



---

## 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>15</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>22</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>

# Pivot Charter School

3020 S FALKENBURG RD, Riverview, FL 33578

www.pivotcharterschool.com

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

### Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

### Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

### Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## I. School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

Engage and empower each student to achieve excellence as a learner and a citizen.

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

To be a leading, innovative, high performing school that graduates each student to be prepared for college and career.

### 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
Rubero, Liz	Principal	The principal is responsible for the total functioning of the school, working in different areas such as: educational leadership, staff management, academic performance, student discipline, school policies and regulations, teacher evaluation, crisis management, budget, hiring process and other responsibilities.

**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.

The process of involving stakeholders is important for the improvement of the school. The school leadership team plays a crucial role in initiating and overseeing the SIP development process. They often lead discussions, facilitate meetings, and coordinate the involvement of other stakeholders. Their input helps to shape the overall direction of the plan. They develop and implement plans to achieve the goals of the school. The teachers and the school staff develop activities for the integration of the community. They collaborate by conducting surveys to find out the needs of students and educational staff. Teachers have the responsibility to implement the curriculum and apply innovative strategies to meet the goals established by the state. Students are a very important part of this school improvement process. Student clubs contribute to improving the school environment and make it an attractive and dynamic place for them. Also, through the student council, new rules and activities are developed that support the best functioning of the school and the integration of students. Parents and family members are kept informed about school policies and rules, participate in satisfaction surveys that help improve, and participate in conferences with teachers to address students' academic needs. All stakeholders need to maintain constant communication to work collaboratively to make the school improve and to achieve established goals.

**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))

Regular monitoring and continuous improvement are critical aspects of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) to ensure its effectiveness in increasing student achievement, especially for those students facing the greatest achievement gaps. In order to monitor the development of the School Improvement Plan, meetings will be held with faculty for data analysis. Among the data that will be analyzed are: grades each quarter, results of standardized tests such as PM, SAT, AC, EOC and others. Progress reports will be analyzed to identify gaps and factors that affect student performance in order to implement instructional strategies and reduce the academic gap. School will collect and analyze data regularly. This could involve assessments, classroom observations, surveys, students and staff attendance and other data sources. This data-driven approach helps in understanding the current state and identifying areas that need improvement. In the same way, reviewing the data will help to identify if the implemented strategies are working or if it is necessary to review them and adopt new strategies to continue the improvement plan. Meetings required by law will also be held to review IEPs and 504 plans to identify student needs and establish reasonable accommodations to give students the opportunity to develop their full potential and meet the academic requirements of the grade. The school leadership team will hold meetings to review the progress of the school improvement plan. During these reviews, the school leadership team, teachers, and relevant stakeholders come together to assess the progress made towards the established goals.

**Demographic Data**

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	73%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	52%
<b>Charter School</b>	Yes
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C

	2019-20: C
	2018-19: C
	2017-18: C
<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	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 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

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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	38	51	50	40	52	51	41		
ELA Learning Gains				54			38		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52			28		
Math Achievement*	21	42	38	22	39	38	21		
Math Learning Gains				38			27		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40			50		
Science Achievement*	21	64	64	35	46	40	29		
Social Studies Achievement*	55	69	66	60	49	48	63		
Middle School Acceleration	21			47	41	44	45		
Graduation Rate	91	89	89	89	64	61	90		
College and Career Acceleration	44	62	65	65	72	67	48		
ELP Progress		39	45						

*\* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

### ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	291
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	91

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	542
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	89

**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	10	Yes	2	2
ELL	24	Yes	4	4
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	30	Yes	4	1
HSP	43			
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	48			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	40	Yes	1	

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	16	Yes	1	1
ELL	23	Yes	3	3
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	33	Yes	3	
HSP	50			
MUL	54			
PAC				
WHT	51			
FRL	46			

**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	38			21			21	55	21	91	44	
SWD	17			7			7				3	
ELL	25			16				31			3	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	39			26			25				3	
HSP	39			20			22	43		50	6	
MUL	50										1	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	31			14			17	78		50	6	
FRL	35			22			17	40	30	44	7	

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	40	54	52	22	38	40	35	60	47	89	65	
SWD	6	27		5	27							
ELL	5	50		13	26		20					
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41	64		18	26		14					
HSP	33	50	60	15	42		29	71		100	50	
MUL	50	67		38	67		50					
PAC												
WHT	47	48		24	26		44	57		81	77	
FRL	36	51	50	20	38	36	27	60	42	85	65	

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	41	38	28	21	27	50	29	63	45	90	48	
SWD	18	19	10	0	31		9					
ELL	29	46		15	30							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38	25		23	50			73				
HSP	38	42		14	23		22	50				
MUL	33	23		13	8							
PAC												
WHT	43	45	40	22	28		45	74	47	89	41	
FRL	44	38	31	24	28	54	24	64	38	80		

**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	28%	50%	-22%	50%	-22%
07	2023 - Spring	32%	47%	-15%	47%	-15%
08	2023 - Spring	34%	44%	-10%	47%	-13%
09	2023 - Spring	55%	48%	7%	48%	7%
06	2023 - Spring	34%	47%	-13%	47%	-13%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	31%	53%	-22%	54%	-23%
07	2023 - Spring	20%	36%	-16%	48%	-28%
08	2023 - Spring	22%	57%	-35%	55%	-33%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	14%	41%	-27%	44%	-30%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	21%	55%	-34%	50%	-29%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	22%	49%	-27%	48%	-26%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	35%	62%	-27%	63%	-28%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	53%	64%	-11%	66%	-13%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	53%	65%	-12%	63%	-10%

### 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.**

The data component showed the lowest performance was the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) results for Progress Monitoring 3 (PM3) in Mathematics. The results of this test showed that the school, in all grades, performed below the District. For PM3, 53% of district-wide 6th graders scored on level or higher while schoolwide 6th graders scored 31%; 36% of district-wide 7th graders scored on level or higher while schoolwide 7th graders scored 20% and 57% of district-wide 8th graders scored on level or higher while schoolwide 8th graders scored 35%. Also, when analyzing the results of the Algebra and Geometry end-of-course (EOC) assessments, the school's results were below the proficiency level of the district and state. Certainly, low performance in end-of-course standards tests can result from a combination of various factors.

One of the factors that contributed to this result is the integration of the new curricular standards and that the tests are aligned with the Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking (B.E.S.T.). Both teachers and students are in the transition process to adapt to the new benchmarks and the new curricular content. Other factors may be lack of engagement, academic gaps, and other external factors that could affect student performance.

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

The data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year is the results between the Florida Standards Assessments and the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking and B.E.S.T. End-of-Course Assessments. By the year 2022, in the subject of mathematics, 7th grade students had a better result than students in 2023. In the year 2022, 33% of the students had a performance of at level or more while for the school year 2023 only 20% of the students had proficient results. For the Language Arts subject,

in the year 2022 the 8th grade students had a 48% proficiency while for the year 2023 the percentage of proficiency was 34%, which makes a difference of -14%. Various factors could influence these results, such as a change in the format of the tests and in the educational standards, academic gap of the students and the lack of motivation and commitment.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

The data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is the End-of-Course (EOC) assessments for the algebra subject with a difference of 32% less than the level of proficiency of the state. One of the factors that contributed to this result is the academic gap that students have in the subject of mathematics. Students do not master the basic skills of the subject of mathematics. Being a subject with a vertical curriculum, it is difficult for students to master the content of the Algebra subject proficiently. Another factor that could have contributed to this result is that the teacher did not cover the curricular content of the course during the school year. Insufficient teaching or curriculum coverage in the classroom or inadequate support from teachers can impact a student's preparedness.

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

The area that showed the most improvement for our school was attendance. A campus attendance committee was created to analyze the data and develop preventative strategies to reduce student absences. Various incentives were implemented to recognize and reward students with perfect attendance. The home room with the highest attendance was also recognized and motivational activities were offered for the groups with the best attendance.

Students were also identified with many absences to work with them individually and offer them help both to improve attendance at school and to complete work missed in class.

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

The area of greatest concern for this school year is academic achievement for the subject of mathematics. When analyzing the data, there is a reduction in the learning gain of 18 points from 2019 to 2022. Performance in the area of mathematics has been a constant area of concern over the years and is the focus of attention for this school year.

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

- Student Achievement and Learning Outcomes: increasing instructional time, more active classes and engaging, offering peer tutoring.
- Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) and Mental Health
- Professional Development for Educators
- Parent and Community Engagement

**Area of Focus**

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

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: After analyzing the performance of students in the subject of mathematics, for this school year it is the area of focus for the school. In the last 3 years, the learning gain in mathematics has decreased by 18 points therefore, strategies will be implemented to improve the academic achievement of students and the performance in the assessment of the subject.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Measurable Outcome: At the end of the school year, the learning gain will be increased by 5% in the subject of mathematics based on the results of Florida Assessment of Student Thinking and B.E.S.T. End-of-Course Assessments.

**Monitoring:**

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

Monitoring: This focus area will be monitored through regular meetings. Data indicators of student academic achievement will be measured monthly to identify academic gaps in students.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Liz Rubero (liz.rubero@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.)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Computer-Assisted Instruction (CAI)

Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies (PALS)

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Computer-Assisted Instruction (CAI): Interactive math software and online platforms can provide students with engaging activities, immediate feedback, and personalized learning paths (ALEKS, Study Island).

Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies (PALS): In this approach, students work in pairs or small groups, taking turns as tutors and tutees. Teaching a concept to a peer helps reinforce the tutor's understanding while providing the tutee with personalized assistance (peer tutoring program).

**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.

Meetings to discuss student performance and identify students with the greatest need.

Peer tutoring

Post test to assess student progress.  
September 2023

Monthly during the school year

After 2nd quarter

April 2024

**Person Responsible:** Liz Rubero (liz.rubero@charter.hcps.net)

**By When:** September 2023 Monthly during the school year After 2nd quarter April 2024

Integration and participation of parents in educational and extracurricular activities.

Increase by 5% the participation of parents, especially parents of ELL students, in all activities organized by the school during this school year.

They will be monitored by reviewing the attendance of parents in activities called or sponsored by the school.

**Person Responsible:** Jesse Laing (jlaing@pivotcharterschool.com)

**By When:** Cultural Awareness Programs: Recognizing and celebrating the diverse cultural backgrounds of families can create a more inclusive and welcoming school environment. Parent-Teacher Communication Tools: Using technology, such as emails, apps, and online platforms, to maintain regular communication between parents and teachers can enhance collaboration and keep parents informed about their child's academic progress.

**#2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

**Monitoring:**

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

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

**#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

**Monitoring:**

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

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

#### #4. 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.

Integration and participation of parents in educational and extracurricular activities.

##### Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase by 5% the participation of parents, especially parents of ELL students, in all activities organized by the school during this school year.

##### Monitoring:

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

They will be monitored by reviewing the attendance of parents in activities called or sponsored by the school.

##### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jesse Laing (jlaing@pivotcharterschool.com)

##### Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Parent-Teacher Communication Tools: Using technology, such as emails, apps, and online platforms, to maintain regular communication between parents and teachers can enhance collaboration and keep parents informed about their child's academic progress.

##### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Using all forms of available communication tools to engage parents will benefit students and their academics.

##### 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***

### **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).