
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	8
III. Planning for Improvement	12
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	18
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Marco Island Academy

2255 SAN MARCO RD, Marco Island, FL 34145

www.marcoislandacademy.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), (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 Marco Island Academy is to provide a student-centered, well-rounded, interdisciplinary education. Students will engage in critical thinking, while focusing on math, science, technology, environmental and global studies. The Academy will uphold the highest standards of academic excellence, integrity, respect, and social responsibility, while guiding students to achieve post-secondary success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Marco Island Academy is to form an integral partnership among students, teachers, parents, and the community. Together, we will create a culture of high expectation, collaboration, and service that will prepare students to succeed in an increasingly complex global society.

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
Scott, Melissa	Principal	-oversees the entire implementation process of MIA's School Improvement Plan -ensures that checks and balances are in place and the plan is implemented with fidelity
Koch, Vanessa	Assistant Principal	-testing and curriculum responsibilities tied to MIA's School Improvement Plan -oversight of instructional staff
Higuera, Heidi	Other	-oversees SWD testing, curriculum, and instruction with regard to MIA's School Improvement Plan

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.

We are lucky to have already established a strong community base that is familiar with our FLDOE "School Report Card." As a charter school, we are held to several levels of compliance, so we have always been and will continue to be extremely transparent with respect to our test scores, student

achievement, and overall student success. MIA's FLDOE "School Report Card" is shared on our website for all stakeholders to view, and it is also electronically distributed on our Manta Newsletter, which reaches all board members, families, and students.

Prior to the start of the 2023-2024 school year, a staff seminar was held by our Students with Disabilities Coordinator to introduce and train the entire staff on our new approach to the instruction of students with disabilities. This session included input from the entire faculty, as well ideas and techniques from a professional development completed by the principal in March of 2023. The same training concepts were also reviewed at the first MIA Board meeting of the year when the targeted goal for our School Improvement Plan were presented.

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))

- As we monitor student progress through various assessments and standardized testing results, return to the SIP to ensure that our goals align with results.
- Effectively use data to drive/guide instructional practices.
- When considering the State's academic standards, also use mastery of classroom content and grade-level skills as measures of success.
- Return to our SIP often; don't leave it as a forgotten document. Rather, use it as a guiding document to continually drive our work throughout the year.

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)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	28%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	26%
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)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A

	2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

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*	63	53	50	67	54	51	72		
ELA Learning Gains				54			57		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			45		
Math Achievement*	74	54	38	60	35	38	69		
Math Learning Gains				41			35		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				15			47		
Science Achievement*	78	71	64	74	51	40	84		
Social Studies Achievement*	78	68	66	81	47	48	80		
Middle School Acceleration					47	44			
Graduation Rate	100	93	89	98	67	61	100		
College and Career Acceleration	65	68	65	82	68	67	81		
ELP Progress		38	45						

** 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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	458
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	100

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	614
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	98

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	36	Yes	3	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	77			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	76			

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%
FRL	64			

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	35	Yes	2	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	71			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	55			

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	63			74			78	78		100	65	
SWD	22							50			2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	63			70			67	70		94	6	
MUL												

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
PAC												
WHT	62			72			81	80		58	6	
FRL	52			60			77	68			4	

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	67	54	42	60	41	15	74	81		98	82	
SWD	37	33	25	36	38		20	55				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	68	56		40			71	91		100	70	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	68	55	48	64	43		74	78		98	85	
FRL	50	61	47	45	35		59	85				

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	72	57	45	69	35	47	84	80		100	81	
SWD	23	33		50	40		55					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	60	57		75	60			70				
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	76	58	42	65	32	36	83	83		100	85	
FRL	60	48		67	11		86	79				

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
10	2023 - Spring	55%	52%	3%	50%	5%
09	2023 - Spring	66%	50%	16%	48%	18%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	83%	59%	24%	50%	33%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	61%	39%	48%	52%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	70%	69%	1%	63%	7%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	70%	66%	4%	63%	7%

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.

Our SWD subgroup component showed the lowest performance. The data that we are being asked to review and analyze is actually not the most up-to-date, rather it is from the 2021-2022 school year, but we do know the students and the trends well enough to reflect.

1. A flawed testing system for SWD - Often, their stated disabilities create a wall to the tests themselves. Be it anxiety, the format of the tests, or the fact that the tests are computer-based, the assessments are often the hardest aspects of the class for them. This is why the state implements the "pass the class and fail the test once IEP waiver rule." Yet for accountability purposes, the school is left with is the failed test score, which affects our pass percentage in turn affecting the federal index score for the SWD subgroup component.
2. Over the last three years of data that we have been provided ('21-'22, '21-'20, & '19-'18), our SWD subgroup seems to fluctuate in the different subjects tested, which makes sense because different students with different strengths and weaknesses take the tests each year.
3. Once they are reintroduced, gains will be something we always work to improve.

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

Science achievement for our SWD component subgroup showed the greatest decline (55 to 20). All 9th graders take this test; rigor; preparation for EOC exam.

Yet, we still had an overall pass rate of 74%, so MIA cannot lost sight of our success as well. We can and will continue to help and reach all students, but the state needs to also address that not all students learn and/or test the same way.

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.

This information (state and district scores) was supposed to be downloaded into this program for review prior to submission, but it was not, so it was pulled by our team from the Florida Department of Education website.

MIA surpassed all of the state averages - ELA Achievement, Math Achievement, Science Achievement, and Social Studies Achievement. Gain scored were not compared, as MIA does not have the similar number of test takers, nor lower test scores to compare gain scores.

Factors - care for all students, attention and hard work by teachers, majority of students understand and care about importance of test

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

SWD component subgroup ELA Achievement (23 to 37)
direct instruction, approach to assessment, understanding the test, double blocking

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

n/a for a high school

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

1. Always keep our instruction student-centered, not test-centered.
2. Ensure that our instructors understand accommodations vs. adaptations.
3. the importance of building relationships, while setting high expectations
4. Ensure that all understand that mastery of classroom content and instruction demonstrates student growth.
5. SWD students feel like valued members of the classroom and community.

Area of Focus

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

#1. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

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

#2. 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.

Our SWD subgroup has fallen below the federal index of 41% and is identified as ATSI (Additional Targeted Support and Improvement).

Measurable Outcome:

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

To raise our SWD subgroup score of 35% to 41%, bringing it to meet the federal index score.

Monitoring:

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

SWD Team will actively observe classroom practices and instruction. Leadership team will meet weekly to review trends.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Scott (scottm5@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.)

SWD Team will meet with students to review assessments and classroom assignments on a weekly basis. SWD Team will conduct follow-up conferences with instructors regarding specific use of accommodations and classroom instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The more support that is provided to students the more opportunities for successes are available. Students are able to see themselves as more than just a test score. Achieving mastery of classroom content and instruction, offers the opportunity for a Student with Disability the same level of success as every classmate and diminishes the feeling of being labeled.

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.

SWD department has restructured its instructional practice planning.

Person Responsible: Melissa Scott (scottm5@collierschools.com)

By When: August 2023.

SWD department will implement classroom accommodations monitoring and collaborative instructional practices.

Person Responsible: Heidi Higuera (higueh@collierschools.com)

By When: By the end of 2023-24 school year.

SWD Team and Leadership will oversee the implementation of test-taking strategies and preparation for all high-stakes testing.

Person Responsible: Vanessa Koch (kochv@collierschools.com)

By When: On-going but fully implemented by the end of 2023-24 school year.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**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.

Increase MIA parent involvement

Measurable Outcome:

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

During the 2023-2024 school year, we would like to see an increase of 25% in extracurricular involvement (volunteering, attending an athletic event or performance, etc.) by parents and/or guardians.

Monitoring:

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

At each event, parents and/or guardians will sign-in on a designated sheet.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Ray (raya1@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.)

Collect data at events.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

As we have already built a strong culture at MIA, we want everyone to be a part of it.

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.

Continue to invite all stakeholders to our events using the Manta News.

Person Responsible: Amanda Ray (raya1@collierschools.com)

By When: August 2023

Continue to invite all stakeholders to our events using our all-call system.

Person Responsible: Kevin Ray (rayk1@collierschools.com)

By When: August 2023

Continue to invite all stakeholders to our events by adding the details to the calendar on our website.

Person Responsible: Amanda Ray (raya1@collierschools.com)

By When: August 2023

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

At this time, there are no additional school improvement funding allocations and/or resources necessary, as they have already been included within MIA's 2023-2024 budget. If any additional funding needs occur, they will be presented to the Board for approval.