Kids Community College Riverview Southeast School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Kids Community College Riverview Southeast

11519 MCMULLEN RD, Riverview, FL 33569

[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.

Kid's Community College Southeast Middle School is dedicated to the well-being and educational success of every child. We aim to foster internationally-minded, lifelong learners who will help shape our global community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

KCC Southeast will use the Guiding Principles for charter schools as established by F.S. 1002.33(2)(a) in the following ways. We will:
a. Set, meet, and exceed high standards of student academic success and achievement wile providing parents flexibility to chose among diverse educational opportunities within the state's public school system.
KCC SE will provide students with challenging curriculum founded in a transdisciplinary approach using the Next Generation Sunshine Standards and the PYP.This school will provide an additional diverse choice option not currently available in this geographic area of the county. KCC SE will meet and exceed these standards through our assessment program.
b. Demonstrate enhanced academic success and financial efficiency by combining responsibility with accountability-- the school district and parents will view KCC SE as an academic, administrative, and financially viable educational choice to send their children within the public school system.
c. Provide parents with sufficient information on whether their child is reading at grade level and whether the child gains at least a year's worth of learning for every year spent in the charter school by doing the following:
-Use a continuous progress program that combines foundational academics with individual student-centered performance measures. Student progress will be monitored and reported through individual development and education plans (IDEP's), parent-teacher and student- led conferences, portfolio reviews, student performance es and standardized testing. At all times, KCC SE will aim to support the family values and beliefs and to this end we endeavor to provide continual communication with parents and guardians in all aspects of the student's education and life. We will encourage interaction between family and school nu having a Board level parent liaison, a toll-free number to receive improvement suggestions, the creation of a Campus Advisory Committee, one-on-one orientation meetings with every enrolled student family (in order prior to set high expectations at the beginning of the school year) and monthly Board meetings with the staff, parents and community.
We will provide parents with sufficient information on their child's progress through compliance with Florida State Statutes and School District of Hillsborough County Policies in reading through timely assessments and reporting.
Parents will be informed in advance of the testing process and testing dates. testing results will be sent home to parents for discussion or explanation of results. Teachers will examine results for patterns of success and to identify areas in which changes are needed (either to curriculum or th the instructional approach.)

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

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.

School leadership admin team, teacher team leaders, parent advisory board members, and community members are included in the development of the SIP. Stakeholders meet to review the SIP and engage in in-depth conversations to construct the best means of support needed to execute and implement 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 biweekly for effective implementation and impact to ensure the increase of student achievement. Students with the greatest achievement gap will be monitored biweekly through assessment. The SIP will be assessed once a month to determine fidelity and make revisions to the plan. If the plan is found ineffective stakeholders will reconvene to assess and revise for the benefit of student success.

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	79%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	57%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: C

*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2019-20: B
	2018-19: B
	2017-18: C
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	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	3
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	5
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	15	16	12	15	17	18	18	17	10	138
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	15	10	9	19	13	22	19	15	15	137
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	3	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	15	7	6	3	4	3	5	4	6	53

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	8	2	4	3	4	8	4	3	8	44
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	13	8	11	25	15	91
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	12	26	21	20	29	125
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	7	0	2	2	3	1	15

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	6	8	3	5	4	6	8	9	8	57

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	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	8	2	4	3	4	8	4	3	8	44
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	13	8	11	25	15	91
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	12	26	21	20	29	125
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	7	0	2	2	3	1	15

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	6	8	3	5	4	6	8	9	8	57

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	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
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*	41	51	53	50	51	55	51		
ELA Learning Gains				57			43		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			25		
Math Achievement*	40	50	55	46	41	42	37		
Math Learning Gains				55			28		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52			8		
Science Achievement*	24	48	52	34	48	54	33		
Social Studies Achievement*	47	65	68		57	59			
Middle School Acceleration	45	70	70		51	51			
Graduation Rate		83	74		44	50			
College and Career Acceleration		33	53		68	70			
ELP Progress	50	52	55		73	70	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	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	285
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	338
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
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	22	Yes	2	1
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	63			
BLK	30	Yes	1	1
HSP	45			
MUL	27	Yes	1	1
PAC				
WHT	42			

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	33	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	38	Yes	1	
ELL	58			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP	45			
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	50			

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	41			40			24	47	45			50
SWD	21			34			10				3	
ELL	43			48			20				4	50
AMI												
ASN	57			69							2	
BLK	38			32			19	35			5	
HSP	38			43			22	73			6	55
MUL	32			32			17				3	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	48			47			35	42			5	
FRL	32			31			16	38	31		7	50

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	50	57	44	46	55	52	34					
SWD	33	50		29	40							
ELL	43			60	70							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	45	59	45	31	53	50	27					
HSP	48	52		48	58		21					
MUL	36			64								
PAC												
WHT	51	62		56	58							
FRL	49	48		50	63		40					

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	51	43	25	37	28	8	33					70
SWD	21			27								
ELL	39			37								70
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	44	22		23	17		35					
HSP	52	62		41	31		20					
MUL	33			42								
PAC												
WHT	52	31		45	31		46					
FRL	41	47		26	16		17					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.
<u>The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide</u>
<u>assessments</u>.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	43%	53%	-10%	54%	-11%
07	2023 - Spring	41%	47%	-6%	47%	-6%
08	2023 - Spring	40%	44%	-4%	47%	-7%
04	2023 - Spring	50%	54%	-4%	58%	-8%
06	2023 - Spring	41%	47%	-6%	47%	-6%
03	2023 - Spring	37%	46%	-9%	50%	-13%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	37%	53%	-16%	54%	-17%
07	2023 - Spring	48%	36%	12%	48%	0%
03	2023 - Spring	39%	55%	-16%	59%	-20%
04	2023 - Spring	48%	59%	-11%	61%	-13%
08	2023 - Spring	41%	57%	-16%	55%	-14%
05	2023 - Spring	50%	53%	-3%	55%	-5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	22%	41%	-19%	44%	-22%
05	2023 - Spring	25%	47%	-22%	51%	-26%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	73%	55%	18%	50%	23%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	64%	49%	15%	48%	16%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	46%	64%	-18%	66%	-20%

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.

Math was the lowest data component. Contributing factors were the retention of qualified teachers that were proficient in varying learning models to support student growth and understanding. Students did not have access to teaches that remained the entire year of instruction.

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

Math even though there was growth and sufficient number of students passed EOC's for Algebra students in critical grades were affected by contributing factors of building teacher knowledge.

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.

Grades 6 - 8 ELA learning gains had the greatest gap when compared in addition to 3rd grade ELA. This trend can be attributed to student readiness in conjunction with ELA teacher retention and consistency of data driven assessments given with fidelity.

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

The data component that showed most improvement was upper level and intermediate math. Math resource and small group supports. Along with math specific tutoring to focus on foundational gaps.

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

Reading readiness and math foundational understanding on potential areas of concerns as students move into the next grade and are not sufficiently ready to begin at grade level. This concern comes for reviewing the amount of level 1 students in each intermediate and upper grade level.

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

Teacher retention
Teacher training
Fidelity of standard based practices
Reading and math comprehension of standards and ability to use tools and strategies to understand key concepts
Parental support

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 Differentiation

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.

Teachers must provide differentiation to students to support in varying levels of cognitive understanding to provide foundational comprehension and build understanding.

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

Teachers will receive differentiation training monthly to support in development and growth to be seen in their teaching practice daily.

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

Admin and resource teams will observe teachers and monitor success or areas for support in conjunction with reviewing student weekly assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Danielle Smalley (danielle.smalley1@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 use of RTI is the evidence based intervention that will be used in small group support with biweekly assessments given after two weeks of daily strategies to student identified groups to ensure that teachers are able to holistically support students direct needs. Using the PM 3 data to begin in August and PM 1 data after testing in September to inform how students should grouped and what strategies should be used for small groups to determine what probes and teaching is needed for small group support and intervention.

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

RTI with the use of Easy CBM probes will support in the function of small group instruction and fidelity. This tool is being used to properly account for the needs of students and address and assess specific learning concerns to provide needed supports.

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.

All teachers trained on EASY CBM
All teachers ready with differentiation strategies toolbox
Calendar for scheduling changes to needed student groups

Person Responsible: Danielle Smalley (danielle.smalley1@charter.hcps.net)

By When: September 1, 2023

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

Teacher retention is crucial to securing the culture and environment as well as consistency of high level instructional practices.

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

Teacher retention for the entire school year with no breaks in employment in critical grades.

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

Admin will ensure the consistency culture and environment building for support, training and congruence of staff.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Danielle Smalley (danielle.smalley1@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.)

Teacher SEL and wellness models used to ensure teachers are supported and have the means to acquire support to continue in a health and mental wellness.

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

This strategy is needed as many teachers are not supported in mental wellness and leave education due to not being holistically supported.

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.

Teacher Wellness checks
Breaks for support
Adequate training
Resources for support

Person Responsible: Danielle Smalley (danielle.smalley1@charter.hcps.net)

By When: October 6, 2023

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

25% of students K - 2 were not grade level proficient in ELA on the star renaissance reading assessment given in May 2023 this percentage is due to students that struggled with phonemic awareness and letter sounds in KG.

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

37% of students 3 -5 were not grade level proficient in ELA on there FAST PM 3 ELA

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

50% of K - 2 students will perform at grade level proficiency.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

55% of K -3 students will perform at grade level proficiency as determine. 45% of grade 6 students will perform as grade level proficiency.

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.

Walkthroughs weekly, teacher planning sessions, along with Tuesday PD's will reflect accountability to secure fidelity of instructional practices. This form on continuous monitoring weekly will be used consistently and monitored by resource and administration to support in ensuring holistic practice of teachers to support student achievement.

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

Smalley, Danielle, danielle.smalley1@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?

Differentiation as evident in the use of RTI tiered systems of support to group and support students focused in closing specific learning gaps.
Data driven instruction by using data to drive and inform instructional practices so teaching and learning reflects students highest need and is adaptive.

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?

The identified need is addressed through the evidence based practices presented as they reflect the needs of students and respond to the specific goal of growth and closing of foundation gaps that prevent students from building collective understanding.Effective and consistency use of RTI will promote student readiness and support with our lowest performing students and allow for development and enrichment within on level students.

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
Teacher coaching and training Teacher resources retained Student monitoring of success goals	Smalley, Danielle, danielle.smalley1@charter.hcps.net