

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Literacy/Leadership/ Technology Academy 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>10</b> |
| <b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>                               | <b>16</b> |
| <b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>                       | <b>21</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>  |

## Literacy/Leadership/Technology Academy

1090 NE 30TH STREET, Ruskin, FL 33570

[ 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),<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.**

To empower a community of lifelong learners to lead the way in literacy, leadership, and technology.

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

Literacy Leadership Technology Academy will provide a safe, well maintained environment for both the students and staff. Our facilities team working in conjunction with our Leader In Me (LIM) Green Team Action Committee and LIM Environmental committee will keep the school clean and green. Security will be a priority in following HB7069 regulations and systems will be monitored and maintained to keep our students, staff and school safe. The culture of LLT will be one of warmth and mutual respect between students, staff, and parents. The administration will foster positive relationships amongst all stakeholders to make the school a place where everyone wants to be involved and has a high sense of ownership. We fully believe all students can reach a level of academic success and social emotional (SEL) well-being with

a qualified, trained and caring staff. Success will be determined through measuring individual student gains during learning in the classroom curriculum, as well as gains made on standardized assessments. SEL outcomes will be monitored through our Mental Health Plan. Data will be kept in both areas of learning (Academic and Social/Emotional), analyzed, disaggregated by administration and instructional staff in order to make well informed decisions regarding students' progress. Regularly scheduled meetings will be held to discuss data results amongst stakeholders allowing for open discussion regarding policy, curriculum, instruction, programming, and desired outcomes in order to implement any changes needed for the benefit of the students served. All curriculum and programming will be research based and in accordance with state standards to give students the best opportunity to succeed both academically and socially emotionally. All staff will continue to grow in their professional development through training, self-assessment, and evaluation in order to offer the best education to the students and feel a sense of accomplishment within themselves. Parents will be a key factor in the progress of their child. Literacy Leadership Technology Academy will provide multiple avenues for parents to receive all information pertinent to their child's educational success. We will encourage and provide resources for families to partner with the school staff to ensure positive student outcomes. Parent involvement through volunteering opportunities with LLT's Parent Teacher Student Organization and the Family Leader In Me Action Team, will be valued and appreciated by school staff as an indicator of commitment to their child's education. The school will use the Franklin Covey Leader in Me program to promote student well-being and positive academic outcomes. This is a top down, all stakeholder immersion into what leadership means, how to lead oneself and then others, how to effectively communicate, set and accomplish goals and serve the community. The LLT culture in conjunction with LIM aids in a paradigm shift in one's thinking to understand how ultimately take ownership and create opportunities in one's life to better self, community and society. The school is a one-to-one device school and technology is used in all LLT learning through curricula, Google Classroom, subject area coursework, electives and beyond. The school will combine all the pieces together to achieve long term success for not only the students, but the also the staff. Consistent growth and not becoming comfortable with the status quo will ensure best practice is at the forefront of the school's philosophy for success.

### 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  |
|------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Logan, Lesley    | Chief Education Officer | To provide strategic direction, program design and implementation, oversee and have input into budgeting, marketing and public relations, school growth, facilities oversight, data analysis, performance accountability planning, creating vision and a pathway for success for all stakeholders.                                       |
| Brennick, Daniel |                         | Lead instructional staff, cultivate a culture of leadership and inclusivity, monitor school data and processes, provide instructional professional development, improve instruction and student achievement, monitor instructional fidelity and accountability, work with CEO on implementation plans, data driven changes and staffing. |
| Johnson, Carrie  |                         | Lead instructional staff, cultivate a culture of leadership and inclusivity, monitor school data and processes, provide instructional professional development, improve instruction and student achievement, monitor instructional fidelity and accountability, work with CEO on implementation plans, data driven changes and staffing. |

**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.

Feedback is sought from all stakeholders through various surveys, staff meetings, and round tables. This feedback data is then used to make decisions for instruction, curriculum, student subgroup needs, policy and procedure changes.

**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 regularly monitored through School Leadership monthly meetings to review current student data and how it pertains to the SIP data. The Instructional staff will meet in weekly Professional Learning Communities to discuss student data, both anecdotal and recorded, with the subgroup listed in the SIP’s ATSI being specifically addressed. Each student’s state academic progress monitoring, which addresses the state standards, will be recorded in the school’s Student Alignment Tracker (STAT). This student tracker is used to track all student subject grades, Progress Monitoring scores, other standardized tests scores (iReady, NWEA MAP), student Exceptional Student Education and/or English Language Learners designations as well as Multi-Tiered System of Support Tiers. Those students who fall in the lowest 25% quartile of the PM state testing will be resourced and monitored to assess for achievement gap growth. A private physical data wall will be implemented in the instructional training room for stakeholders to assess and provide feedback. The School Improvement Plan will be revised as necessary based on the data and feedback to ensure there is continuous improvement paying special attention to those listed in out ATSI subgroup.

**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>   | No  |
| <b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>   | 56%   |
| <b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>   | 17%   |
| <b>Charter School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>RAISE School</b>  | No  |
| <b>ESSA Identification</b><br>*updated as of 3/11/2024   | TSI   |
| <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>Black/African American Students (BLK)<br>Hispanic Students (HSP)<br>Multiracial Students (MUL)<br>White Students (WHT)<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: A  |
| <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   | 0           | 8 | 11 | 6 | 9  | 8  | 8  | 20 | 12 | 82    |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 1 | 0  | 0 | 2  | 3  | 4  | 6  | 6  | 22    |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)   | 0           | 6 | 4  | 5 | 1  | 11 | 5  | 7  | 12 | 51    |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 3 | 1  | 2 | 0  | 8  | 4  | 10 | 11 | 39    |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0 | 0  | 0 | 8  | 16 | 7  | 26 | 15 | 72    |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0  | 0 | 12 | 20 | 14 | 21 | 8  | 75    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 6 | 11 | 5 | 6  | 11 | 7  | 9  | 5  | 60    |

**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           | 5 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 14 | 27 | 15 | 101   |

**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           | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4     |
| 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 | 0     |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 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 | 0     |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 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 | 0     |
| Level 1 on statewide FSA 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*                | 48     | 51       | 53    | 53     | 51       | 55    | 50     |          |       |
| ELA Learning Gains              |        |          |       | 53     |          |       | 43     |          |       |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile      |        |          |       | 40     |          |       | 30     |          |       |
| Math Achievement*               | 42     | 50       | 55    | 53     | 41       | 42    | 48     |          |       |
| Math Learning Gains             |        |          |       | 62     |          |       | 44     |          |       |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile     |        |          |       | 60     |          |       | 42     |          |       |
| Science Achievement*            | 39     | 48       | 52    | 45     | 48       | 54    | 43     |          |       |
| Social Studies Achievement*     | 92     | 65       | 68    | 86     | 57       | 59    | 76     |          |       |
| Middle School Acceleration      | 73     | 70       | 70    | 86     | 51       | 51    | 75     |          |       |
| Graduation Rate                 |        | 83       | 74    |        | 44       | 50    |        |          |       |
| College and Career Acceleration |        | 33       | 53    |        | 68       | 70    |        |          |       |
| ELP Progress                    | 72     | 52       | 55    | 69     | 73       | 70    | 55     |          |       |

\* 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)               | TSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 58  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 2   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 406 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 7   |
| Percent Tested                                 | 99  |
| Graduation Rate                                |     |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index           |      |
|--------------------------------------|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)     | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 61   |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index                     |     |
|--|-----|
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 1   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 607 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 10  |
| Percent Tested                                 | 99  |
| Graduation Rate                                |     |

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY |                                 |                    |   |   |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup                      | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD                                | 25                              | Yes                | 3   | 3   |
| ELL                                | 41                              |                    |   |   |
| AMI                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| ASN                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| BLK                                | 21                              | Yes                | 1   | 1   |
| HSP                                | 54                              |                    |   |   |
| MUL                                | 50                              |                    |   |   |
| PAC                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| WHT                                | 61                              |                    |   |   |
| FRL                                | 50                              |                    |   |   |

| 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                                | 31                              | Yes                | 2   | 2   |
| ELL                                | 42                              |                    |   |   |
| AMI                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| ASN                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| BLK                                | 43                              |                    |   |   |
| HSP                                | 52                              |                    |   |   |

| 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                                | 58                              |                    |   |   |
| PAC                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| WHT                                | 69                              |                    |   |   |
| FRL                                | 43                              |                    |   |   |

**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                                   | 48       |        |             | 42        |         |              | 39       | 92      | 73        |                   |                     | 72           |
| SWD  | 24       |        |             | 17        |         |              | 8        |         |           |                   | 4                   |              |
| ELL  | 33       |        |             | 19        |         |              |          |         |           |                   | 3                   | 72           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 26       |        |             | 30        |         |              | 7        |         |           |                   | 3                   |              |
| HSP  | 47       |        |             | 37        |         |              | 30       | 91      | 60        |                   | 7                   | 74           |
| MUL  | 47       |        |             | 53        |         |              |          |         |           |                   | 2                   |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 56       |        |             | 49        |         |              | 49       | 97      | 73        |                   | 6                   |              |
| FRL  | 48       |        |             | 40        |         |              | 29       | 91      | 40        |                   | 5                   |              |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups                                      | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 | ELP Progress |
| All Students                                   | 53       | 53     | 40          | 53        | 62      | 60           | 45       | 86      | 86        |                   |                     | 69           |
| SWD  | 13       | 37     | 33          | 21        | 50      | 47           | 0        | 50      |           |                   |                     |              |
| ELL  | 33       | 42     | 26          | 32        | 59      | 50           | 14       | 54      |           |                   |                     | 69           |
| 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  | 35       | 55     | 41          | 27        | 54      | 57           | 11       | 67      |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 44       | 46     | 25          | 43        | 61      | 51           | 23       | 78      | 81        |                   |                     | 67           |
| MUL  | 52       | 52     |             | 56        | 71      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 63       | 57     | 55          | 64        | 63      | 69           | 61       | 98      | 87        |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 43       | 32     | 28          | 41        | 54      | 41           | 31       | 75      |           |                   |                     |              |

| 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                                   | 50       | 43     | 30          | 48        | 44      | 42           | 43       | 76      | 75        |                   |                     | 55           |
| SWD  | 17       | 40     | 38          | 23        | 42      | 50           | 26       | 45      |           |                   |                     |              |
| ELL  | 15       | 25     | 26          | 16        | 33      | 44           | 8        |         |           |                   |                     | 55           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 32       | 38     | 28          | 23        | 29      | 38           | 35       | 54      |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 35       | 36     | 27          | 35        | 42      | 40           | 33       | 54      | 71        |                   |                     | 60           |
| MUL  | 59       | 58     |             | 50        | 52      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 59       | 45     | 33          | 57        | 46      | 42           | 47       | 88      | 75        |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 38       | 49     | 42          | 34        | 41      | 47           | 30       |         |           |                   |                     |              |

**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.

| Grade | Year          | ELA    |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
|       |               | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 57%    | 53%      | 4%                         | 54%   | 3%                      |
| 07    | 2023 - Spring | 51%    | 47%      | 4%                         | 47%   | 4%                      |

| ELA   |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08    | 2023 - Spring | 56%    | 44%      | 12%                        | 47%   | 9%                      |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 41%    | 54%      | -13%                       | 58%   | -17%                    |
| 06    | 2023 - Spring | 42%    | 47%      | -5%                        | 47%   | -5%                     |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 32%    | 46%      | -14%                       | 50%   | -18%                    |

| MATH  |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06    | 2023 - Spring | 21%    | 53%      | -32%                       | 54%   | -33%                    |
| 07    | 2023 - Spring | 60%    | 36%      | 24%                        | 48%   | 12%                     |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 27%    | 55%      | -28%                       | 59%   | -32%                    |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 20%    | 59%      | -39%                       | 61%   | -41%                    |
| 08    | 2023 - Spring | 65%    | 57%      | 8%                         | 55%   | 10%                     |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 28%    | 53%      | -25%                       | 55%   | -27%                    |

| SCIENCE |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08      | 2023 - Spring | 41%    | 41%      | 0%                         | 44%   | -3%                     |
| 05      | 2023 - Spring | 32%    | 47%      | -15%                       | 51%   | -19%                    |

| ALGEBRA |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A     | 2023 - Spring | 82%    | 55%      | 27%                        | 50%   | 32%                     |

| GEOMETRY |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|----------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade    | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A      | 2023 - Spring | 96%    | 49%      | 47%                        | 48%   | 48%                     |

| CIVICS |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|--------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade  | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A    | 2023 - Spring | 91%    | 64%      | 27%                        | 66%   | 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.**

After reviewing the data, it is clear that students with disabilities subgroup needs extra support beyond the Exceptional Student Education (ESE) accommodations and tiered Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) they have been receiving. Students with disabilities have been in the underperforming category in both 2021 and 2022 at 35% and 31% respectively and this subgroup has shown an overall 4% decline, this puts them below the ESSA threshold of 41%. This subgroup is still feeling the effects of the stay at home order and hybrid learning from Covid. The academic gaps continued to widen for this group.

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

In the 2022 assessments, reading showed the greatest decline for students in the students with disabilities subgroup. This subgroup is below the 41% threshold. As noted above students with disability are still feeling the effects of the stay at home order of 2020, hybrid learning for 2020-2021, and returning to only brick and mortar classroom environment for 2021-2022 after two years of significant changes to their services yet being expected to be at grade level.

**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.**

State data was not made available and was therefore unable to be compared.

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

The English Language Learners subgroup showed the most improvement in English/Language Arts achievement (+18), English/Language Arts learning gains (+17), math achievement (+16), and math learning gains (+26). Our school incorporated a dedicated English Students Other Language Coordinator to work with the students, provided more resources for instructional staff, and met with instructional staff to ensure completion of English Students Other Language course requirements.

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

One potential area of concern is attendance based on the Early Warning System data from Part I.

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

- 1) Students with disabilities - increase in English/Language Arts achievement.
- 2) Student engagement: academics, culture, and leadership.

#### Area of Focus

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



**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Students with disabilities was identified as an area of focus based on the English/Language Arts component scores from 2021 to 2022 which displayed a 4% decline to 13%.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Students with disabilities will go from 13% English/Language Arts achievement to 25% English/Language Arts achievement by May 2024. 1) The school obtained new curriculum based on the science of reading for all grade levels. 2) Prior to the start of the 2023-2024 school year, the school provided in-person training for the curriculum to all instructional staff and leaders. 3) The school changed the Exceptional Student Education service model to provide more intensive services to address the widest gaps in English/Language Arts for students with disabilities.

**Monitoring:**

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

This focus will be monitored by instructional staff formal and in-formal observations; professional learning community meetings held weekly by grade level; i-Ready and state testing completed three times year.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Carrie Johnson (carrie.johnson1@chartet.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.)

Using the science of reading curriculum provided, students with disabilities will increase English/Language Arts achievement.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Moving to a strong evidence-based curriculum encompassing both the Florida State Standards and the Science of Reading strategies will enable our teachers to better address the achievement gap for all students. The emphasis on phonics and phonemic awareness in the early grades will provide a strong foundation for all students to build reading skills taking them from learning to read to reading to learn. Our students with disabilities will benefit greatly from these strategies as they too require systematic and explicit instruction. These strategies will be specifically used for all grade-level students with disabilities students with gaps in the foundational instruction, which impedes their ability to work with grade-level texts and works.

**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.

New curriculum researched and ordered based on the Science of Reading.

**Person Responsible:** Lesley Logan (lesley.logan@charter.hcps.net)

**By When:** August 2023

Professional Learning provided to all English/Language Arts teachers including Exceptional Student Education instructional staff on how to correctly use the new curriculum by the publishing consultants.

**Person Responsible:** Joanne Rutherford (joanne.rutherford@charter.hcps.net)

**By When:** August 2023

Assessment Data, both curriculum and standardized will be reviewed at the end of the first grading period to review outcomes for all subgroups. These reviews will occur after each grading period, but the first one is critical to address lack of growth early.

**Person Responsible:** Carrie Johnson (carrie.johnson1@chartet.hcps.net)

**By When:** October 2023

Exceptional Student Education Personnel to conduct a specific follow up to further review data for the students with disabilities subgroup to disaggregate the data aligned to their specific Individual Education Plan goals for English/Language Arts.

**Person Responsible:** Joanne Rutherford (joanne.rutherford@charter.hcps.net)

**By When:** October 2023

Follow up training provided if needed for any teacher not achieving an overall data improvement for students.

**Person Responsible:** Lesley Logan (lesley.logan@charter.hcps.net)

**By When:** November 2023

Further strategies employed for those students with disabilities students not showing improvement including reading interventionist working in conjunction with Exceptional Student Education teachers.

**Person Responsible:** Carrie Johnson (carrie.johnson1@chartet.hcps.net)

**By When:** November 2023

Team meetings with students with disabilities student families where growth is not occurring to go over the data and resource the family with strategies to use at home. The school will continue to stay in touch with the family for regular check-ins.

**Person Responsible:** Joanne Rutherford (joanne.rutherford@charter.hcps.net)

**By When:** November 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.

Student Engagement is a vital part of a school's positive culture and environment for all students and our SWD subgroup need to feel and believe they are an important part of our school culture. This will lead to a more positive environment in which for them to be able to thrive, grow, and attain academic success. LLT Academy students are taught engagement strategies through a leadership framework that encompasses Academics, Culture and Leadership. Engagement in this framework leads to self-actualization for the students to own their education and gives a sense of belonging, what they do matters. Typically, SWD students are not the ones leading the charge in student engagement and in shifting that mindset: we believe we can make a difference for our SWD students, which will also improve their academic engagement leading to higher achievement over all.

As a Franklin Covey Leader In Me (LIM) School, leadership skills among both the staff and students is a key component to our program. In a teacher's first year working in our school, we train them to understand the LIM program as it relates to student achievement and well-being. Students learn to understand through the LIM paradigms, that they themselves own their achievement and are taught first to be a leader of themselves and then others. This instills confidence and a belief in their own abilities. In focusing on the 4DX process with the staff and students, which is a specific goal setting practice pinpointing in on the needed area of academic improvement, the students will be able to prioritize their needs and have a plan for how to achieve the need. This same strategy is also used by the whole staff to increase the achievements of the overall school.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

The Academics component of the Leadership Framework is designed specifically for students to increase individual student achievement in an area of greatest academic need. Our goal is to improve the English/ Language Arts reading data for our students with disabilities (SWD) subgroup, that will be the focus within their leadership framework. While we have proven results from previous years that setting goals through the 4DX process produces results, we have not focused on a specific subgroup but the student body as a whole. We will disaggregate the subgroup data to get a precise picture of the how the strategy is working within the subgroups to get a more clarified picture of any changes need to occur in using the strategy. Based on the data goal from focus #1 in this plan, our SWD student subgroup will go from 13% ELA passing rate to 25% using this strategy from student engagement.

### Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored by the subgroup's classroom teachers through achievement on curriculum assessments and the state's STAR and FAST progress monitoring assessments. This data will be discussed and monitored by those teachers in their Professional Learning Communities as well as the Exceptional Student Education (ESE) instructional staff. ESE Specialists and Principals will further discuss the data. Findings will dictate any need for students to change their academic reading goal including changes when goals are met to proceed to a new higher percentage goal. Any changes needed to instruction and/or curriculum will also be discussed at the ESE Specialists and Administration level personnel.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Daniel Brennick (daniel.brennick@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.)

Franklin Covey Leader in Me is an Evidence-based program, which is built around the Seven Habits of Highly Effective People, a program used throughout the world in successful corporations, and is highly recognized for positive transformation in schools for student achievement. It is also a CASEL approved program as its program components of leadership naturally lead to positive well-being for our students. The resources used are the Franklin Covey Leader In Me program complete with in-person multi-visit annual professional learning trainings, LIM student and staff materials, LIM website resources and a book study for staff beyond their seven habits training titled, The 4 Disciplines of Execution for Educators Achieving Your Wildly Important Goals.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

LLT Academy has been a leadership school since 2005. In 2014, we added the Franklin Covey Seven Habits of Highly Effective People school-based program, Leader In Me (LIM). The program was developed by Dr. Stephen Covey in conjunction with a Principal in a failing traditional public school. With her help in understanding school culture and academic needs, Dr. Covey created the seven habits for school children. We have seen how leadership habits and skills have helped our students grow in their education as a whole child with data showing an overall increase in attendance, grades, and a decrease in behavior issues. That was derailed in 2020 when Covid struck. We are starting over to rebuild academic stamina, foundations, and achievement for our students while keeping them engaged in school learning and culture. Creating a positive school culture is key to helping students achieve and feel a sense of pride.

**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 all new staff including instructional in the Franklin Covey Seven Habits of Highly Effective People.

**Person Responsible:** Carrie Johnson (carrie.johnson1@chartet.hcps.net)

**By When:** November 2023

Create a schedule with built-in time for teachers to lead students in the Leader In Me program.

**Person Responsible:** Daniel Brennick (daniel.brennick@charter.hcps.net)

**By When:** August 2023

Teachers help students create a Student Leadership Notebook encompassing the Framework, Academics – goal setting, Culture, and Leadership

**Person Responsible:** Carrie Johnson (carrie.johnson1@chartet.hcps.net)

**By When:** September 2023

Leader In Me on the agenda of Professional Learning Community weekly meetings to discuss successful implementation of the program as well as academic achievement.

**Person Responsible:** Carrie Johnson (carrie.johnson1@chartet.hcps.net)

**By When:** September 2023

ESE team meet with LIM Coordinator to discuss the SWD students and how they are progressing in LIM specifically including use of Leadership notebooks, LIM teams served on, and event management roles assigned. Any changes needed for this subgroup as it relates to their successful inclusion in the Leader In Me program will be immediately implemented.

**Person Responsible:** Carrie Johnson (carrie.johnson1@chartet.hcps.net)

**By When:** September 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).

The newly purchased Math and English Language Arts (ELA) curriculum (ELA based in the science of reading) and provided in-person training for all instructional staff prior to the start of the 2023-2024 school year. ESSER III grant funds were used to purchase the new curriculum.