Winthrop Charter School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Winthrop Charter School

6204 SCHOLARS HILL LN, 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.

Winthrop Charter School will be passionate in our pursuit of academic excellence. With integrity and grit, we will provide educational programming to create lifelong learners and valued contributors to our global community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We will utilize collaboration, research proven instructional strategies, and high expectations to promote academic excellence and personal development.

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
Johnson, Terry	Principal	Setting SIP meeting schedule, data dive, assign roles, allocate resources, progress monitoring, provide instructional feedback and professional development
Clifford, Colleen	Assistant Principal	Attend SIP meetings, data dive, provide learning environment conducive to learning, student course scheduling, provide instructional feedback
Bruce, Megan	Parent Engagement Liaison	Attend SIP meetings, data dive, accountability partner, and providing continuous feedback (implementation, accommodations tracking, and student outlook).
Watkins, Ernest	Teacher, ESE	Attend SIP meetings, ensure full implementation of IEP and related services, co-planning with general education teachers, progress monitoring, and caseload assignment based upon content area expertise
Markey, Bethany	Other	Attend SIP meetings, data dive, student attendance monitoring and resolving any absenteeism, engaging mental health services as appropriate, collecting student accommodation trackers
Cook, Maria	Teacher, K-12	Attend SIP meetings, data dive, teach to full rigor of the standard, MTSS, provide differentiated instruction, provide tutoring opportunities (before and after school), progress monitoring, attend PLC's/PD sessions, co-plan with ESE Teacher
Campbell, Sara	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Attend SIP meetings, data dive, provide instructional coaching, provide instructional resources, progress monitoring, provide professional development
Grear, Brianna	Teacher, ESE	Attend SIP meetings, ensure full implementation of IEP and related services, co-planning with general education teachers, progress monitoring, and caseload assignment based upon content area expertise
Fiala, Samantha	Teacher, K-12	Attend SIP meetings, data dive, teach to full rigor of the standard, MTSS, provide differentiated instruction, progress monitoring, attend PLC's/PD sessions, co-plan with ESE Teacher
Storm, Kristen	Other	Attend SIP meetings, data dive, progress monitoring, provide learning environment conducive to learning, professional development, and provide instructional feedback

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.

Performance outcomes were communicated with parents. SIP Team meetings were held to analyze student data, identify gaps, and to develop and a SIP. Student performance data was discussed, roles were assigned, and the SIP was drafted.

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))

There will be weekly data dives to review and discuss student performance (MTSS outcomes, weekly IFC's, NWEA benchmark assessments, and FAST), walkthroughs will be used to monitor instructional delivery, student impact, and to develop PD sessions, weekly PLC's will be held, and if performance outcomes do not improve, SIP action steps will be addended.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	71%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	39%
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: A

	2019-20: A
	2018-19: A
	2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Absent 10% or more days	23	24	18	9	9	9	23	18	19	152
One or more suspensions	22	9	12	8	12	13	28	31	16	151
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	3	3	5	3	3	4	8	3	33
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	1	4	5	8	3	0	22
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	9	10	9	11	8	11	7	65
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	4	2	3	9	7	6	5	3	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	6	9	13	15	17	8	6	0	75

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	1	3	2	4	7	8	10	11	3	49

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	6	3	2	6	1	3	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1

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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Absent 10% or more school days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	68	51	53	72	51	55	76		
ELA Learning Gains				60			65		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50			57		
Math Achievement*	77	50	55	79	41	42	77		
Math Learning Gains				62			53		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				60			51		
Science Achievement*	74	48	52	65	48	54	60		
Social Studies Achievement*	97	65	68	96	57	59	90		
Middle School Acceleration	76	70	70	86	51	51	81		
Graduation Rate		83	74		44	50			
College and Career Acceleration		33	53		68	70			
ELP Progress	35	52	55	69	73	70	58		

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	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	502
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	699
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	45			
ELL	58			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	75			
HSP	68			
MUL	83			
PAC				
WHT	82			

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	66			

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	35	Yes	1	
ELL	62			
AMI				
ASN	86			
BLK	61			
HSP	67			
MUL	78			
PAC				
WHT	77			
FRL	62			

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	68			77			74	97	76			35
SWD	36			45			55				3	
ELL	54			58			52	92			5	35
AMI												
ASN	83			91			90		80		5	
BLK	63			73			64	100	70		6	
HSP	62			70			67	96	78		7	36
MUL	85			74			74	100			5	

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	71			84			85	94	78		6	
FRL	60			66			62	95	72		7	46

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	72	60	50	79	62	60	65	96	86			69
SWD	40	41	24	49	39	33	21					
ELL	49	56	60	65	59	60	48	93				69
AMI												
ASN	85	72		95	81		92		92			
BLK	60	53	48	69	61	54	42	93	70			
HSP	69	60	49	74	56	52	65	96	84			69
MUL	89	73	79	81	64	77	70		90			
PAC												
WHT	78	58	48	87	66	82	81	96	93			
FRL	62	54	47	69	59	55	49	98	75			56

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	76	65	57	77	53	51	60	90	81			58
SWD	45	58	47	59	42	35	38					
ELL	56	62	56	75	64	77	44	90				58
AMI												
ASN	89	61		92	64		88	100	100			
BLK	62	64	54	70	50	49	54	87	76			
HSP	77	68	63	75	52	56	55	91	63			58
MUL	78	59		78	55	30	55	100	88			
PAC												
WHT	80	67	61	82	56	53	65	88	90			
FRL	65	59	52	71	50	58	60	85	92			62

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
05	2023 - Spring	74%	53%	21%	54%	20%
07	2023 - Spring	59%	47%	12%	47%	12%
08	2023 - Spring	63%	44%	19%	47%	16%
04	2023 - Spring	82%	54%	28%	58%	24%
06	2023 - Spring	63%	47%	16%	47%	16%
03	2023 - Spring	75%	46%	29%	50%	25%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	70%	53%	17%	54%	16%
07	2023 - Spring	80%	36%	44%	48%	32%
03	2023 - Spring	83%	55%	28%	59%	24%
04	2023 - Spring	86%	59%	27%	61%	25%
08	2023 - Spring	48%	57%	-9%	55%	-7%
05	2023 - Spring	80%	53%	27%	55%	25%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	64%	41%	23%	44%	20%
05	2023 - Spring	78%	47%	31%	51%	27%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	75%	55%	20%	50%	25%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	93%	49%	44%	48%	45%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	93%	62%	31%	63%	30%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	96%	64%	32%	66%	30%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

ELA was the lowest data component. We attributed this to students entering Winthrop below grade-level, summer regression, inconsistency in student access to instructional technology, and SEL impacts.

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

ELA learning gains. SEL impacts (attention challenges, socialization challenges,), low tutoring attendance rates, and few touchpoints with small group instruction.

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 lowest 25% learning gains. SEL impacts (attention challenges, socialization challenges,), low tutoring attendance rates, and few touchpoints with small group instruction

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

Middle School Acceleration. Reviewed state testing data as far back as 4th grade to identify students to continue to stretch academically. Increased enrichment opportunities for all learners by providing Cambridge opportunities across all grade-levels versus simply cohorts.

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

SEL

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

1. SEL
2. Enrichment opportunities for all learners
3. Providing 1:1 technology
4. Monitoring small group instruction via walkthrough observations
5. Providing PD for behavioral supports

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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.

Based upon our data review, we have identified student suspensions as an area of focus. We have over 150 children impacted. We want to increase professional development around classroom management/ behavioral MTSS. This includes increasing de-escalation strategies and PBS supports. In addition, we will utilize the HERO conduct system schoolwide to track positive and corrective behavioral incidents so that we can target any trend behaviors that result in the loss of instructional time/opportunities. We will also hold anti-bullying assemblies.

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

Our goal is to decrease suspensions by 10%.

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

We will pull our suspension reports monthly to compare to data from 2022-2023 and 2023-2024 school years. We will also track students who attributed to these suspensions to ensure they are trending downward towards our 10% goal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Colleen Clifford (colleen.clifford@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.)

We will utilize the Attitude is Altitude (AIA) Program. Through morning meetings and check-in/check-out sessions, students will learn strategies of self-reflection, self-regulations, positive modalities of expression, and the importance of their presence and role in shaping school climate.

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

We want to empower students with the skills to cope, self-reflect, and act for the betterment of the entire learning community.

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.

AIA session implementation during morning meeting.

Person Responsible: Kristen Storm (kristen.storm@charter.hcps.net)

By When: Daily

Check-In/Check-Out (CICO) personnel identified and partnered with students,

Person Responsible: Bethany Markey (bethany.markey@charter.hcps.net)

By When: Daily

PBS Store for students to acquire prizes for earning positive behavior points in the HERO system.

Person Responsible: Kristen Storm (kristen.storm@charter.hcps.net)

By When: Monthly

Suspension report monitoring.

Person Responsible: Colleen Clifford (colleen.clifford@charter.hcps.net)

By When: Weekly

Behavioral MTSS/PD

Person Responsible: Sara Campbell (sara.campbell@charter.hcps.net)

By When: Monthly training opportunity for teachers in conjunction with Invo Progressus Therapy Services..

#2. 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.

Our ESE subgroup was approximately 35% proficient based upon FAST/PM3 data from the 2022-2023 school year.

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

Our goal is to achieve 41% proficiency for our ESE subgroup based upon FAST/PM3 data from the 2023-2024 school year.

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

Classroom teachers will complete daily student accommodations trackers. During weekly data chats, we will discuss ESE student performance and establish actions steps. We will host parent universities regarding ways to support the learning process at home. ESE teachers will attend monthly PD sessions within our school district. Attendee participation will be tracked.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bethany Markey (bethany.markey@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.)

Aside from full compliance in administering IEP accommodations and related services, I-ready will be used in conjunction with MTSS supports.

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

I-ready will permit us to progress monitor in an individualized capacity and assist with modifying MTSS supports as needed.

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.

Weekly student accommodations tracker checks.

Person Responsible: Bethany Markey (bethany.markey@charter.hcps.net)

By When: Weekly

I-ready and other performance data analysis.

Person Responsible: Megan Bruce (megan.bruce@charter.hcps.net)

By When: Weekly

ESE Teachers (B. Grear, E. Watkins, and V. Williams) to attend HCPS monthly meetings/Pd.

Person Responsible: Brianna Grear (brianna.grear@charter.hcps.net)

By When: Monthly

Parent Universities

Person Responsible: Kristen Storm (kristen.storm@charter.hcps.net)

By When: Each semester

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).

Based upon analysis of our ESSA Data, we intend to allocate resources to securing an additional ESE Teacher instead of hiring a Dean of Students. A school budget review was held on 8/1/23 with our management company and the determination was made that we can make this hiring change. WE have posted the ESE Teacher vacancy and will continue to screen and interview applicants until a new hire is made. This additional role will help decrease ESE caseload ratios.

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

We do not qualify.

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

We do not qualify.

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

We do not qualify.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

We do not qualify.

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 do not qualify.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

We do not quality.

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?

We do not quality.

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

We do not qualify.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Non-applicable.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Non-applicable.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

Non-applicable.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Non-applicable.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Non-applicable.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Non-applicable.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Non-applicable.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Noon-applicable.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

on-applicable.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes