

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Hillsborough Academy Of Math And Science School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 9 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 18 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 0 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 0 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

Hillsborough Academy Of Math And Science

9659 W WATERS AVE, Tampa, FL 33635

hillsboroughacademy.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.

The mission of Hillsborough Academy of Math and Science is to provide students with a challenging program which emphasizes scientific inquiry, critical thinking, understanding of mathematical concepts, and effective communication using innovative, reform-based instructional methods in a stimulating and nurturing environment that fosters maximum student achievement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Hillsborough Academy of Math and Science is to provide students with a challenging and rigorous curricula enabling them to be well prepared for secondary education and life through adherence to an unwavering mission, shared purpose, and clearly articulated goals.

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 |
|----------------|---------------------|---|
| Deen, Brittany | Principal | The principal is the academic leader of the school. Their main focus is to develop and maintain effective educational programs within the school and to promote the improvement of teaching and learning. The principal should strive to create a climate which fosters teacher and student growth, |
| | Assistant Principal | Assistant principals support the principal in all aspects of student achievement and discipline. They also support schoolwide academic goals and support teachers in achieving excellence. |

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 SIP was created in conjunction with the school leadership team, Charter School Associates, and the Governing Board (Advantage Academy of Hillsborough, INC.)

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 leadership team will actively monitor student data to increase instructional strategies and student achievement. The team will meet monthly to review the SIP and enact any necessary changes to promote student achievement.

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 | 81% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 61% |
| 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: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B |
| School Improvement Rating History | |
| DJJ Accountability Rating History | |

Early Warning Systems

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | Total | |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-------|-----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | | 8 |
| Absent 10% or more days | 13 | 7 | 10 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 11 | 6 | 65 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 17 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 1 | 12 | 16 | 19 | 10 | 12 | 21 | 16 | 6 | 113 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 11 | 3 | 18 | 17 | 15 | 18 | 22 | 7 | 3 | 114 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 1 | 3 | 9 | 13 | 6 | 6 | 11 | 6 | 2 | 57 |

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 | 6 | 8 | 12 | 15 | 8 | 7 | 14 | 7 | 3 | 80 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

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

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Students with two or more indicators | | |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Retained Students: Current Year | | |
| Students retained two or more times | | |

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

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

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

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

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

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | 64 | 51 | 53 | 62 | 51 | 55 | 61 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 54 | | | 57 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 44 | | | 45 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 63 | 50 | 55 | 56 | 41 | 42 | 51 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 57 | | | 38 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 49 | | | 39 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 59 | 48 | 52 | 41 | 48 | 54 | 49 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 76 | 65 | 68 | 86 | 57 | 59 | 66 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | 73 | 70 | 70 | 83 | 51 | 51 | 70 | | |
| Graduation Rate | | 83 | 74 | | 44 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | 33 | 53 | | 68 | 70 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 73 | 52 | 55 | 58 | 73 | 70 | 59 | | |

* 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 | 66 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 462 |
| 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 | 59 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 590 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| 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 | 31 | Yes | 2 | 1 |
| ELL | 55 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 73 | | | |
| BLK | 50 | | | |
| HSP | 65 | | | |
| MUL | 82 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 70 | | | |
| FRL | 63 | | | |

| 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 | 51 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 77 | | | |
| BLK | 47 | | | |
| HSP | 56 | | | |

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| MUL | 66 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 64 | | | |
| FRL | 53 | | | |

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 | 64 | | | 63 | | | 59 | 76 | 73 | | | 73 |
| SWD | 28 | | | 30 | | | | | | | 3 | |
| ELL | 49 | | | 56 | | | 36 | 71 | | | 6 | 73 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 73 | | | 73 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| BLK | 58 | | | 42 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| HSP | 62 | | | 61 | | | 55 | 77 | 73 | | 7 | 74 |
| MUL | 82 | | | 82 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 68 | | | 70 | | | 64 | 77 | 75 | | 6 | |
| FRL | 61 | | | 58 | | | 55 | 75 | 68 | | 7 | 73 |

| 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 | 62 | 54 | 44 | 56 | 57 | 49 | 41 | 86 | 83 | | | 58 |
| SWD | 31 | 46 | 36 | 33 | 43 | | 38 | | | | | |
| ELL | 49 | 49 | 38 | 44 | 53 | 42 | 18 | 84 | 73 | | | 58 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 81 | 55 | | 88 | 82 | | | | | | | |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 | ELP Progress |
| BLK | 48 | 38 | | 36 | 61 | 50 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 62 | 55 | 43 | 52 | 53 | 42 | 33 | 87 | 78 | | | 57 |
| MUL | 75 | 47 | | 75 | 71 | | 60 | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 59 | 57 | 50 | 66 | 64 | 58 | 56 | 88 | 80 | | | |
| FRL | 56 | 50 | 38 | 49 | 53 | 48 | 27 | 82 | 79 | | | 50 |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 61 | 57 | 45 | 51 | 38 | 39 | 49 | 66 | 70 | | | 59 |
| SWD | 23 | 36 | 36 | 28 | 50 | 55 | 17 | | | | | |
| ELL | 40 | 58 | 56 | 38 | 41 | 52 | 28 | 45 | | | | 59 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 90 | 92 | | 80 | 46 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 50 | 47 | | 22 | 29 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 57 | 53 | 44 | 46 | 36 | 39 | 40 | 58 | 62 | | | 62 |
| MUL | 81 | 55 | | 76 | 64 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 68 | 64 | 53 | 62 | 39 | 35 | 59 | 81 | 73 | | | |
| FRL | 53 | 50 | 38 | 41 | 30 | 36 | 39 | 55 | 63 | | | 53 |

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 | 62% | 53% | 9% | 54% | 8% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 60% | 47% | 13% | 47% | 13% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 79% | 44% | 35% | 47% | 32% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 77% | 54% | 23% | 58% | 19% |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 61% | 47% | 14% | 47% | 14% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 53% | 46% | 7% | 50% | 3% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 48% | 53% | -5% | 54% | -6% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 53% | 36% | 17% | 48% | 5% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 61% | 55% | 6% | 59% | 2% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 65% | 59% | 6% | 61% | 4% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 92% | 57% | 35% | 55% | 37% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 54% | 53% | 1% | 55% | -1% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 66% | 41% | 25% | 44% | 22% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 45% | 47% | -2% | 51% | -6% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 100% | 55% | 45% | 50% | 50% |

| GEOMETRY | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 100% | 49% | 51% | 48% | 52% |

| BIOLOGY | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 100% | 62% | 38% | 63% | 37% |

| CIVICS | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 74% | 64% | 10% | 66% | 8% |

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 that showed the lowest performance was 6th grade math at 47%. This was in part the students having difficulty dissecting word problems.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was 7th grade ELA from a 75% to a 60%. This was due to students having a lack of foundational reading skills.

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 that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was 6th grade math. The state was 55% and the school was 47%. The factors that contributed to this were student lack of knowledge on basic math facts and them being able to dissect word problems.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was grade 8 math. Grade 8 went from 65% to 92%. Additional tutoring, more hands on instruction, and project based learning helped students have a better understanding of mathematical concepts.

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

The EWS data showed that we would benefit from continuing our focus on math achievement and the correlation of excessive absences affecting student performance.

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

Improving SWD achievement

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 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.

Parents play an integral role in the education of their children as partners with the school. Each parent is encouraged to volunteer 10 hours per family per year. Opportunities to volunteer include evening projects, chaperoning of evening activities or other opportunities developed by the School's staff. Parent Academies include topics such as: Working with Your Child Utilizing Math Concepts Taught at School, Reading with Your Child and Asking Thought Provoking Questions about the Passage, Specific ELL and ESE strategies, Hispanic Heritage Night, etc. This approach assists in developing that critical partnership between the school and parents to help their children achieve, and for parents to support educational practice at home. The ELL Coordinator and ESE staff will ensure that parents of those students receive information regarding these programs.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increasing the attendance of families at the above events and encouraging continued attendance through effective communication by school leaders.

Monitoring:

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

The school will keep attendance of these events and ensure effective communication of events in a timely manner.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brittany Deen (brittany.deen@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.)

N/A

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

N/A

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

#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.

Teachers differentiate instruction as necessary and offer tutoring services or other such assistance to ensure all students remain successful. Teachers in all classes utilize scaffolding to provide contextual supports for meaning through the use of simplified language, teacher modeling, visuals and graphics, cooperative learning and hands-on learning. Then, as students become more proficient, the scaffold is gradually removed. The objective at the school is to maintain the rigorous curriculum designed for each grade, but to modify methods and practices to ensure all students are achieving at grade level.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Subgroup achievement on FAST assessments will increase.

Monitoring:

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

FAST data, supplemental program data, and exam data will be triangulated to target BEST standards to drive standards-based instructional decisions. On-going progress monitoring will also occur through the review of Literacy Design Collaborative writing samples, curriculum assessments, and benchmarks. Specific strategies to remediate learning deficiencies will be implemented. Supplemental materials includes, but are not limited to: Success Maker, IXL, Magnetic Reading, Ready Florida Math, MyOn, Easy CBM, and ILit45.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brittany Deen (brittany.deen@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.)

All Pacing Guides and Focus Calendars align with the BEST Standards to guide instruction. Savvas core curriculum for math, reading, and science will be utilized to meet the rigorous requirements of the BEST standards. All classes will provide appropriate interventions based on student's academic needs and data supporting the interventions. Supplemental curriculum that is researched-based will be used in small group to address the learning gaps. Daily intervention or tutoring may be required for those students consistently demonstrating non-mastery. Reading strategies in other content areas will be provided in addition to those taught during reading and language arts classes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Savvas core curriculum is utilized as part of the schools instructional plan. The program has supplemental materials designed to remediate skills. PM1, PM2, and PM3 is implemented for all benchmark testing in all grade levels to monitor standards mastery on a quarterly basis. The assessments are used to provide data to make instructional decisions based on the needs of each grade level and classroom to focus on the strengths and needs of individual students. The data is utilized in data meetings with administrators, teachers, coaches, and students on a regular basis to create and modify goals to improve student achievement levels.

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.

Teachers will provide:

- Cooperative groups of mixed ability
- Classroom teachers place students in cooperative groups of mixed abilities to complete daily activities to promote peer support and learning models
- Centers - Centers within the classroom for small group/individual assistance and activities for struggling students.
- Before and after school study time
- After school study time for struggling students to develop effective study habits.
- Small group guided instruction - Identify groups of students (5 or less) who need additional assistance to be provided in a small group while the rest of the class is working on independent practice.

Person Responsible: Brittany Deen (brittany.deen@charter.hcps.net)

By When: 2023-2024 school year

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).

School Improvement funding allocations and resources based on needs are discussed and decided on by all stakeholders. Funds are allocated to provide supplemental research-based materials to meet the needs of student subgroups.