 51%      | 8%                                | 58%   | 1%                             |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -50%   |          |                                   | •     |                                |

|            |          |        | ELA      |                                   |       |                                |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade      | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 05         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 44%    | 48%      | -4%                               | 56%   | -12%                           |
| Cohort Cor | nparison | -59%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 06         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 52%    | 48%      | 4%                                | 54%   | -2%                            |
| Cohort Cor | nparison | -44%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 07         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 58%    | 47%      | 11%                               | 52%   | 6%                             |
| Cohort Cor | nparison | -52%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 08         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 64%    | 49%      | 15%                               | 56%   | 8%                             |
| Cohort Cor | nparison | -58%   |          |                                   | · ·   |                                |

|           |          |        | MATH     |                                   |          |                                |
|-----------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|----------|--------------------------------|
| Grade     | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State    | School-<br>State<br>Comparisor |
| 01        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|           | 2019     |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
| Cohort Co | mparison |        |          |                                   | · · ·    |                                |
| 02        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|           | 2019     |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
| Cohort Co | mparison | 0%     |          |                                   |          |                                |
| 03        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|           | 2019     | 56%    | 54%      | 2%                                | 62%      | -6%                            |
| Cohort Co | mparison | 0%     |          |                                   |          |                                |
| 04        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|           | 2019     | 61%    | 53%      | 8%                                | 64%      | -3%                            |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -56%   |          |                                   |          |                                |
| 05        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|           | 2019     | 52%    | 48%      | 4%                                | 60%      | -8%                            |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -61%   |          |                                   |          |                                |
| 06        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|           | 2019     | 53%    | 45%      | 8%                                | 55%      | -2%                            |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -52%   |          |                                   |          |                                |
| 07        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|           | 2019     | 62%    | 30%      | 32%                               | 54%      | 8%                             |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -53%   |          |                                   | · ·      |                                |
| 08        | 2022     |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|           | 2019     | 35%    | 47%      | -12%                              | 46%      | -11%                           |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -62%   |          |                                   | <b>-</b> |                                |

| SCIENCE |      |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |
|---------|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Grade   | Year | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |  |  |  |
| 05      | 2022 |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |

|            |          |        | SCIENC   | E                                 |       |                                |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade      | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
|            | 2019     | 47%    | 45%      | 2%                                | 53%   | -6%                            |
| Cohort Cor | mparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 06         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Cor | mparison | -47%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 07         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Cor | mparison | 0%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 08         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 46%    | 42%      | 4%                                | 48%   | -2%                            |
| Cohort Cor | mparison | 0%     |          |                                   | · · · |                                |

|          |        | BIOLO    | GY EOC                      |       |                          |
|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Year     | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2022     |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019     |        |          |                             |       |                          |
|          |        | CIVIC    | SEOC                        |       |                          |
| Year     | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2022     |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019     | 81%    | 73%      | 8%                          | 71%   | 10%                      |
| <u>.</u> |        | HISTO    | RY EOC                      |       |                          |
| Year     | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2022     |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019     |        |          |                             |       |                          |
|          |        | ALGEE    | RA EOC                      | •     |                          |
| Year     | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2022     |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019     | 87%    | 49%      | 38%                         | 61%   | 26%                      |
|          |        | GEOME    | TRY EOC                     |       |                          |
| Year     | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2022     |        |          |                             | 1     |                          |
| 2019     |        |          |                             |       |                          |

Subgroup Data Review

|           |             | 2022      | SCHOO             | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | ONENT              | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2020-21 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2020-21 |
| SWD       | 7           | 25        | 28                | 13           | 46         | 56                 | 10          |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 40          | 54        | 53                | 41           | 50         | 53                 | 23          | 55         | 53           |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 38          | 50        |                   | 38           | 56         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 47          | 49        | 47                | 42           | 48         | 44                 | 31          | 63         | 56           |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 50          | 50        |                   | 57           | 74         |                    | 58          | 73         | 100          |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 42          | 44        | 38                | 41           | 51         | 48                 | 34          | 57         | 71           |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2021      | SCHOO             | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | PONENT             | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 |
| SWD       | 7           | 41        | 42                | 18           | 25         |                    |             | 45         |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 51          | 66        | 54                | 48           | 49         | 42                 | 37          | 75         |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 47          | 52        |                   | 56           | 45         |                    | 45          | 62         |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 61          | 66        | 52                | 52           | 47         | 37                 | 48          | 78         | 85           |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 70          | 70        |                   | 63           | 52         |                    | 36          | 83         |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 59          | 63        | 39                | 49           | 43         | 25                 | 45          | 70         | 84           |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2019      | SCHOO             | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | PONENT             | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2017-18 |
| SWD       | 17          | 62        |                   | 31           | 45         | 42                 | 23          |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 44          | 69        | 84                | 50           | 68         | 66                 | 35          | 71         |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 64          | 73        |                   | 60           | 58         |                    | 48          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 55          | 70        | 86                | 59           | 70         | 62                 | 51          | 79         | 83           |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 64          | 63        |                   | 70           | 70         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 53          | 68        | 82                | 56           | 69         | 63                 | 42          | 74         | 76           |                         |                           |

### 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)  | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 50   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 1    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 53   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 500  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 10   |
| Percent Tested  | 99%  |
| Subgroup Data   |      |

Osceola - 0881 - P. M. Wells Charter Academy - 2022-23 SIP

| Students With Disabilities   |                          |
|--|--------------------------|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities   | 26                       |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?   | YES                      |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%  | 1                        |
| English Language Learners  |                          |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners  | 48                       |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  | NO                       |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%   | 0                        |
| Native American Students   |                          |
| Federal Index - Native American Students   |                          |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?   | N/A                      |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%  | 0                        |
| Asian Students   |                          |
| Federal Index - Asian Students   |                          |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?   | N/A                      |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%  |                          |
|  |                          |
| Black/African American Students  |                          |
| Black/African American Students Federal Index - Black/African American Students  | 46                       |
|  | 46<br>NO                 |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students  | -                        |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students         Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  | NO                       |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students         Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?         Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%   | NO                       |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students         Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?         Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%         Hispanic Students   | NO<br>0                  |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students         Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?         Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%         Hispanic Students         Federal Index - Hispanic Students   | NO<br>0<br>48            |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students         Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?         Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%         Hispanic Students         Federal Index - Hispanic Students         Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?   | NO<br>0<br>48<br>NO      |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students         Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?         Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%         Hispanic Students         Federal Index - Hispanic Students         Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?         Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%  | NO<br>0<br>48<br>NO      |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students         Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?         Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%         Hispanic Students         Federal Index - Hispanic Students         Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?         Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%         Multiracial Students   | NO<br>0<br>48<br>NO      |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students         Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?         Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%         Hispanic Students         Federal Index - Hispanic Students         Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?         Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%         Multiracial Students         Federal Index - Multiracial Students  | NO<br>0<br>48<br>NO<br>0 |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students         Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?         Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%         Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%         Federal Index - Hispanic Students         Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?         Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%         Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%         Federal Index - Multiracial Students         Multiracial Students         Federal Index - Multiracial Students  | NO<br>0<br>48<br>NO<br>0 |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students         Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?         Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%         Hispanic Students         Federal Index - Hispanic Students         Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?         Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%         Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%         Federal Index - Mispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%         Multiracial Students         Federal Index - Multiracial Students         Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?         Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%         Federal Index - Multiracial Students         Multiracial Students         Multiracial Students         Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | NO<br>0<br>48<br>NO<br>0 |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students         Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?         Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%         Hispanic Students         Federal Index - Hispanic Students         Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?         Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%         Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%         Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%         Federal Index - Multiracial Students         Multiracial Students         Multiracial Students         Multiracial Students         Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?         Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%         Pacific Islander Students         Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | NO<br>0<br>48<br>NO<br>0 |

Osceola - 0881 - P. M. Wells Charter Academy - 2022-23 SIP

| White Students   |          |  |
|--|----------|--|
| Federal Index - White Students   | 66       |  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?   |          |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%  |          |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |          |  |
|  |          |  |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students  | 48       |  |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | 48<br>NO |  |

### 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?

The school's ELA scores, while decreasing by approximately 14% from the previous school year, are on par with the school district's ELA scores from the 2019 assessment year. A notable achievement for the school is that while Math achievement decreased 7% from the previous school year overall, Math learning gains improved by 5% from the 2021 assessment year and the Math lowest 25 percentile increased to 49% from 38% (11%). Science achievement scores also decreased which is of concern, from 46% to 35% and social studies achievement also decreased, from 77% to 65%. Students with Disabilities is the most concerning subgroup with 26% of students showing proficiency, a decrease from the previous year.

# 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 ELA, Science, Civics and US History, and the SWD supgroup. Specifically, Science had a drop of 11% and social studies had a drop of 12%. ELA overall also showed a decrease in achievement; however, learning gains near matched 2021 assessment results but still are a concern.

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

Middle school science was a great challenge in the 2021-2022 school year because despite aggressive recruiting efforts all year long, a certified science teacher was not able to be found and hired until late April of 2022. Certified, experience science educators, already hired at the middle school level, will help science proficiency for the 2022-2023 school year. For ELA achievement, besides student's intensive reading gaps caused by the pandemic and virtual school for/during the two years prior, at the middle school level, the ELA teacher for 7th and 8th grade departed to another state only 3 months into the school year while the other middle school ELA teacher had health related absences which also impacted ELA student achievement.

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

Math learning gains improved by 5% from the 2021 assessment year and the Math lowest 25 percentile increased to 49% from 38% (11%).

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

The school's math department in grades 3-8, including departmentalized teachers that taught 3rd-8th grade, had stability and were in their positions/classes consistently for the entire school year across the board. In addition, the math learning gains were buttressed at the middle school level by an Intensive Math class that utilized targeted small-group instruction with a blend of adaptive learning technology (ALEKS and Prodigy). Also at the K-5 level for math (as well as reading), the school increased the instructional day and dedicated an additional 30 minutes specifically to MTSS Tier 2 and 3 small group instruction and Tier 1 student instructional enrichment.

### 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 at the K-5 levels.

# 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. Instruction  | nal Practice specifically relating to ELA   |
|--|---|
| Area of<br>Focus<br>Description<br>and<br>Rationale:<br>Include a<br>rationale<br>that explains<br>how it was<br>identified as<br>a critical<br>need from<br>the data<br>reviewed. | ELA achievement in grades 3rd through 8th has dropped approximately 11% proficiency from the 2021 to the 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<br>Outcome:<br>State the<br>specific<br>measurable<br>outcome the<br>school plans<br>to achieve.<br>This should<br>be a data<br>based,<br>objective<br>outcome.         | PM Wells Charter Academy will achieve a minimum of 55% proficiency rate in reading comprehension as evidenced by the 2023 S.T.A.R administration and FAST administration in grades K-8.   |
| Monitoring:<br>Describe<br>how this<br>Area of<br>Focus will<br>be<br>monitored<br>for the<br>desired<br>outcome.  | This area of focus will be monitored through universal screener data (Istation for K-5 and Achieve3000) 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<br>responsible<br>for<br>monitoring<br>outcome:   | [no one identified]   |
| Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy:<br>Describe the<br>evidence-<br>based<br>strategy<br>being   | Given the high number of Tier 2/3 students, results from the MTSS/Universal Screener process will drive specific standard-based lessons for interventions during daily intervention blocks. Students 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), 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. Fundations® core instruction
 implemented
 for this Area
 of Focus.
 now have Evidence for ESSA Strong (Tier 1) rating. Fundations® core instruction
 implementation is associated with better performance in reading with a rating of "Promising Evidence" / ESSA Tier 3. Grades 6-8 will receive Springbaord ELA Tier curriculum support and Tier 2 students will receive an Intensive Reading Class w/Lexia's adaptive instructional reading support.

### Rationale for

| basedStrategy:Explain the<br>rationale for<br>selecting<br>this specific<br>strategy.Describe the<br>resources/<br>criteria used | struction on student grade level while also providing<br>in a small group setting at the students' individual<br>ease learning gains for students at all levels and<br>ieving proficiency on grade level material. Small group<br>47 per John Hattie. Analysis of student assessment<br>her decision making and meeting the diverse needs of<br>alysis of assessments to adjust instruction produces<br>s, including those with disabilities. Marzano (2003),<br>a John Hopkins study, Istation Early Reading program<br>g Evidence. Lexia Core5 Reading now have Evidence<br>evidenced by dozens of additional peer-reviewed<br>exia Learning). |
|--|--|
|--|--|

strategy.

### **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 Ivonne Sardinas Darder (isardinas@pmwellsacademy.org)

Extend the day for all students for additional learning by 30 minutes daily for grades K-5.

Person

Responsible Ivonne Sardinas Darder (isardinas@pmwellsacademy.org)

Purchase Fundations to increase phonemic awareness in all students in grades K-3 and implement with fidelity including regular progress-monitoring checks.

### Person

Responsible Ivonne Sardinas Darder (isardinas@pmwellsacademy.org)

Purchase and implement iStations as a Tier 1 adaptive learning platform for all students in grades K-5 and Achieve3000 as the Tier 1 adaptive learning platform for all students in grades 6-8.

Person

Responsible Iliana Rosado (irosado@pmwellsacademy.org)

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 (Lexia PowerUp for grades 6-8).

Person

Responsible Ivonne Sardinas Darder (isardinas@pmwellsacademy.org)

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

Person

Responsible Ivonne Sardinas Darder (isardinas@pmwellsacademy.org)

Implement an MTSS Learning Lab for reading to service Tier 3 students in small groups with a reading endorsed teacher in grades K-5.

Person Responsible Ivonne Sardinas Darder (isardinas@pmwellsacademy.org)

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

Person Responsible

| Area of Focus<br>Description and<br>Rationale:<br>Include a<br>rationale that<br>explains how it<br>was identified<br>as a critical<br>need from the<br>data reviewed. | Math scores dropped approximately 11% for mathematics in grades 3-8 from the 2021 to the 2022 assessment year as per FSA results. PM Wells Charter Academy will need to implement additional strategies to maintain proficient math students and increase learning gains amongst all student.<br>Ensuring high levels of learning of mathematics achievement for all students is paramount for the 2022-2023 school year. Data indicates a need to strengthen Tier one instruction and a structured Tier two intervention program followed with fidelity to improve mathematics skills. For appropriate results to occur, teachers need to understand the Florida math Standards and the level of rigor that they must be taught. Also, the implementation with fidelity of the Eureka Math program for K-8 grade students and supplemental resources is a key focus to increase mathematics performance. |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| Measurable<br>Outcome:<br>State the<br>specific<br>measurable<br>outcome the<br>school plans to<br>achieve. This<br>should be a data<br>based, objective<br>outcome.   | utcome:<br>tate the<br>pecific<br>reasurable<br>utcome the<br>chool plans to<br>chieve. This<br>nould be a data<br>ased, objective  |  |  |  |
| Monitoring:<br>Describe how<br>this Area of<br>Focus will be<br>monitored for<br>the desired<br>outcome.   | This area of focus will be monitored weekly through instructional focus walks<br>conducted by school-based coaches and administration and weekly monitoring of the<br>math Tier 2 and tier 3 intervention platform (IStation for K-5, Khan Academy for 6-8) by<br>teachers and administration to ensure weekly usage requirements are met.<br>Additionally, student achievement data will be monitored at regular school-based data<br>meetings and with district personnel at district data meetings.  |  |  |  |
| Person<br>responsible for<br>monitoring<br>outcome:  | [no one identified]   |  |  |  |
| Evidence-based<br>Strategy:<br>Describe the  | Teachers will collaboratively plan for and effectively implement standards-based instruction during the math block and will use the intervention/MTSS block (K-5) 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.  |  |  |  |
| evidence-based<br>strategy being<br>implemented for<br>this Area of<br>Focus.  | In addition, Istation will be used for all Tier 2 and Tier 3 math students both at school<br>and at home for grades K-5 as an adaptive-learning based intervention program<br>specifically targeting and addressing student needs as determined by the Universal<br>Screener assessment. Khan Academy Math Istation will be used for all Tier 2 and Tier<br>3 math students both at school and at home for grades 6-8 as an adaptive-learning<br>based intervention program specifically targeting and addressing student needs as<br>determined by the Universal Screener assessment.  |  |  |  |

| rationale for<br>selecting this<br>specific<br>strategy.<br>Describe the | 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 Instructional Coach for Mathematics to provide coaching and instructional support to staff.

### Person

Responsible Ivonne Sardinas Darder (isardinas@pmwellsacademy.org)

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

### Person Responsible

Ivonne Sardinas Darder (isardinas@pmwellsacademy.org)

Implement i-Station Math (K-5) and Khan Academy (grades 6-8) as an adaptive learning tool for Tier 2-3 students.

### Person

Iliana Rosado (irosado@pmwellsacademy.org)

Responsible

Implement a daily 30 minute MTSS block for mathematics and a 60 minute Tier 1 instructional block (Grades K-5)

### Person Responsible

Ivonne Sardinas Darder (isardinas@pmwellsacademy.org)

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

### Person

Responsible Iliana Rosado (irosado@pmwellsacademy.org)

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 Ivonne Sardinas Darder (isardinas@pmwellsacademy.org)

| #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| Area of Focus<br>Description<br>and Rationale:<br>Include a<br>rationale that<br>explains how<br>it was<br>identified as a<br>critical need<br>from the data<br>reviewed. | The school's Science proficiency (5th grade) decreased from 40% to 38% from the 20-21 to the 21-22 school year which shows a critical need for this content area.  |  |
| Measurable<br>Outcome:<br>State the<br>specific<br>measurable<br>outcome the<br>school plans<br>to achieve.<br>This should be<br>a data based,<br>objective<br>outcome.   | The school will achieve a minimum of 50% proficiency rate in Science for the 2022-2023 school year as measured by the Science state assessment (FCAT 2.0) - this applies to both grade 5 and grade 8. Biology EOC scores will be targeted at 65 % or higher (13% increase from the 2022 Bio EOC administration).   |  |
| Monitoring:<br>Describe how<br>this Area of<br>Focus will be<br>monitored for<br>the desired<br>outcome.  | Instructional practices for Science will be monitored by student progress on Mastery<br>Connect-based assessments to ensure that they're making progress between each<br>administration of the screener. In addition, classroom walkthroughs will take place to<br>observe for quality core instruction, including the appropriate usage of instructional<br>differentiation and student-centered, high-yield, instructional strategies at the appropriate<br>rigor levels with fidelity-driven usage of the StemScopes core science instructional<br>materials. Lastly, the usage of digital instructional programs pertaining to the content<br>areas (i.e. Gizmos) will be monitored weekly by teachers and administration. |  |
| Person<br>responsible<br>for monitoring<br>outcome:   | [no one identified]  |  |
| Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy:<br>Describe the<br>evidence-<br>based strategy<br>being<br>implemented  | 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. For grades K-5, 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.   |  |
| for this Area<br>of Focus.<br>Rationale for   | For grades 6-8, Discovery Education's curriculum, fused with a focus on hands-on<br>experience from teachers with support from administration, will ensure a great retention<br>of scientific knowledge and the scientific process on behalf students.<br>For grades K-5, Students who manipulate scientific ideas using hands-on/minds-on   |  |
| Evidence-<br>based  | 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   |  |

| Strategy:      | inception at Rice University, STEMscopes has conducted research to inform product           |
|----------------|---|
| Explain the    | development and to evaluate the effectiveness of STEMscopes on teachers and                 |
| rationale for  | students. Based on this research conducted over several years, the evidence of              |
| selecting this | STEMscopes effectiveness is solidly in Tier 2 (moderate evidence).                          |
| specific       |   |
| strategy.      | For grades 6-8, Discovery Education's science curriculum, utilized as the core Science      |
| Describe the   | curriculum meet rigorous evidence-based standards defined in ESSA — meeting Tier 4          |
| resources/     | evidence criteria for federal requirements. In addition, students who manipulate scientific |
| criteria used  | ideas using hands-on/minds-on strategies and activities are more successful than peers      |
| for selecting  | who are taught by teachers relying primarily on lecture and the textbook (Lynch &           |
| this strategy. | Zenchak, 2002).   |

### 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 K-5/Discovery Education 6-8) to ensure that it is utilized with fidelity for science education is hands-on, relevant, and aligned to the Next Generation Science Standards.

#### Person Cyndee Williams (cwilliams@pmwellsacademy.org) Responsible

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

### Person

Cyndee Williams (cwilliams@pmwellsacademy.org) Responsible

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

Person

Cyndee Williams (cwilliams@pmwellsacademy.org) Responsible

Teachers will provide individual student data chats at the beginning, middle, and end of year based on the results of MasteryConnect summative benchmark assessments and the Khan Academy Universal Screener for the Biology course and EOC.

Person Cyndee Williams (cwilliams@pmwellsacademy.org) Responsible

### #4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

|  | b specifically relating to Students with Disabilities   |
|--|---|
| Area of Focus<br>Description and<br>Rationale:<br>Include a rationale<br>that explains how<br>it was identified<br>as a critical need<br>from the data<br>reviewed.                                | Students with disabilities only showed a 26% proficiency rate, which is below the 41% minimum requirement. Specifically, 28% of SWD students demonstrated Learning Gains in ELA and 56% of SWD students demonstrated Learning Gains in Math.  |
| Measurable<br>Outcome:<br>State the specific<br>measurable<br>outcome the<br>school plans to<br>achieve. This<br>should be a data<br>based, objective<br>outcome.                                  | Given the implementation of the actions steps included in the ESSA Subgroup relating to Students with Disabilities, students classified with a primary exceptionality, in attendance both FTE periods, will improve their reading skills as evidenced by improving their Lexile level by at least 10 points from baseline to Spring 2023 Universal Screener administration (Istation for K-5 and Achieve 3000 for grades 6-8).  |
| Monitoring:<br>Describe how this<br>Area of Focus will<br>be monitored for<br>the desired<br>outcome.  | This area of focus and its corresponding strategies will be monitored by the school principal and the Network Director for Students with Disabilities. Weekly reports for Achieve 3000 and IStation will be printed by each SWD Student's assigned Special Education teacher to monitor the usage of the students and their performance on the weekly assignments. Furthermore, performance in core classes will be monitored to ensure that success rates are high and that appropriate accommodations are provided.   |
| Person<br>responsible for<br>monitoring<br>outcome:  | Ivonne Sardinas Darder (isardinas@pmwellsacademy.org)   |
| Evidence-based<br>Strategy:<br>Describe the<br>evidence-based<br>strategy being<br>implemented for<br>this Area of<br>Focus.   | Supporting learners with special needs using a combination of supports and interventions. Use available evidence to identify where learners are in the learning progression, identify specific evidenced-based interventions, implement those interventions with fidelity, and continually monitor the impact of those interventions. Differentiation will be used in classrooms. This involves adjusting the content, the process of learning, and the way the learners demonstrate the learning, and the learning environment. This will include scaffolding learning and creating challenging goals. |
| Rationale for<br>Evidence-based<br>Strategy:<br>Explain the<br>rationale for<br>selecting this<br>specific strategy.<br>Describe the<br>resources/criteria<br>used for selecting<br>this strategy. | The effect size of supporting learners with special needs is 0.80. The effect size of differentiation is 0.46. To increase the effectiveness of this strategy it will be coupled with scaffolding learning (0.58) and creating challenging goals (0.59).  |

### **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 students with disabilities support facilitation teacher support in the core mathematics class and in the intensive reading class (grades 6-8) and during the core Reading/Math classes and/or the MTSS Tier 2/Tier 3 intervention time.

### Person

Responsible Ivonne Sardinas Darder (isardinas@pmwellsacademy.org)

Provide extra instructional time every day for students with disabilities who struggle to understand content being taught in the general education course.

Person Responsible Ivonne Sardinas Darder (isardinas@pmwellsacademy.org)

Allocate a Special Education coach to provide ESE teachers with the strategies required to meet the needs of the students per the IEP. In addition, to work with the general education teachers to understand how to provide the accommodations the students is entitled to per the IEP.

Person Responsible Ivonne Sardinas Darder (isardinas@pmwellsacademy.org)

### 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, the school 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 allocated for writing taught daily using the incorporated writing program. Lastly, a phonics based companion will be used, Fundations, for grades K-3 to increase phonics, phonemic awareness and vocabulary skills in the

students. This program will 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, the school 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 allocated for writing taught daily using the incorporated writing program. This program will 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. The dual language program will service K-3 students in 22-23, K-4 in 23-24, and K-5 in 24-25. 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)

PM Wells Charter Academy will achieve a minimum of 55% 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)

PM Wells Charter Academy will achieve a minimum of 55% 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.

Rosado, Iliana, irosado@pmwellsacademy.org

### **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. §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 Evidencebased 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 Fundations® 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, Fundations (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<br>Monitoring          |
|---------------------------|--|---|
| gro<br>scre<br>wee<br>imp | Implement an MTSS Learning Lab for reading to service Tier 3 students in small<br>sups with a reading endorsed teacher, groups will be based on Istation universal<br>eener assessment and the reading endorsed intervention teacher will have bi-<br>ekly meetings with the school's literacy coach to ensure the program is<br>blemented with fidelity including the use of Lexia Learning (Tier 1, Strong evidence<br>ESSA) and small-group reading intervention. | Rosado, Iliana,<br>irosado@pmwellsacademy.org |
| gua<br>pro                | Extend the day for all students for additional learning by 30 minutes daily to embed aranteed intervention time - the literacy coach will push in, model, co-teach, and/or wide feedback during the MTSS blocks as well as the use of key literacy curricula Fundations (Tier 3, Promising evidence per ESSA) and Wit&Wisdom.  | Rosado, Iliana,<br>irosado@pmwellsacademy.org |

### **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.