

Escambia County School District

Achieve Academy At Mcmillian



2022-23 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	12
R.A.I.S.E	18
Positive Culture & Environment	20

Achieve Academy At Mcmillian

3000 OWEN BELL LANE, Pensacola, FL 32507

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Christopher Wooten

Start Date for this Principal: 8/31/2022

2021-22 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Function (per accountability file)	Alternative
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative 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)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: Unsatisfactory 2020-21: No Rating 2018-19: Unsatisfactory 2017-18: Unsatisfactory 2016-17: Maintaining
DJJ Accountability Rating	2023-24: No Rating

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia County School Board.

SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools

receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Achieve Academy is deeply committed to the academic and social success of its students. Through partnerships with school districts across the country, we focus on re-engaging, graduating and preparing our students for success in K-12 and beyond.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Achieve Academy's vision is to provide students with a learning environment that integrates research-based instructional strategies and a normative school culture model that challenges students to achieve success, both academically and socially by encompassing high expectations and accountability standards for all stakeholders.

Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.

Achieve Academy serves students who have been removed from the traditional school setting for various behavior infractions. The majority of students served at Achieve Academy are minority male students, economically disadvantaged, with some being credit deficient either in middle or high school making them overage for their grade. Achieve Academy serves students in grades K-5 in our KAPS program and students in grades 6-12 on the Achieve side. Achieve Academy also serves students under the Exceptional Student Education Umbrella, students with 504's and general education students.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Travis, Leslie	Director of Education	Lead and supervise all areas of academics including teachers, Special Education, testing, curriculum, planning, Title I, etc. Serve as district liaison for each area of academics and leadership. Train and provide PD opportunities for staff.
Maxwell, Andrew	Regional Director	Supervise and guide school leadership team that includes Ms. Travis and the school director Mr. Wooten.

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

Yes

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

SESI (Specialized Education Services Inc.)

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/31/2022, Christopher Wooten

Total number of students enrolled at the school.

225

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.

15

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?

3

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?

12

Number of teachers with ESE certification?

2

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

4

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

2

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2022-23

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	2	6	10	10	10	12	50	58	37	19	8	3	225
Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	5	7	10	7	7	44	51	33	17	7	3	193
One or more suspensions	0	2	6	10	8	9	9	48	57	37	18	7	3	214
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	8	5	7	3	0	0	27
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	4	2	7	3	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	6	4	6	28	49	30	14	5	1	145
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	7	7	7	33	45	27	3	1	0	132
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	2	6	4	6	28	49	30	14	5	1	145

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	2	5	7	8	8	8	46	56	37	18	6	3	204

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	5	9	6	2	0	31
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	13	6	5	8	2	1	39

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/31/2022

2021-22 - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	3	4	6	7	11	8	22	29	22	17	13	2	144
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	1	6	5	9	7	15	21	19	9	9	1	103
One or more suspensions	0	2	4	6	3	6	8	22	27	19	14	8	0	119
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	5	5	7	2	0	28
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	5	4	3	2	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	7	6	18	15	17	12	7	0	86
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	20	23	13	3	0	0	73
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	11	8	6	16	23	18	11	7	2	102

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	1	1	6	3	6	6	16	23	18	11	6	1	98

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	5	3	4	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4	4	6	0	26

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		22%	55%					64%	61%
ELA Learning Gains								51%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile								41%	54%
Math Achievement		23%	42%					65%	62%
Math Learning Gains								47%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									52%
Science Achievement		18%	54%					71%	56%
Social Studies Achievement		32%	59%					69%	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-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	0%	56%	-56%	58%	-58%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	6%	52%	-46%	58%	-52%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019	0%	51%	-51%	56%	-56%
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
06	2022					
	2019	10%	42%	-32%	54%	-44%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019	0%	43%	-43%	52%	-52%
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
08	2022					
	2019	20%	50%	-30%	56%	-36%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	0%	55%	-55%	62%	-62%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	0%	58%	-58%	64%	-64%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019	0%	55%	-55%	60%	-60%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019	4%	36%	-32%	55%	-51%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019	17%	50%	-33%	54%	-37%
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
08	2022					
	2019	3%	21%	-18%	46%	-43%
Cohort Comparison		-17%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	0%	55%	-55%	53%	-53%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	10%	42%	-32%	48%	-38%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	58%	-58%	67%	-67%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	3%	54%	-51%	71%	-68%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	62%	-62%	70%	-70%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	5%	52%	-47%	61%	-56%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	47%	-47%	57%	-57%

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
SWD		11			6						
BLK		18	27		12	19				24	
FRL		18	33		14	24				19	

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	6	25		6	21		9			10	
BLK	2	23	40	2	19	30		4		15	
FRL	7	28		6	27		9	4			

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	5	19		4	35					8	
BLK	10	14	18	7	24	47				22	
FRL	12	18	18	9	26	47				22	

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	12
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	105
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	84%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	3
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	11
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	3

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	12
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	3

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

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

Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place related to the Areas of Focus?

During the 2021-2022 school year we used Star360 for progress monitoring assessments and students were provided with supplemental support through FRECKLE and iReady.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Reading showed the most growth with specific subgroups. During the 2021-2022 school year we incorporated the Frayer Model into every subject across grade levels, as we are doing again this school year.

What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?

Both Reading and Math show a need for improvement. FSA data and Star data indicate the need for additional Math supports.

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

FSA Math scores for 6-8 grade reflect the need for intense instruction in Geometry and Expressions/Equations. Each of these domains were below 20% correct for each grade level.

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

We will continue with use of the Frayer Model across all grades/subjects. Use Title I funds to purchase supplemental Florida Performance Coach for grades 3-19 for Reading. To address Text-Based Writing, students will receive explicit instruction in citing a text and elaborating on the text using Answer-Cite-Explain writing strategy. This strategy is designed to provide students with a structure to cite and elaborate on text evidence.

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

All teachers will attend professional development on using data (FAST, iReady, Freckle, and Star) to drive small group instruction. Additionally, they will receive professional development on the ACE-writing model to support text-based writing in all subject areas. Elementary and Math teachers will receive training and support on Freckle Math as well as the Gradual Release of Responsibility lesson plan. ELA, Reading, and Elementary teachers will train on iReady as well as Close Read Strategies. Elementary teachers will train on Wilson Fluency/Reading.

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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

Based on English Language Arts Statewide Assessment Data, 75% of students scored below the 50th percentile rank.

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

Based on the new FAST progress monitoring, 25% of students in each subgroup will score at a proficient level on the third progress monitoring assessment.

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

In addition to the FAST progress monitoring assessments, student progress will be monitored through the use of the iReady literacy program.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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

K-5 students will use iReady to support phonics, phonemic awareness, and sight word recognition. iReady will be utilized from grades K-10.

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

Evidence for ESSA endorses the use of iReady.

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 training in the use of iReady and data collection and review.

Person Responsible Leslie Travis (ltravis@ecsdfl.us)

Facilitate and monitor use of programs as a part of small group literacy instruction.

Person Responsible Leslie Travis (ltravis@ecsdfl.us)

Review iReady data for subgroup each 9-weeks to identify need for additional interventions.

Person Responsible Leslie Travis (ltravis@ecsdfl.us)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:
 If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

#2. 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.

Based on English Language Arts Statewide Assessment Data, 75% of students scored below the 50th percentile rank.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on the new FAST progress monitoring, 35% of students will score at a proficient level on the third progress monitoring assessment for English Language Arts.

Monitoring:

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

In addition to the FAST progress monitoring assessments, student progress will be monitored through the use of the iReady literacy program.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Students will receive strategic, intensive small group instruction in foundational reading components. Grades K-2 will receive reading instruction focused on Dolch/Fry words as well as fluency instruction utilizing the Wilson Fluency Readers. Grade 3-10 will include reading instruction that incorporates explicit vocabulary instruction as well as the use of Close Reading techniques infused in ELA as well as content specific curriculum.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Intensive, strategic small group reading comprehension instruction is rated as a strong evidence-based strategy by the What Works Clearinghouse. Evidence for ESSA endorses the use of Wilson Fluency Readers.

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 professional development on use of Wilson Fluency Readers and Close Reading techniques in all subject areas.

Person Responsible

Leslie Travis (ltravis@ecsdfl.us)

Facilitate and monitor use of programs as a part of small group literacy instruction.

Person Responsible

Leslie Travis (ltravis@ecsdfl.us)

Review iReady data for subgroup each 9-weeks to identify need for additional interventions.

Person Responsible

Leslie Travis (ltravis@ecsdfl.us)

Provide professional development on explicit vocabulary instruction and close reading comprehension strategies.

Person Responsible

Leslie Travis (ltravis@ecsdfl.us)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of

ESSA subgroups (Black, Students with Disabilities, Economically Disadvantaged) progress monitoring will occur via FAST, Star Reading, Star Early Literacy, and iReady. They will take weekly fluency assessments using Wilson Fluency Readers and weekly

Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

sight word assessments. Data will be reviewed every 4.5 weeks to track progress and adjust interventions.

#3. 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.

Based on Math Statewide Assessment Data, 83% of students scored below the 50th percentile rank.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on the new FAST progress monitoring, 30% of students will score at a proficient level on the third progress monitoring assessment for Math.

Monitoring:

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

Students' progress will be monitored on the first and second administration of the FAST progress monitoring. Interim progress will be monitored via iReady Math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Students will participate in explicit, systematic small group math instruction. Students will utilize iReady Math as a part of daily math instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Explicit, systematic instruction is shown to be a highly effective evidence-based practice with a 1.19 effect size. iReady Math has moderate evidence to support its effectiveness.

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.

Professional Development on iReady Math.

Person Responsible

Leslie Travis (ltravis@ecsdfl.us)

Monitor weekly use of iReady.

Person Responsible

Leslie Travis (ltravis@ecsdfl.us)

Professional development on small group math instruction for K-5 and 6-10.

Person Responsible

Leslie Travis (ltravis@ecsdfl.us)

Review iReady Math data quarterly and identify need for additional interventions.

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

ESSA subgroups (Black, Students with Disabilities, Economically Disadvantaged) progress monitoring will occur via FAST, Freckle Math, and Progress Learning. Fast data will be reviewed after each testing window to differentiate interventions. Freckle Math data will be reviewed every 4.5 weeks to monitor student progress, identify areas of concern, and implement remediation/interventions.

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

Students will participate in strategic small group instruction focusing on fluency, phonemic awareness, and sight word recognition. Programs used will include Wilson's Fluency Basic Readers, iReady, and Freckle. Diagnostic assessments will be the Star Early Literacy as well as iReady. iReady will also be used for formative assessments and progress monitoring. iReady and Wilson Fluency Basic Readers are purchased using Title I funds. Additionally, students will work in small groups, teacher led groups, to reinforce sight word recognition.

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

Student will participate in literacy based small group centers. Diagnostic assessments conducted will be the F.A.S.T., iReady, as well as Dolch/Fry Sight Word assessments. In teacher led small groups students will participate in Close Reads of informational and literary texts. Additionally, students will utilize iReady and Freckle to promote growth while also serving as progress monitoring and formative assessments.

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)

Based on the STAR Early Literacy Assessment, the percentage of students reaching proficiency will increase from 31% of K-2 grade students to 41% of K-2 grade students.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Based on the new FAST assessment, the percentage of 3-5 students reaching proficiency will increase from 35% to 45% by the third progress monitoring period.

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.

In addition to the F.A.S.T. progress monitoring, student progress will be monitored via iReady. iReady will be utilized daily as a part of English Language Arts instruction. Student progress will also be monitored via weekly sight word assessments, as well as quarterly fluency and reading comprehension assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Travis, Leslie, ltravis@ecsdf.us

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?

The evidence-based program, iReady, will be utilized. It has a strong rating, and this intervention aligns with the Foundations strand of the BEST ELA Standards. This strand encompasses fluency, phonics, and phonemic awareness. Teachers will utilize the intervention of providing intensive, systematic instruction on foundational reading skills in small groups. Foundational reading skills include comprehension, fluency, phonemic awareness, phonics, and vocabulary.

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?

iReady is evidence-based practices/programs based on Evidence for ESSA. iReady will support student growth in the areas of fluency, phonics, phonemic awareness, and reading comprehension. What Works Clearinghouse identifies intensive, systematic instruction on foundation skills as a strong evidence based practice.

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
Literacy Leadership: 1. Review initial FAST/STAR data to determine initial instructional needs. Utilize data to identify students in need of additional interventions. 2. Review subsequent FAST/STAR data to evaluate effectiveness of interventions and develop strategic plan to address concerns.	Travis, Leslie, ltravis@ecsdfi.us

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment is critical in supporting sustainable schoolwide improvement initiatives. When schools implement a shared focus on improving school culture and environment, students are more likely to engage academically. A positive school culture and environment can also increase staff satisfaction and retention.

Select a targeted element from the menu to develop a system or process to be implemented for schoolwide improvement related to positive culture and environment.

Other

Describe how data will be collected and analyzed to guide decision making related to the selected target.

Achieve Academy works hard to maintain a positive school culture. A positive school culture is embedded in every aspect of our school. We set norms for every area within the school and norms are what help to drive our positive culture, from our student arrival process, townhouse, hallways, transitions and classrooms. School admin and the resource team monitor the culture of the school daily. Data is tracked through our CIP, which is required from our parent company, and reviewed weekly within the resource team and data share through teams.

Describe how the target area, related data and resulting action steps will be communicated to stakeholders.

Our norms, operations and focus on a positive school culture are communicated at every student orientation, parent meetings and at every Title I meeting. We share data with our district partners and

stakeholders through monthly reports and data from our Campus Improvement Plan. Our CIP is posted throughout the school for visitors and staff to see.

Describe how implementation will be progress monitored.

Our process is ongoing and implemented daily. Norms are reviewed everyday. Data is reviewed daily - attendance through monitoring for meeting daily attendance goals, discipline through review of incidents from each day with reflection of how to monitor for the next school day, parent communication is recorded and shared with all staff.

Parents/stakeholders are provided with the opportunity to complete a survey each time they are on campus. Data is reviewed and shared at parent meetings and with our staff.

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.

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Share data with stakeholders at the Annual Title I meeting and Open House.	Travis, Leslie, ltravis@ecsdfi.us
Continue to provide survey's for parents/stakeholders and share the data.	Travis, Leslie, ltravis@ecsdfi.us