Emma Jewel Charter Academy School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Emma Jewel Charter Academy

705 BLAKE AVE, Cocoa, FL 32922

http://emmajewelcharter.com

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;   2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;   3. Have a school grade of D or F; or   4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The Mission of Emma Jewel Charter Academy (EJCA) is to instill within each scholar a passion for learning, a
strong desire to nurture their family members, friends and their community. We will empower each individual
scholar to be lifelong learners, problem solvers and have a positive impact in their community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is for all scholars to demonstrate academic excellence once they are placed in a
nurturing educational environment where they are valued and celebrated for their uniqueness.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Cole, Thomas	Principal	To provide a safe learning and working environment for all educators scholars, and parents. He will support scholars and educators in their pursuit of increasing academic success. He will set the tone for providing a culture that expect a high standard for all that enter the building.
Karnetsky, Mary	Assistant Principal	Inputs information into data bases for lunch programs, scholar academic programs, scheduling, and testing coordinator. Supports school budget and data meetings as needed. Manages the Professional Development. Performs evaluations on teachers.
Hansen-Lettsome, Jeselle	Reading Coach	Works with educators through the IPST and MTSS process. Reviews scholar data to help monitor progress during intervention. Observes classroom instruction and provides feedback to educators.
Turner, Greg	Other	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

SIP will be reviewed with teachers and parents at Open House. A copy will also be posted on the Emma Jewel web site. The SIP Plan will be reviewed with the SAC team and school board for questions and input. During pre-planning prior year's data was shared as well as the changes in the grading system after which teachers were able to provide input for the SIP Plan.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP Plan will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs with administration, curriculum mapping, biweekly Data Chats, and evidence of impact on scholar achievement using FAST, STAR, iReady, and KLS. The plan will be reviewed/revised throughout the school year by the School Leadership Team

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	98%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	9	15	8	11	9	6	4	3	0	65
One or more suspensions	7	9	12	3	15	21	12	14	5	98
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	14	12	17	13	10	71
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	13	21	17	14	0	7	72
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	4	4	7	19	16	13	11	7	81

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	10	14	8	8	10	7	1	3	0	61
One or more suspensions	3	0	1	0	4	9	0	2	0	19
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	1	4	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	17	16	13	13	11	77
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	19	26	18	15	8	92
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	1	2	9	10	5	9	4	41

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	17	23	17	15	6	9	13	6	109
Students retained two or more times	0	0	6	1	3	2	8	7	7	34

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	10	14	8	8	10	7	1	3	0	61
One or more suspensions	3	0	1	0	4	9	0	2	0	19
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	1	4	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	17	16	13	13	11	77
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	19	26	18	15	8	92
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	1	2	9	10	5	9	4	41

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	17	23	17	15	6	9	13	6	109
Students retained two or more times	0	0	6	1	3	2	8	7	7	34

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	32	58	53	27	63	55	29		
ELA Learning Gains				52			40		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				60			39		
Math Achievement*	30	62	55	33	40	42	29		
Math Learning Gains				54			42		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47			41		
Science Achievement*	25	61	52	27	64	54	28		
Social Studies Achievement*	57	72	68	66	61	59	60		
Middle School Acceleration		70	70	0	51	51			
Graduation Rate		87	74		62	50			
College and Career Acceleration		75	53		76	70			
ELP Progress	60	47	55	57	68	70			

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	243
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	423
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	13	Yes	4	1
ELL	60			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	1	
HSP	24	Yes	1	1
MUL	33	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	35	Yes	1	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	32	Yes	3	
ELL	57			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP	49			
MUL	44			
PAC				
WHT	39	Yes	1	
FRL	41			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	32			30			25	57				60
SWD	17			14			11				4	
ELL											1	60
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29			30			17	67			5	
HSP	26			21							2	
MUL	44			22							2	
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	29			30			26	54			5	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	27	52	60	33	54	47	27	66	0			57
SWD	9	47	56	11	36	47	5	42				
ELL												57
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	26	52	53	32	53	45	27	60				
HSP	26	59		37	67							54
MUL	26	56		37	56							
PAC												
WHT	42	36		42	36							
FRL	24	51	60	34	55	43	27	64	0			55

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	29	40	39	29	42	41	28	60				
SWD	17	26	26	15	28	29	25	31				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24	37	37	28	43	42	26	58				
HSP	32	43		32	50							
MUL	42	53		27	33							
PAC												
WHT	41	46		41	31							
FRL	26	39	42	30	43	39	24	62				

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.
The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	29%	59%	-30%	54%	-25%
07	2023 - Spring	32%	53%	-21%	47%	-15%
08	2023 - Spring	45%	52%	-7%	47%	-2%
04	2023 - Spring	30%	61%	-31%	58%	-28%
06	2023 - Spring	32%	61%	-29%	47%	-15%
03	2023 - Spring	36%	56%	-20%	50%	-14%

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	41%	67%	-26%	54%	-13%
07	2023 - Spring	50%	58%	-8%	48%	2%
03	2023 - Spring	38%	60%	-22%	59%	-21%
04	2023 - Spring	14%	61%	-47%	61%	-47%
08	2023 - Spring	23%	38%	-15%	55%	-32%
05	2023 - Spring	21%	55%	-34%	55%	-34%

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	32%	48%	-16%	44%	-12%
05	2023 - Spring	21%	57%	-36%	51%	-30%

ALGEBRA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	51%	*	50%	*

CIVICS

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	56%	69%	-13%	66%	-10%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Proficiency in ELA, Math, and Science are still lower than expected. Civics had a substantial decrease in proficiency in comparison to previous years. Grades 4 and 5 continue to stand out as the lowest performing grades in regard to scholar proficiency. High staff turnover the past few years at these grade levels continues to be an issue. Hiring highly qualified teachers is a struggle. Other factors include working with new standards and adjusting to standards in math that had changed by grade level as well as the high level of mobility of scholars that are low performing entering school from other schools.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Proficiency scores in all areas continue to be a concern. Civics showed the biggest decline dropping 12%. Science continues to be an area of concern. Reading is a contributing factor to all content-based testing. Informational text is typically a bigger challenge for our scholars. Scholars can understand concepts verbally, but when presented in text it is often confusing. Scholars need an increased focus to reading in the content areas after discussions and verbal understanding. Content vocabulary is a must. Intervention groups for older scholars need to be focused on science and government standards to help expose scholars to content multiple times.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average was the percentage of scholars scoring Level 1 on statewide standardized tests. A factor leading to this trend are the number of scholars with substantial reading deficiencies.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was 3rd grade reading proficiency. We only had 3 scholars that scored a level 1 in grade 3 reading. That is the lowest number we have had at Emma Jewel. A consistent targeted intervention plan and consistently teaching small groups during the core in instruction lead to this improvement. Implementation of SAXON Phonics over the past three years in grades K-3 is paying off as our scholars progress through our systems.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Areas of concern in academics continue to be grades 4 and 5 which produced the most level 1 scholars in both math and ELA. Another area of concern is attendance. 61 Scholars with over 10% of days missed is far too many. Also, there are 34 scholars that have been retained two or more years. The research on this is disaster in regard to scholars dropping out of school. One retention if not continuously monitored is bad but two is a death sentence as far as education is concerned. This should not be happening.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

ELA, Writing, Math, Science, Grade 3 Reading. When your proficiency levels are consistently below 40% all areas are high priorities. Reading may take precedence as it affects all other areas. Grades 7 and 8 are particularly the highest performing grades in regard to proficiency in both ELA and Math.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

**Do not have to enter anything for this area

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

Attendance at school events will be monitored to measure the culture of the school. Surveys will be provided to staff, parents, and scholars during the year specifically relating to the culture at the school.

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

Evidence of implementation: Event attendance with survey taken following the completion of the event and surveys will be provided to all stakeholders in regards to school culture

Evidence of impact: Number of attendees and data with 80% or more rating that the school has a positive culture on campus

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tranisha Boother (tboother@emmajewelcharter.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Continuing the implementation of Positive Behavioral Support strategies in teaching and recognizing scholars exhibiting characteristics that represent a high quality scholar. Continuing to recognize and support the school store for the token economy (Warrior Bucks) for scholars and parents in which dollars are earned for exhibiting positive characteristics.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Why these strategies for these scholars? Scholars exhibiting positive behaviors and characteristics need to be recognized often to model the expectations and rewarding for representing the school in a positive way.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to White

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Data provided demonstrated that 39% of our white scholars were proficient in reading.

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

Our White scholars will make a 5% increase in reading proficiency from 39% to 44%.

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

Our white scholars will be monitored through IReady, Cold assessments, and Cambium progress monitoring by our reading coach after each testing period.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeselle Hansen-Lettsome (hansen-lettsome.jeselle@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Scholars below proficiency will be placed in Tier 2 or Tier 3 intervention. FCRR approved intervention programs will be implemented and monitored to ensure that the scholars are making progress towards proficiency based on the data collected.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Approved tier 2 or tier 3 interventions have been studied and shown to have success with all scholars. Monitoring of their improvement will be a key to ensure success of these scholars.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Students with disabilities has continued to be an area of concern. It is the third year that we have been below 41%. The data provided has us at 32%.

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

Emma Jewel's students with disabilities will have a 15% increase to 47% on this years summative assessment.

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

Monthly meetings will take place with ESE specialist as well as classroom teachers to monitor the progress of the scholars. Meetings will be specific for showing growth toward goals and achieving on grade level status.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeselle Hansen-Lettsome (hansen-lettsome.jeselle@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Interventions being used will be approved programs that have demonstrated success and approved by the state. The intervention being used will depend on the specific needs of the scholars. Assessments that diagnosis the specific needs will be used to monitor success. Scholars will get their minutes in small groups with a highly certified instructor using programs such as Barton, 95% group materials, and Rewards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In order to provide intervention scholars have to be diagnosed using an appropriate tool. This will then allow the use of an appropriate intervention tool to be used during instruction. Meetings will have to take place with all educators that service these scholars to ensure that everyone is implementing appropriate strategies during instruction.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP will be shared at Title I Family Nights, at Governing Board Meetings and at Staff Meetings. A copy of the SIP is posted on the school's website: www.emmajewelcharteracademy.com.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The school will use FOCUS to allow parents to monitor the status of their child's progress. This will be shared at all meetings (parent teacher conferences, Title 1 Family Nights...). The school holds multiple activities for parents to become involved with the school. One such event is a monthly breakfast to celebrate scholars that are representing their classroom as a person who is demonstrating a certain positive characteristic for that month. Information is sent in written form, on the webpage, and through voice mail to keep parents informed of various events. The Emma Jewel Step Team performs at multiple community events throughout the year.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Area of Focus is white and students with disabilities. Emma Jewel has an extended school day. School starts at 8:00 am and dismisses at 3:45 pm. After school tutoring starts in September twice a week for reading and math. Saturday school starts in late January and runs up to testing, focusing on reading and math. The is the second year of implementing (reading program). Programs including i-Ready, Study Island, Barton, 95% Group products, Rewards, Lexia and Heggerty are being used to target areas of student need. Small group differentiated instruction is used at all levels.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

The school receives the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program grant to provide fresh produce to our scholars to promote good nutrition.
The school was awarded Brevard County's CDBG (Community Development Block Grant) and is used to supplement the transportation budget to provide transportation to and from school for more scholars to increase attendance.