

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Kids Community College Riverview South (K 12)



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	19
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Kids Community College Riverview South (K 12)

10030 MATHOG RD, Riverview, FL 33578

[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.

We are "dedicated to the well-being and educational success of every child". We use Howard Gardner's theory of multiple intelligence as the basis of our approach and the foundation of our system of individualized instruction for each student.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Kid's Community College will integrate research based best practices at home, at school and in the community and position itself as the market leader in early, primary and secondary education and caregiving by partnering with parents, school districts, early childhood coalitions and the community to offer the highest quality, cutting edge instruction and learning system in the industry.

We will continue to be aware of market trends and make changes, as needed, to remain competitive and consistently offer the best in service quality.

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
Evans, Katrina	Principal	Kindergarten-8th grade
Bonich, Anna	Principal	

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.

Our school administration team, grade level team leads, parent board members, and community members are included in the development of the SIP. Stakeholders meet to review the SIP and engage in conversations to develop the best means of support needed to implement and deliver the plan for student achievement.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored regularly for effective impact and implementation to ensure that the increase of student achievement is met. Students with the greatest achievement gap will be monitored through assessments. Fidelity will be monitored monthly to make any revisions needed to the plan.

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-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	70%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	49%
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) Asian Students (ASN) 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: C 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B
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	10	9	11	5	12	2	19	10	18	96	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	
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	4	16	10	26	20	13	89	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	13	22	22	10	6	78	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	4	1	2	15	8	7	8	1	48	

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	2	0	0	0	0	2	4

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	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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*	45	51	53	54	51	55	61		
ELA Learning Gains				44			59		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				30			49		
Math Achievement*	47	50	55	50	41	42	55		
Math Learning Gains				52			50		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45			46		
Science Achievement*	42	48	52	48	48	54	47		
Social Studies Achievement*	45	65	68	68	57	59	72		
Middle School Acceleration	55	70	70	78	51	51	66		
Graduation Rate	92	83	74		44	50			
College and Career Acceleration	6	33	53		68	70			
ELP Progress	42	52	55	85	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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	439
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	92

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55

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	554
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
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	20	Yes	4	2
ELL	33	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	50			
BLK	43			
HSP	44			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	56			
FRL	45			

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	3	1
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN	70			
BLK	53			
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	52			
PAC				
WHT	56			
FRL	48			

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	45			47			42	45	55	92	6	42
SWD	13			16			18	33			4	
ELL	31			33			18	42			5	42
AMI												
ASN	50										1	
BLK	40			41			37	29			5	
HSP	39			44			28	39	42	7	8	
MUL	70			70							2	
PAC												
WHT	56			54			63	57	57	0	8	
FRL	39			41			35	43	53	6	8	

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	54	44	30	50	52	45	48	68	78			85
SWD	31	35	24	24	45	43	18					
ELL	35	45		43	52		30					85
AMI												
ASN	73	67		73	69		70					

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	56	43	32	43	54	44	42	74	92			
HSP	44	40	32	46	49	38	40	62	77			90
MUL	62	53		43	50		54					
PAC												
WHT	59	46	19	63	53	65	57	70	71			
FRL	47	40	24	38	46	48	31	64	53			91

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	61	59	49	55	50	46	47	72	66			
SWD	39	52	44	39	52	58	29					
ELL	53	64		41	73							
AMI												
ASN	79			79								
BLK	58	58	35	48	40	40	26	72	60			
HSP	55	53	42	53	52	46	43	53	57			
MUL	53	67		63	67							
PAC												
WHT	68	63	71	62	55	39	64	85	78			
FRL	52	47	39	45	45	50	37	60	57			

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	41%	50%	-9%	50%	-9%
05	2023 - Spring	64%	53%	11%	54%	10%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	37%	47%	-10%	47%	-10%
08	2023 - Spring	56%	44%	12%	47%	9%
09	2023 - Spring	25%	48%	-23%	48%	-23%
04	2023 - Spring	33%	54%	-21%	58%	-25%
06	2023 - Spring	47%	47%	0%	47%	0%
03	2023 - Spring	64%	46%	18%	50%	14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	49%	53%	-4%	54%	-5%
07	2023 - Spring	63%	36%	27%	48%	15%
03	2023 - Spring	79%	55%	24%	59%	20%
04	2023 - Spring	50%	59%	-9%	61%	-11%
08	2023 - Spring	35%	57%	-22%	55%	-20%
05	2023 - Spring	40%	53%	-13%	55%	-15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	40%	41%	-1%	44%	-4%
05	2023 - Spring	49%	47%	2%	51%	-2%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	32%	55%	-23%	50%	-18%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	13%	49%	-36%	48%	-35%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	22%	62%	-40%	63%	-41%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	51%	64%	-13%	66%	-15%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	34%	65%	-31%	63%	-29%

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.

4th grade showed the lowest performance in ELA and 8th grade showed the lowest performance in math. Although 4th grade ELA did show improvement last year, there seems to be a lack of foundational understanding, many of these students were in our bottom quartile.

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

4th grade ELA showed the deepest decline within the grade level and cohort additional changes will be needed as students performed significantly higher the previous year. Intentional PLC meetings and goal setting will be implemented along with subject area collaboration.

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.

ELA proficiency 3-10 was 76% combined below the state average. With 4th grade ELA having the largest deficient of 25% less than the state average. We have seen a trend of fluctuation in our 4th grade ELA scores.

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

Our greatest improvement was the math proficiency in 3rd grade. Improving from 49% proficiency to 79% proficiency. Educators incorporated the online tool IXL to additional math practice, encouraging

students to work on the program for at least 20 minutes each day. The edition of the paraprofessional afforded tiered students extra in class support.

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

The higher number of level 1 students in 6th grade ELA , we have planned for more intensive intervention and have the courses and instructors available. Intentional intervention will be incorporated in 4th grade ELA as 15 of the 57 students demonstrate a substantial reading deficiency.

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

1. Increasing our percentage in our bottom quartile, including our ESE learning gains and proficiency
2. 4th grade ELA and Math Learning Gains
3. 5th grade Math Learning Gains
4. 7th grade ELA Learning Gains
5. Revamping our campus community by building a consensus

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 Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**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.

Learning Gains for ESE students

2022-23, Exceptional students scored 31% in the ESSA data.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The ESE student ESSA Data will improve from 31% to 41% or higher shown by PM3 FAST data

Monitoring:

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

Our ESE teacher and resource professor will closely monitor all assessments. easy CBM and PM1 & 2 data, while encouraging students to use the available resources such as IXL, progress learning, and waggle for additional enrichment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katrina Evans (katrina.evans@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.)

Easy CBM and PM1 and 2 data. Supporting with the use of coach digital, IXL (ELA and Math), progress learning, waggle(math), iReady materials, Wonders, Study Sync, Top Score Writing, New World Reading Initiative, MyOn, Saxon math, and Into Math materials. Targeted identification of lowest quartile and tracking of gains the data folder and chats in the classroom. Additional small groups and intensive classes. With paraprofessional support in each grade level.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Involving student in the process of improvement increase the likelihood of buy-in and personal ownership. Additional instructional time with struggling students also shows performance gains.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. 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.

Including stakeholders in decision making and goal setting. Stakeholders are more receptive to information when they are included, and inclusion comes with building a relationship. Creating an environment where families feel that school is a part of there community and creating purposeful ways for parents to get involved in school academics.

Parent's expectations for their child

Teacher's skill and commitment to the school

Student engagement and personal drive

Measurable Outcome:

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

Collecting data from our stakeholders in the form of surveys and questionnaires twice a year. This data will help us identify positively and negatively impacted areads targeted for growth.

Monitoring:

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

Student and parent engagement

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katrina Evans (katrina.evans@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 incorporation of school volunteer survey's, monthly after school parent involvement activities, parent meeting nights. By tracking the attendance of these activities we will able to promote parental involvement and increase student engagement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Involvement number data is powerful. This will assist in focusing on developing the relationship and parental environment, which leads to student success.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. 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.

With 1 year in of implementing the new standards and new curriculum simultaneously, we will reiterate the importance for our teachers to understand the meaning of the standards and the pedagogical practices that foster the best student outcomes to master the standards.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student learning gains for ALL students (including the lowest quartile)) in ELA and will grow in all areas over the prior year for all grade levels.

Monitoring:

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

Our admin staff will conduct lesson plan checks and walk throughs weekly to ensure that standards are being met and understood. Ongoing training to meet teacher needs with priority given.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katrina Evans (katrina.evans@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.)

FAST assessment tracking. Support using our enrichment tools (ixl, coach digital, wonders, study sync, and top score). Intentional and targeted identification of lowest quartile and tracking of all gains.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Data will be used to set campus and class wide goals. Additional focus on instructional time with struggling students also shows performance gains.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

33% of 4th grade students were not grade level proficient on the FAST PM3 ELA. Teachers will utilize small group instruction to narrow the achievement gap.

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

We will increase our number of students to 50% or greater "on-grade level" on the FAST PM3.

Monitoring**Monitoring**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

We will use FAST ELA PM 1 and 2 to place students in appropriate enrichment groups and develop an action plan with our small group and paraprofessional educators.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evans, Katrina, katrina.evans@charter.hcps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term “evidence-based” means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida’s definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Small group instruction and paraprofessional support is included in our Comprehensive Reading Plan and teaching foundational skills that directly align with the B.E.S.T standards.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Small group and paraprofessional support will directly address the identified need by focusing on developing skills for the group of students to successfully narrow the achievement gap.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school’s Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Data dives to identify how to shift the focus of the small-group instruction	Evans, Katrina, katrina.evans@charter.hcps.net
Plan for instruction with the classroom and reading small groups professor including the paraprofessionals.	Evans, Katrina, katrina.evans@charter.hcps.net