Learning Gate Community School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Learning Gate Community School

16215 HANNA RD, Lutz, FL 33549

[no web address on file]

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.

To promote academic excellence, community service, and environmental responsibility through family and community partnerships

Provide the school's vision statement.

Tommorow's leaders engaging in and contributing to an educated, sustainable world.

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
Mason, Michelle	Principal	Develop, implement and maintain curriculum standards. Observe and evaluate classrooms and teachers, provide support to staff and locate and/or develop professional development opportunities. Review and anaylze data for trends. Instructural leader, engagement of stakeholders, and collaborator.
Bassoumi, Sara	School Counselor	Interacts with students and families, meets with individual and small groups, provides counsleing services to all
Dial, Lauren	School Counselor	Interacts with all students and families, provides counseling to students individually and in small group, testing coordinator for LLF
Fox, Kelly	Assistant Principal	Monitor student behavior, testing, instructional leader
Jordan, Carlos	Assistant Principal	instructional leader, testing, student behehavior
Radka, George	Teacher, ESE	ESE Specilaist, IEP compliance, scheduling, and ELL
Windish, Kara	Teacher, K-12	Mentoring new teachers, educating students, behavior management
Newell, Dee	Parent Engagement Liaison	engage parents and report to the board

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.

Questions and data were shared with staff and several selected parents. Each person was asked to review the data and answer the questions asked. The areas that showed the greatest need, based on the answers received, were the areas selected for improvement.

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))

SIP will be regulary monitored using the progress monitoring through STAR/FAST as well as walk throughs and observations in the classes.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	37%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	8%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A

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

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Absent 10% or more days	4	2	0	1	4	4	1	0	0	16
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	13	12	12	15	12	19	7	10	2	102
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	14	11	14	16	25	38	7	6	1	132
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	5

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	6	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	13

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	1	1	0	0	2	2	1	2	2	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	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 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	

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	

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	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in 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	

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*	63	51	53	67	51	55	68		
ELA Learning Gains				58			61		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47			46		
Math Achievement*	62	50	55	63	41	42	61		
Math Learning Gains				64			62		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54			47		
Science Achievement*	61	48	52	67	48	54	58		
Social Studies Achievement*	94	65	68	93	57	59	94		
Middle School Acceleration	74	70	70	71	51	51	55		
Graduation Rate		83	74		44	50			
College and Career Acceleration		33	53		68	70			
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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	418
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	584
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	38	Yes	1	
ELL	32	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN	91			
BLK	48			
HSP	63			
MUL	63			
PAC				
WHT	72			

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	57			

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	47			
ELL	38	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	47			
HSP	60			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	67			
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

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			62			61	94	74			
SWD	33			35			32	75			5	
ELL	27			36							2	
AMI												
ASN	82			100							2	
BLK	52			43							2	
HSP	57			55			54	90	64		6	
MUL	64			62			62				3	

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	66			64			62	96	74		6	
FRL	50			50			41	85	67		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	67	58	47	63	64	54	67	93	71			
SWD	30	47	49	34	52	47	48	67				
ELL	38	20		23	70							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	48	59		33	47		50					
HSP	62	55	48	58	59	50	63	91	53			
MUL	76	67		68	69							
PAC												
WHT	70	58	43	66	67	58	70	94	80			
FRL	57	53	31	55	61	56	47	92				

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	68	61	46	61	62	47	58	94	55			
SWD	30	38	33	32	53	44	15	93				
ELL	50			42								
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	57	75		43	58							
HSP	66	56	36	61	56	53	54	88	31			
MUL	81	60		65	71							
PAC												
WHT	67	61	50	61	62	43	61	95	62			
FRL	61	64	50	52	50	33	47	88				

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.
<u>The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments</u>.

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	59%	53%	6%	54%	5%
07	2023 - Spring	62%	47%	15%	47%	15%
08	2023 - Spring	66%	44%	22%	47%	19%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	54%	8%	58%	4%
06	2023 - Spring	75%	47%	28%	47%	28%
03	2023 - Spring	61%	46%	15%	50%	11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	73%	53%	20%	54%	19%
07	2023 - Spring	80%	36%	44%	48%	32%
03	2023 - Spring	57%	55%	2%	59%	-2%
04	2023 - Spring	57%	59%	-2%	61%	-4%
08	2023 - Spring	70%	57%	13%	55%	15%
05	2023 - Spring	31%	53%	-22%	55%	-24%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	76%	41%	35%	44%	32%
05	2023 - Spring	45%	47%	-2%	51%	-6%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	55%	43%	50%	48%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	93%	64%	29%	66%	27%

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.

ELA Lowest 25% was the area that LG showed the lowest performance. In 2019 students scores at 67%. In the year 2022, LG had dropped to 58%. Online/hybrid learning was not optimal for students. Once they returned, there was a lot of catching up that needded to be done. I believe this and a higher number of students with significant ESE needs contrubuting to the lower performance.

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

ELA Learning Gains was the component that showed the greatest decline from 2019 to 2022. The scores went from 61% down to 58%. Online/hybrid learning was not optimal for students. Once they returned, there was a lot of catching up that needded to be done.

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 greatest gap we had in comparison to the state average was in math gains in our 3rd, 4th and 5th grades. I believe we are still catching up after Covid and needing to fill in the instruction that was lost during that time period. I believe this will begin to be fixed as we work towards filling in the gaps in instruction

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

We saw the most growth in the area of middle school math, we far outscored the state in this area. We bought new curriculum for the middle school and we sent the teachers for mmore trainings. Middle School teacher also had more observations durign the school year with feedback. The teachers were also doing observation of other classroom to see if there were new ti[/tricks to learn

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

The biggest area of concern is the number of Level 1 students on the statewide math assessments in K-5. The scores show there is a great concern in that area and it needs to be addressed.

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

The number one priority is improving the math instruction in grades K-5.

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 Math

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.

Providing a more positive culture and environment to our ELL students is a crucial need. According to the data our ELL's scores at a 38 in the Federal Percent of Points Index. We need to see this score improve during the 2023-2024 school year.

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

The Students at Learning Gate who receive assistance through the ELL service will increase their FAST Math/Science scores bringing the index number from 38 to 42% during the 2023-24 school year.

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

The ELL Supervisor will meet with teachers who have ELL students at weekly team meetings to discuss progress and any needs that the students may be having. We will chart progress using claasrrom assessments, benchmark testing anf progress monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Mason (michelle.mason@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.)

Whole language is provided in small groups, integrate listening,speaking, reading, and writing skills in explicit, strategic instructional practices using pre selected novels. Students are provided guided and independent practice with corrective feedback. These evidence-supported practices have been validated and show strong evidence of effectiveness

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

Students learn best when emersed in the language. They need to see it, hear it and use it to become fluent with it. The approach we will use will do just that

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.

ELL Students will be grouped according to ablility once they have completed their screening.
Interventions will begin 2-3x per week
Monitoring will be done monthly

Person Responsible: Michelle Mason (michelle.mason@charter.hcps.net)

By When: Students will have completed their testing by and begun their intervention groups by September 1, 2023

#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.

We will be focusing on parent communication and involvement in school activities as our area of focus, with a concentration on our familes that communicate in languages other than english and families of students with disabilities

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

By increasing the verbal and written communication with families, especially the families of ELL and ESE students, we expect to see students' increase their reading and math scores by the end of PM3 by at least 4 percentiles

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

We will be monitoring the progress of the students using EAsy CBM monthly and the STAR/FAST data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Mason (michelle.mason@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.)

The school has hired multiple bilingual staff members this year. Using their abilty to translate in person as well as help to create materials, and welcome new families into our community. We will be increasing the events for parents to participate in

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

Data shows that parent involvememtn is a ket to student success. At times, parents of students who may not use english a first language or have students with disabilities shy away from school functions and activities.

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.

We will create points of contact for all of our ELL students with a staff member that is able to speak the same language. The ESE team will do the same to open up dialogue with families by the 2nd full week of school.
All messages home will be translates for the families and we will reach out personally to all for events and activities at school. Staff will reach out monthly to touch base with the families and encourage them to volunteer at school.

Person Responsible: Michelle Mason (michelle.mason@charter.hcps.net)

By When: Throughout the school year

<div style="background-color:#2a2a5a;color:white;text-align:center;padding:10px">

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).

</div>

If school improvement funding is allocated, the allocation will be focused on our ELL students. We will purchase additional materials for the program. Any items will be sent to the principal for review before purchasing and a rationale must be provided for each item to be approved for purchase.