

Collier County Public Schools

# RCMA Immokalee Community School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>                                   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>I. School Information</b>                                       | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>                            | <b>11</b> |
| <b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>                               | <b>16</b> |
| <b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>                       | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>                                    | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>                       | <b>0</b>  |

## RCMA Immokalee Community School

123 N 4TH ST, Immokalee, FL 34142

charterschools.rcma.org

### 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),<br>(7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B)<br>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.**

Mission: Redlands Christian Migrant Association Charter Schools are committed to excellence in education. Students will be educated to reach their potential as bilingual individuals with life choices and opportunities for success.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

RCMA Charter Schools prepare our students to be bilingual, bi-literate and bi cultural life-long learners; sources of energy, hope, and leadership for themselves, families, communities, and their nation. We work with parents to provide students with an education rooted in shared values and ethical foundations necessary for responsible citizenship, a life lived with integrity, and a commitment to the higher purpose of serving and advocating for others.

### 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  |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Brown, Juana      | Director of Charter Schools | The responsibilities of our schools executive director include the following. She helps to provide leadership opportunities, supports the school's vision while ensuring the curriculum aligns with it, assure that students are learning effectively in the classroom by meeting their personal and education goals and needs. Our charter school director, also helps to achieve financial and fundraising goals and maintaining and improving the school's overall rating, and assuring that we are in compliance with our district and state requirements.   |
| Quintero, Zulaika |                             | The duties and responsibilities of the principal are to oversee all school operations policies and procedures, budgets, and ensure the school remains a safe site for students. The principal hires, monitors, and evaluates all staff, as well as monitors student achievement, and encourage parent involvement.   |
| Facundo, Amy      |                             | Our instructional coach has an important role of great value, as she helps our teachers by ensuring that they reach their highest level of success. She helps to promote the use of data to inform and drive teaching practices. She also supports by helping to reflect on their instruction, by collaborating, modeling, and giving them honest feedback. This helps to promote a supportive and connected environment.  |
| Seijo, Audrey     | Academic Coach              | Support teachers in using data to improve instruction on all levels. Develop coaching plans to ensure teachers and student improvement through professional development and targeted topics and designs. She works with teachers in order to establish professional learning communities that provide support and guidance for interventions for all grade levels.   |
| Preciado, Manuel  | Afterschool Manager         | Our after school manager provides a safe, nurturing, and well supervised after school program and summer program; he's the liaison with parents, collaborators, school leadership, volunteers, and visitors and displays the site and the program positively. He is responsible for planning and development of the creative learning environment, establishment of interest centers, and preparation of needed materials and supplies. In addition he is responsible for the collection of program data, providing reports for contract compliance, and assisting with administrative support. He is also responsible for recruitment and retention of after school staff, and supervision of after school staff. |
| Gregorio, Rosa    |                             | Provides support services to students, staff, and parents. Support services include referrals, assessment, diagnostics, and report writing. This work takes place at the school site, in other public buildings, and in private residences independent judgment and learned social work skills must be used with establishing, maintaining, and using a network of accessible community  |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|------|----------------|--|
|      |                | services to assist families with fulfilling their goals and becoming advocates for their children. |

### 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.

The school leadership team sets the area of focus on the school improvement plan and meet on an ongoing basis to review DATA, set goals and make adjustments to current programming. Each member has an important piece of the plan which they are responsible to implement throughout the school year.

Teachers and staff help develop the school improvement plan by giving their input on the areas of focus. Once input is given, we move forward with implementing the plan for the year.

The School Advisory Council is given the opportunity to review the School Improvement Plan throughout the school year. SAC parents are given the DATA to review and to approve during our SAC meeting in August. Once approved, it is provided to all parents via backpack.

### 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 will be monitored throughout the school year during our bi-weekly leadership team meetings. We will discuss the plan and make adjustments as needed. The team member responsible for each area of focus will be able to bring in their DATA points to discuss and evaluate. Our Wednesday professional development days will be tailored to our school improvement plan. PD's will be focused on the goals set by our school improvement plan. Bi-weekly teacher meetings will be held with the school principal and teachers will be bringing their own DATA as evidence of their progress toward the state's academic standards.

After each quarterly assessment, DATA will be reviewed by all stakeholders to assess and make any necessary changes.

### Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

|   |                            |
|---|----------------------------|
| <b>2023-24 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)                | Active                     |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File) | Combination School<br>KG-8 |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)          | K-12 General Education     |
| <b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>                    | Yes                        |



|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>   | 100%  |
| <b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>   | 100%  |
| <b>Charter School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>RAISE School</b>  | No  |
| <b>ESSA Identification</b><br>*updated as of 3/11/2024   | N/A   |
| <b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>  | No  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)<br>English Language Learners (ELL)<br>Hispanic Students (HSP)<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| <b>School Grades History</b><br>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.  | 2021-22: B<br>2019-20: B<br>2018-19: B<br>2017-18: B  |
| <b>School Improvement Rating History</b>   |   |
| <b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>   |   |

### 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   | 6           | 0  | 6  | 4  | 6 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 36 |       |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2  |       |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 7  |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 17 | 13 | 11 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 68 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 4  | 3  | 2  | 2 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 18 |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 10          | 11 | 4  | 10 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 42 |       |

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           | 11 | 4 | 10 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 39    |

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1     |

**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 |
|---|-------------|-------|
| Absent 10% or more days   |             |       |
| One or more suspensions   |             |       |
| Course failure in ELA   |             |       |
| Course failure in Math  |             |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   |             |       |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  |             |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. |             |       |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Students with two or more indicators |             |       |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Retained Students: Current Year     |             |       |
| Students retained two or more times |             |       |

**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   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |
| 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 | 0 |       |

**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 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     |

**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 | 0     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     |

**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*                | 50     | 58       | 53    | 56     | 62       | 55    | 48     |          |       |
| ELA Learning Gains              |        |          |       | 61     |          |       | 55     |          |       |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile      |        |          |       | 62     |          |       | 50     |          |       |
| Math Achievement*               | 76     | 63       | 55    | 69     | 45       | 42    | 61     |          |       |
| Math Learning Gains             |        |          |       | 66     |          |       | 41     |          |       |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile     |        |          |       | 53     |          |       | 38     |          |       |
| Science Achievement*            | 31     | 55       | 52    | 35     | 59       | 54    | 24     |          |       |
| Social Studies Achievement*     | 58     | 76       | 68    | 58     | 56       | 59    |        |          |       |
| Middle School Acceleration      | 76     | 62       | 70    |        | 51       | 51    |        |          |       |
| Graduation Rate                 |        | 56       | 74    |        | 54       | 50    |        |          |       |
| College and Career Acceleration |        | 63       | 53    |        | 73       | 70    |        |          |       |
| ELP Progress                    | 62     | 58       | 55    | 53     | 66       | 70    | 61     |          |       |

*\* 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](#).

### ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index                     |     |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)               | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 55  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 1   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 382 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 7   |
| Percent Tested                                 | 100 |
| Graduation Rate                                |     |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index                     |     |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)               | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 57  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 0   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 513 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 9   |
| Percent Tested                                 | 100 |
| 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                                | 38                              | Yes                | 1   |   |
| ELL                                | 42                              |                    |   |   |
| AMI                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| ASN                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| BLK                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| HSP                                | 55                              |                    |   |   |

**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

| <b>ESSA Subgroup</b> | <b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b> | <b>Subgroup Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b> |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| MUL                  |  |                           |  |  |
| PAC                  |  |                           |  |  |
| WHT                  |  |                           |  |  |
| FRL                  | 55                                     |                           |  |  |

**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

| <b>ESSA Subgroup</b> | <b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b> | <b>Subgroup Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b> |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| SWD                  | 54                                     |                           |  |  |
| ELL                  | 53                                     |                           |  |  |
| AMI                  |  |                           |  |  |
| ASN                  |  |                           |  |  |
| BLK                  |  |                           |  |  |
| HSP                  | 57                                     |                           |  |  |
| MUL                  |  |                           |  |  |
| PAC                  |  |                           |  |  |
| WHT                  |  |                           |  |  |
| FRL                  | 57                                     |                           |  |  |

**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**

| <b>Subgroups</b> | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2021-22</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2021-22</b> | <b>ELP Progress</b> |
|------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| All Students     | 50              |               |                    | 76               |                |                     | 31              | 58             | 76               |                          |                                | 62                  |
| SWD              | 27              |               |                    | 60               |                |                     | 27              |                |                  |                          | 4                              | 36                  |
| ELL              | 35              |               |                    | 70               |                |                     | 26              | 39             |                  |                          | 6                              | 62                  |
| AMI              |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |
| ASN              |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |                     |

| 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 |
| BLK  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 50       |        |             | 76        |         |              | 31       | 58      | 76        |                   | 7                   | 62           |
| MUL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 50       |        |             | 76        |         |              | 31       | 58      | 76        |                   | 7                   | 62           |

| 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                                   | 56       | 61     | 62          | 69        | 66      | 53           | 35       | 58      |           |                   |                     | 53           |
| SWD  | 48       | 65     | 62          | 67        | 52      | 40           |          |         |           |                   |                     | 45           |
| ELL  | 54       | 61     | 58          | 63        | 61      | 45           | 33       | 50      |           |                   |                     | 53           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 56       | 61     | 62          | 69        | 66      | 53           | 35       | 58      |           |                   |                     | 53           |
| MUL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 56       | 61     | 62          | 69        | 66      | 53           | 35       | 58      |           |                   |                     | 53           |

| 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                                   | 48       | 55     | 50          | 61        | 41      | 38           | 24       |         |           |                   |                     | 61           |
| SWD  | 16       | 30     |             | 40        | 10      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     | 53           |
| ELL  | 46       | 56     | 46          | 55        | 38      | 33           | 13       |         |           |                   |                     | 61           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 48       | 55     | 50          | 61        | 41      | 38           | 22       |         |           |                   |                     | 61           |
| MUL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |

| 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 |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 47       | 54     | 53          | 60        | 39      | 38           | 23       |         |           |                   |                     | 59           |

### 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 | 53%    | 60%      | -7%                        | 54%   | -1%                     |
| 07    | 2023 - Spring | 49%    | 52%      | -3%                        | 47%   | 2%                      |
| 08    | 2023 - Spring | 54%    | 47%      | 7%                         | 47%   | 7%                      |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 51%    | 65%      | -14%                       | 58%   | -7%                     |
| 06    | 2023 - Spring | 58%    | 51%      | 7%                         | 47%   | 11%                     |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 26%    | 56%      | -30%                       | 50%   | -24%                    |

| MATH  |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06    | 2023 - Spring | 87%    | 70%      | 17%                        | 54%   | 33%                     |
| 07    | 2023 - Spring | 69%    | 75%      | -6%                        | 48%   | 21%                     |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 69%    | 67%      | 2%                         | 59%   | 10%                     |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 91%    | 74%      | 17%                        | 61%   | 30%                     |
| 08    | 2023 - Spring | 75%    | 52%      | 23%                        | 55%   | 20%                     |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 64%    | 70%      | -6%                        | 55%   | 9%                      |

| SCIENCE |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08      | 2023 - Spring | 46%    | 45%      | 1%                         | 44%   | 2%                      |

| SCIENCE |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05      | 2023 - Spring | 14%    | 62%      | -48%                       | 51%   | -37%                    |

| ALGEBRA |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A     | 2023 - Spring | 89%    | 59%      | 30%                        | 50%   | 39%                     |

| CIVICS |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|--------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade  | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A    | 2023 - Spring | 54%    | 68%      | -14%                       | 66%   | -12%                    |

### 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.**

The data component that showed the lowest performance was 5th grade Science. The contributing factors for the low performance are: lack of high quality Science curriculum, teacher preparation and underlying reading skills.

Historically, our Science scores tend to fluctuate but have always been below Reading and Math achievement.

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

The two data components that showed the greatest decline were 5th grade Science and 3rd grade Reading.

For 5th grade Science, the contributing factors for the low performance are: lack of high quality Science curriculum, teacher preparation and underlying reading skills.

For 3rd grade Reading, the contributing factors for the low performance are: lack of mastery on foundational reading skills from prior grades. This group of scholars were highly impacted by COVID. The repeated quarantines and distance learning was detrimental to these scholars who needed classroom interaction with teachers and classmates during face-to-face instruction.

**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 that had the greatest gap with compared to the state average is 5th grade Science. The contributing factors were lack of high quality Science curriculum, teacher preparation and underlying reading skills.

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

The overall school Math proficiency data showed the most improvement. We set wildly important goals (WIGS) for every classroom, a new high quality math curriculum was implemented last school year and every middle school scholar participated in a double block of Math.

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

The primary area of concern from the EWS data is reading. In particular, in the lower elementary grades during the 2022-2023 school year (grades K-4) there is a pattern of higher numbers of students scoring a Level 1 or having an indicator for substantial reading deficiency. In these grades nearly 25% of students are scoring at the lowest level of reading proficiency. In grades 1-3, special attention needs to be paid to students scoring a level 1 (2023-2024 grades 2-4). Substantial reading deficiency (below 10th%) numbers were high in grades K, 1 and 3 (2023-2024 grades 1, 2, and 4).

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

1. 5th Grade Science
2. 1st-4th Grade Reading
3. School Culture and Climate

**Area of Focus**

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

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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.

While student performance in math has continued to improve since COVID closures, reading achievement for our students has largely stayed the same or decreased for certain grades. While 77% of our students in K-8 achieved grade level achievement or above in math for the 2022-2023 school year, 49% of those same students achieved grade level proficiency in reading for the same time period. This was particularly pronounced in grades K-3, where nearly 25% of students remained at level 1. For this reason, we are focusing on improving reading achievement, particularly for our youngest scholars.

To that end, we have identified ELA instructional priorities for the 2023-2024 school year:

1. Build principal and coach capacity lead our literacy initiatives
2. Implementation of foundational skill reading diagnostic and progress monitoring in grades K-3
3. Build teachers' knowledge of how to use Amplify CKLA tools and curriculum supplements to address foundational skill needs
4. Implement UFLI Foundations as a Tier 2 intervention for the students with the most substantial reading deficiencies grades K-4.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

75% of K-2 students are proficient readers as measured by the EOY STAR Early Literacy/ Reading state assessment (2022-23: 135/231 students/58%).

Reduce the number of students in all grades who are scoring a level 1 or identified for a substantial reading deficiency by 50% as measured by the FAST assessment.

**Monitoring:**

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

In weekly principal meetings, the principal manager will meet with the principal to analyze data from the classrooms of concern. During these meetings, they will monitor the implementation of the plan and needs for adjustments or next steps.

In bi-weekly leadership meetings, the leadership team will analyze data from grade levels of concern and make adjustments to plans to support those grade level teachers. The leadership team will determine appropriate next steps and assign roles and responsibilities for team members related to those steps. The principal will hold bi-weekly data chats with teachers where they bring in evidence of student progress toward learning goals and evidence of plan implementation to determine next steps for achievement. The MTSS team and grade level teachers will monitor student data to determine who should be part of the UFLI intervention, assign them to an intervention group, and evaluate weekly progress monitoring performance.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Zulaika Quintero (quintz@collierschools.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.)

UFLI Foundations is a daily systematic foundational skills program that can be used in whole or small group for at grade level or below grade level students.

We will also implement summarizing and scaffolding strategies school-wide because they have been shown to be high leverage strategies for reading instructions.

#### **Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We have selected UFLI as an evidence-based intervention because we want to focus on our K-4 students with the lowest levels of proficiency. The program includes phonemic awareness, phonics, and fluency. It is systematic, easy-to-use, and has been shown to be an effective, interleaved practice for students.

We believe implementing summarizing and scaffolding across grade levels will support our students to make deeper meaning of texts even as they work on improving their foundational abilities. These have been shown to be high-impact strategies for all academic classes so will address gaps not only in ELA but in content areas.

#### **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.

Train school leadership in the science of reading

**Person Responsible:** Ashley Johnson (ashley.johnson@rcma.org)

**By When:** October 2023

Implement weekly and bi-weekly data chats at each school level to track progress of students toward reading goals

**Person Responsible:** Zulaika Quintero (quintz@collierschools.com)

**By When:** May 2024

Implement Tier 2 UFLI foundations for students with substantial reading deficiencies in grades 1-4 and who are in need of phonics support

**Person Responsible:** Amy Facundo (amy@rcma.org)

**By When:** September 30, 2023

Provide Amplify professional learning for teachers to support summarizing and scaffolding in ELA lessons

**Person Responsible:** Ashley Johnson (ashley.johnson@rcma.org)

**By When:** October 2023

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science****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.

Our Science scores have declined from previous years. Our percentage for meeting high standards in Science had increased in previous years: 2015-16 29%, 2016-17 39%, 2017-18 52%, 2018-19 our Science achievement percentage decreased to an 8% and 2020-2021 our Science achievement percentage increase to a 24% and in 2021-2022 our Science achievement score increased again to 35%. In 2022-23, our science achievement decreased to 14%. This is the largest gap between our average and the state average in all of our end of year data. This was the first year we tested 8th grade students for science and achievement was 46%, slightly above the state average. Science remains an area of focus for ICA.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The objective for the 2023-2024 school year is to attain a 50% or higher proficiency in 5th and 8th grade FSA science achievement score.

**Monitoring:**

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

Teachers will individually monitor their students progress for each standard. Academic coach will monitor each testing grade-level as a whole to determine specific needs. Leadership team will monitor student performance data during monthly collaborative meetings.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Zulaika Quintero (quintz@collierschools.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.)

"Classroom Discussion ES = .82

Planning and Prediction ES= .76

Summarization ES= .79

ESSA High Impact Strategies- Teaching Academic Content to EL; integrate oral and reading instruction into content area teaching

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We believe using these evidence-based interventions will increase science achievement because they will work together to support students ability to apply scientific knowledge to more rigorous grade-level tasks. These strategies emphasize vocabulary-building and application, two areas our students need support in. We will also use Progress learning to better monitor students progress toward grade-level standards mastery in science.

**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.

Train teachers to plan using grade-level standards and materials on a daily basis in 4th-8th grade science

**Person Responsible:** Zulaika Quintero (quintz@collierschools.com)

**By When:** October 30, 2023

Train teachers in 5th-8th grade to use progress learning assessments and practice

**Person Responsible:** Audrey Seijo (audrey.seijo@rcma.org)

**By When:** September 30, 2023

Provide feedback on science lessons and planning aligned to standards

**Person Responsible:** Zulaika Quintero (quintz@collierschools.com)

**By When:** December 20, 2023

Hold bi-weekly data chats with science teachers to monitor student progress toward standards mastery

**Person Responsible:** Zulaika Quintero (quintz@collierschools.com)

**By When:** May 2024

**#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System****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.

To improve our classroom culture, we are focusing on increasing rigor using strategies from Teach Like a Champion. We were able to take our staff to a pre-service training focused on improving engagement through discussion and writing and will focus school-wide on their implementation. We believe that these high-yield strategies will result in higher scholar engagement and better results in both academic performance and culture.

Our focus will be strategies from Chapters 7-9 of Teach Like a Champion 3.0

Ch. 7: Building Ratio through Questioning

Ch. 8: Building Ration through Writing

Ch. 9: Building Ratio through Discussion

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Our first goal will be increasing scholar engagement in daily classroom lessons. Based on classroom observations and walk-throughs, we expect at least 90% of our scholars to engage in daily lessons as measured by on-task behavior.

This culture focus also goes hand-in-hand with our reading goal for the year. By May 2024, the students in grades K-8th will increase in overall reading proficiency by 20 percent from the May 2023 FAST.

**Monitoring:**

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

The principal and literacy coach will monitor student engagement using weekly and bi-weekly walk-through data. They will also work with the academic coach to monitor student progress toward reading proficiency.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Zulaika Quintero (quintz@collierschools.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.)

N/A

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

N/A

**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.

Hold follow-up training sessions on each strategy from Chs. 7-9 of TLAC 3.0

**Person Responsible:** Zulaika Quintero (quintz@collierschools.com)

**By When:** December 2023

Conduct weekly/bi-weekly walk-throughs and provide targeted feedback to teachers on implementation of strategies

**Person Responsible:** Zulaika Quintero (quintz@collierschools.com)

**By When:** Begin Sept 2023 and ongoing