Hillsborough County Public Schools

Pepin Academies School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Pepin Academies

3916 E HILLSBOROUGH AVE, Tampa, FL 33610

http://pepinacademies.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.

Empowering students with learning disabilities to maximize their potential in a positive therapeutic educational environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To prepare students to meet the academic, social, and emotional challenges encountered in everyday life and prepare them for a successful transition to middle school, high school, and post-secondary opportunities.

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
Messerschmitt, Jennifer	Principal	The principal has the ultimate responsibility to ensure the action steps outlined in the plan are completed and the goals of the plan are obtained.
Henry, Geri	Principal	The principal has the ultimate responsibility to ensure the action steps outlined in the plan are completed and the goals of the plan are obtained.

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.

Stakeholders impressions were determined based upon survey data. School Improvement Team made up of staff, parents, and students worked together to develop the 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))

Data Teams/MTSS meetings are held monthly and SIP goals are reviewed. Data collection is on-going and SIP plan can be revised if deemed necessary.

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 03-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	68%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	18%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
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.	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: MAINTAINING 2018-19: MAINTAINING 2017-18: MAINTAINING 2016-17: MAINTAINING
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	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	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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
Absent 10% or more school days		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on statewide FSA 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 school days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	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	

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	

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	

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*	22	51	53	19	51	55	24		
ELA Learning Gains				37			42		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39			55		
Math Achievement*	18	50	55	22	41	42	24		
Math Learning Gains				41			41		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57			47		
Science Achievement*	26	48	52	19	48	54	31		
Social Studies Achievement*	35	65	68	40	57	59	53		
Middle School Acceleration	55	70	70		51	51			
Graduation Rate	93	83	74	95	44	50	94		
College and Career Acceleration	5	33	53	3	68	70	0		
ELP Progress		52	55		73	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](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	33
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	7
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	267
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	93

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	37

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	7
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	372
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	95

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	33	Yes	4	
ELL	10	Yes	4	4
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	28	Yes	2	1
HSP	31	Yes	4	1
MUL	27	Yes	4	1
PAC				
WHT	34	Yes	2	
FRL	33	Yes	2	

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	37	Yes	3	
ELL	27	Yes	3	3
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	35	Yes	1	
HSP	37	Yes	3	

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%
MUL	34	Yes	3	
PAC				
WHT	40	Yes	1	
FRL	35	Yes	1	

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	22			18			26	35	55	93	5	
SWD	22			18			26	35	55	5	8	
ELL	11			10			10	9			4	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25			20			22	38		0	7	
HSP	18			17			24	26		5	6	
MUL	15			22				45			3	
PAC												
WHT	23			17			33	41		6	7	
FRL	24			18			35	27		2	6	

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	19	37	39	22	41	57	19	40		95	3	
SWD	19	37	39	22	41	57	19	40		95	3	
ELL	11	25	19	17	40	55	23	25				
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	22	37	35	24	36	46	18	34		94	0	
HSP	18	36	29	20	38	61	20	39		100	7	
MUL	24	44		22	44							
PAC												
WHT	17	38	48	21	49	69	16	47		93	4	
FRL	17	31	22	19	38	48	24	37		82		

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	24	42	55	24	41	47	31	53		94	0	
SWD	24	42	55	24	41	47	31	53		94	0	
ELL	12	50	53	7	33	42	14	28				
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27	35	39	27	37	53	34	56		88	0	
HSP	22	45	54	22	41	50	26	43		100	0	
MUL	35	57		35	54							
PAC												
WHT	22	43	75	23	41	38	37	61		95	0	
FRL	22	42	49	24	40	45	30	49		80	0	

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	17%	50%	-33%	50%	-33%
05	2023 - Spring	12%	53%	-41%	54%	-42%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	9%	47%	-38%	47%	-38%
08	2023 - Spring	14%	44%	-30%	47%	-33%
09	2023 - Spring	17%	48%	-31%	48%	-31%
04	2023 - Spring	0%	54%	-54%	58%	-58%
06	2023 - Spring	8%	47%	-39%	47%	-39%
03	2023 - Spring	8%	46%	-38%	50%	-42%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	4%	53%	-49%	54%	-50%
07	2023 - Spring	13%	36%	-23%	48%	-35%
03	2023 - Spring	0%	55%	-55%	59%	-59%
04	2023 - Spring	0%	59%	-59%	61%	-61%
08	2023 - Spring	13%	57%	-44%	55%	-42%
05	2023 - Spring	6%	53%	-47%	55%	-49%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	8%	41%	-33%	44%	-36%
05	2023 - Spring	8%	47%	-39%	51%	-43%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	17%	55%	-38%	50%	-33%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	9%	49%	-40%	48%	-39%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	26%	62%	-36%	63%	-37%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	10%	64%	-54%	66%	-56%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	38%	65%	-27%	63%	-25%

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 students come to us scoring well below grade level in all areas in order to be considered for our learning program. ELA and Math are both well below expected levels.

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

Data from last year cannot be accurately compared due to the change from FSA to FAST. However, data from 2022 FAST demonstrated a decline in scores in comparison to 2019 FSA data.

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 state does not specifically report the data comparison between School SWD data and State SWD data however the differential in this group reporting presents as a lesser gap with the school presenting with higher results in the area of Math compared to the state.

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

All scores reported for FAST 2022 are lower than FSA 2019 scores. The school is specifically focused on addressing the BEST standards through curriculum and instructional strategies specific to students with disabilities.

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

EWS data unavailable.

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

Improved Reading Assessment scores
Improved Math Assessment Scores
Improved Attendance
Improved School Climate and Environment

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.

Our students come to us scoring well below grade level in all areas in order to be considered for our learning program. 19% of students scored at or above grade level on FAST ELA assessments in the 2021-2022 school year. As 2021-2022 was the first year of administration of the FAST assessment, our students with disabilities were unfamiliar with the assessment format. Instructional focus on the BEST standards is more focused upon attainment using strategies specifically determined to be effective for students with disabilities. The subgroup of Black and Hispanic students will be analyzed within the subgroup of SWD.

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

1. Students in grades 3-8 will increase their overall typical growth score by 5% using iReady.
2. Students in grades 9-12 will increase their overall typical growth score by 5% using IXL.

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

Goals will be monitored at monthly MTSS meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Geri Henry (geri.henry@charter.hcps.net)

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.)

1. Use of research-based curriculum, iReady and IXL, for intensive reading instruction.
2. Data driven intervention strategy support
3. Extended day tutoring program in the areas of both Reading

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

iReady and IXL provide "toolbox" of strategies generated based upon regularly administered assessment data.

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 3 - Promising 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.

Continuation of extended learning time through a targeted tutoring model.
Analysis of iReady and IXL data during monthly MTSS meetings
Ensure data is being used to drive instruction

Person Responsible: Geri Henry (geri.henry@charter.hcps.net)

By When: 3/2024

#2. 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.

The number of referrals for major disruptive behaviors was uncharacteristically high and resulted in an increase of students removed from the classroom. Research has shown that students with disabilities who are inordinately removed from the classroom resulted in decreased classroom instructional time.

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

The number of students receiving referrals for major disruptive behaviors will decrease by 20% from previous year.

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

MTSS team will monitor student disciplinary data at monthly meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Geri Henry (geri.henry@charter.hcps.net)

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.)

Schools use PBIS-Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, which is an evidence-based three-tiered framework to improve and integrate all of the data, systems, and practices affecting student outcomes every day. PBIS creates schools where all students succeed.

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

PBIS is evidence based and has strong data to support the practice if used with fidelity.

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.

Ensure PBIS is fully supported and used with fidelity.
Continued Analysis of disciplinary data through MTSS meetings

Person Responsible: Geri Henry (geri.henry@charter.hcps.net)

By When: 5/2024

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).

The board of our authorizing LEA approves our school calendar, instructional times (bell schedule), and maintains oversight over our charter program. The charter school is solely responsible for meeting the needs of our students the per pupil expenditures, teacher quality, school leadership quality, facilities, the content and rigor of our course offerings, and our specialized instructional support personnel.