Southshore Charter Academy School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Southshore Charter Academy

11667 BIG BEND RD, Riverview, FL 33579

[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.

As a team of staff, parents, and community, we will strive to inspire a passion for lifelong learning and instill a confidence for students to discover their full potential through a diverse school environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Southshore Charter Academy will empower students to achieve academic excellence and embrace social responsibility.

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
Sams, Amy	Principal	The principal serves as the instructional leader to ensure students are provided with academic opportunities that challenge them to grow and master standards aligned to their grade level and beyond. The principal will engage stakeholders to strengthen the school community and build collaboration and trust among all members.
Swank, Alicia	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal supports the role of the principal to ensure the school environment is conducive to effective academic opportunities. The AP will specifically oversee the work of the ESOL, ESE, credit recovery, and attendance departments.
Mehl, Paul	Dean	The dean of students supports the school learning environment by overseeing discipline, mental health, and facilities.
Gold, Sarah	Dean	The dean of curriculum supports the teachers and curriculum coaches to ensure that all students and teacher have needed textbooks and instructional software platforms that are being implemented with fidelity.

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.

Administration meets regularly with grade level team leads to gain teacher input to school procedures. The assistant principal meets regularly with the PTC chair to understand the voice of the parents. The principal is actively involved in business partnerships and the local chamber of commerce to involve community stakeholders. The principal works with the Anchored for Life teams (one for elementary and one for middle school) to include students. Input garnished from these meetings at the end of the 22-23 school year and over the summer was used by the administrative team for this SIP.

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 by administration via their weekly meetings where they share the progress and/or challenges for each area of the school of which they have direct oversight. Adjustments to schedules, lesson plans, and teacher support resources will be adjusted as needed. A focus will be given to students lacking in proficiency via the RTI/MTSS process as well as the offering of tutoring after school.

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	78%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	51%
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 *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 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	39	33	24	29	23	16	36	37	26	263
One or more suspensions	4	4	2	3	9	4	15	13	6	60
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	27	24	23	13	20	38	0	145
Course failure in Math	0	0	17	32	12	70	45	95	6	277
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	20	27	27	36	30	26	166
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	18	40	44	27	23	39	191
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	11	10	13	21	29	23	19	20	146
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	1	2	4	1	6	6	3	26

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	2	4	9	8	7	5	6	11	12	64
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	5

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	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*	45	51	53	45	51	55	51		
ELA Learning Gains				50			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			36		
Math Achievement*	44	50	55	44	41	42	39		
Math Learning Gains				55			32		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52			34		
Science Achievement*	48	48	52	38	48	54	38		
Social Studies Achievement*	58	65	68	65	57	59	63		
Middle School Acceleration	76	70	70	69	51	51	63		
Graduation Rate		83	74		44	50			
College and Career Acceleration		33	53		68	70			
ELP Progress	67	52	55	48	73	70	56		

* 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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	395
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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	510
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	29	Yes	4	1
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN	68			
BLK	50			
HSP	52			
MUL	47			
PAC				
WHT	64			

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	53			

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	36	Yes	3	
ELL	35	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	52			
HSP	46			
MUL	48			
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	47			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	45			44			48	58	76			67
SWD	19			22			32	45			6	45
ELL	37			35			37	46			6	67
AMI												
ASN	71			65							2	
BLK	40			38			44	53	70		6	
HSP	42			40			38	59	65		7	64
MUL	50			36			58	42			4	

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	55			59			65	70	84		6	
FRL	40			38			47	54	78		7	63

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	45	50	44	44	55	52	38	65	69			48
SWD	15	41	50	24	53	62	4					
ELL	19	34	24	27	45	46	15	54				47
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	47	54	49	40	54	51	37	59	74			
HSP	40	44	40	37	50	53	34	53	62			47
MUL	48	52		42	48	60	38					
PAC												
WHT	55	53	28	59	66	43	55	83	75			
FRL	38	45	48	35	49	45	34	64	68			45

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	48	36	39	32	34	38	63	63			56
SWD	20	33	30	14	32	35	25					64
ELL	28	35	31	27	35	35	0	43				56
AMI												
ASN	60			60								
BLK	45	43	36	33	27	24	35	55	63			
HSP	48	43	30	32	31	38	28	60	54			58
MUL	54	57		46	39		18	55				
PAC												
WHT	62	60	50	55	40	36	58	82	76			
FRL	37	44	33	31	32	33	33	40	53			65

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	49%	53%	-4%	54%	-5%
07	2023 - Spring	43%	47%	-4%	47%	-4%
08	2023 - Spring	45%	44%	1%	47%	-2%
04	2023 - Spring	43%	54%	-11%	58%	-15%
06	2023 - Spring	39%	47%	-8%	47%	-8%
03	2023 - Spring	54%	46%	8%	50%	4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	38%	53%	-15%	54%	-16%
07	2023 - Spring	48%	36%	12%	48%	0%
03	2023 - Spring	60%	55%	5%	59%	1%
04	2023 - Spring	37%	59%	-22%	61%	-24%
08	2023 - Spring	45%	57%	-12%	55%	-10%
05	2023 - Spring	33%	53%	-20%	55%	-22%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	32%	41%	-9%	44%	-12%
05	2023 - Spring	43%	47%	-4%	51%	-8%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	82%	55%	27%	50%	32%

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

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	92%	62%	30%	63%	29%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	59%	64%	-5%	66%	-7%

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.

Science was the lowest overall score for our school, both in 5th and 8th grade. Contributing factors are that the higher students in 8th grade are enrolled in biology so peer collaboration is limited. Another contributing factor was lack of monitoring science with needed benchmarks. Low science sores have been a concern for the last 3 years. This year we have made changes to the monitoring system, teacher changes in these subject areas, and hired a science tutor to assist with small group support. Though it was the lowest overall score, science did grow 5% from the previous year. That increase was due to increased hands-on learning experiences which will continue this year.

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

The greatest decline occurred in middle school language arts. The largest contributing factor was teacher turnover in this department. Combine teacher turnover with the new standards that were in place created gaps in the lesson planning and implementation. This year we have more solid teachers in place and a new curriculum resource teacher (coach) for the middle school as a whole.

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 greatest gap occurred in math for grades 4, 5, and 6. A contributing factor in 4th and 6th grade was teacher turnover. Other factors were the new standards. Teacher changes with more experienced teachers being placed in these grade levels have been applied for this school year. Despite the

weaknesses in 6th grade there was an 11% increase in math from the previous year, proving that the after school tutoring and success block instructinal software efforts made an impact.

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

The greatest improvement occurred in 3rd grade math. The action steps taken were the addition of two teachers to third grade from our primary grades, a third grade full-time tutor to aid in small group instruction, focused incentives, boot camp during spring break, and team planning.

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

An area of concern is attendance. Too many students are absent frequently as well as too many who are tardy. This year we have added an attendance clerk who will not just be responsible for entering the data into the system but also for creating intervention plans with students and families.

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

A top priority for this year is to improve foundational skills in all core subjects for Tier 2 and 3 students, leading to an increase in overall school proficiency by 5 points in all 4 core areas (reading, math, science, and civics). This priority will be addressed through greater opportunities for tutoring/small groups, monitoring of instructional software, engagement strategies, and teacher PD on understanding and implementing standards with fidelity.

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 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.

As all schools, we have seen a decline in teacher applicants which created gaps in classroom structures the past two years. This summer a focus was given to recruitment and talent development. Careful arrangment of new teachers and rearrangement of returning teachers was given to ensure that each grade level was not only fully staffed but built to work as a solid team. The difference has already been seen during pre-planning workdays. Having stronger teacher teams will impact the team planning for core subjects to give consistency in the implementation of standards-based teaching.

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

By December of 2023, 2 or fewer teachers will have left at the mid-year point, and at least 90% of teachers will have been involved in 15 or more PLC meetings. By May of 2024, 5 or fewer teachers will have left in the school year, and at least 90% of teachers will have been involved in 30 or more PLC meetings.

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

This will be monitored with frequent teacher check-ins, stronger grade level PLCs, and improved onboarding procedures for new teachers. Lesson plans will be developed during weekly PLC and team planning meetings and checked via the school's teacher observation tool for standards-aligned implementation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amy Sams (amy.sams@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.)

Weekly PLC meetings = Professional Learning Communities are grounded in data. Analyzing data, setting goals, using data to guide lesson planning, identifying gaps where reteaching is needed, and adjusting strategies to reach all learning types are the activities that these grade level groups (for elementary) and subject-area groups (middle school) will do on a weekly basis, led by curriculum resource teacher and dean of curriculum.

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

PLCs provide teachers opportunities to collaborate and develop innovative activities to diversify instruction and meet the needs of more students.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Data pulled to share and discuss at PLC team meeting

Person Responsible: Sarah Gold (sarah.gold@charter.hcps.net)

By When: Following PM1 test completions (mid-late September)

Use of data to create lesson plans at weekly team meetings/PLC

Person Responsible: Sarah Gold (sarah.gold@charter.hcps.net)

By When: weekly, checked in school's teacher observation tool at regular intervals of walk-throughs

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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

The overall school math proficiency score from 21-22 to 22-23 was stagnant with no growth.

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

From PM1 to PM2, student math proficiency will improve at least 3%. From PM1 to PM3, student math proficiency will improve at least 7% with the goal of improving the overall school math proficiency from 44% to 51% by the end of the 23-24 school year.

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

Data chats will occur during weekly PLCs to monitor student scores in classroom assignments, standardized testing (including benchmarks), unit assessments, and instructional software. Standards that are not mastered will cycle through the lesson plans again for reteach and review.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sarah Gold (sarah.gold@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.)

Small group instruction is at the core of classroom structures this year. As well, students will have the i-Ready platform for instructional software support. The core curriculum is Savaas, as approved by the state.

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

Small group instruction provides more individual and personalized support to meet individual student needs. This was selected as an intervention based on data analysis of students' individual scores.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

students will complete the i-Ready diagnostic test

Person Responsible: Sarah Gold (sarah.gold@charter.hcps.net)

By When: This will be completed by the end of the first 4 weeks of school.

Student names will be divided into small group focus based on data analysis following the diagnostic test, again after PM1, and again after PM2

Person Responsible: Sarah Gold (sarah.gold@charter.hcps.net)

By When: September and January

Offering of incentives for students who exceed the number of required minutes on instructional software at home (accessing family engagement)

Person Responsible: Sarah Gold (sarah.gold@charter.hcps.net)

By When: quarterly

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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.

The overall school science proficiency score was lower than reading and math.

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

By completion of PM2, at least 25% of students in grades 5 and 8 will demonstrate growth in science. By May of 2024, at least 50% of students in grades 5 and 8 will demonstrate growth in science.

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

Data chats will focus on results from PM1 and PM2 as well as from unit assessments to guide lesson planinng

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sarah Gold (sarah.gold@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.)

Discovery Ed and Mystery Science has been added as additional support resources.

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

Students need differentiated instruction and respond well to instructional software platforms. The use of these platforms also allows for students to extend their practice at home.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

additional hands-on science labs

Person Responsible: Sarah Gold (sarah.gold@charter.hcps.net)

By When: Each student will have at least two hands-on learning labs quarterly.

software incentives

Person Responsible: Sarah Gold (sarah.gold@charter.hcps.net)

By When: Quarterly incentives will be offered for students' home usage.

Boot camps will be offered prior to the PM3 testing.

Person Responsible: Alicia Swank (alicia.swank@charter.hcps.net)

By When: Quarters 3 and 4

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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

An area of focus is to improve parent engagement. The school's spring survey of parents had only 40% stating they agreed or strongly agreed to being engaged.

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

By May of 2024, the spring parent survey score for the category of engagement will improve at least 5%.

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

This area will be monitored through a fall and spring survey that is sent to all families. The survey is sent by the charter school's home office.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amy Sams (amy.sams@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.)

An improvement to parent communication is needed to engage more families as well as creating a voice for them. A redesign of the SOS (Sharks on Success) folders has been done to give students and teachers more precise written interactions regarding students' goals and assignment results.

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

The involvement of stakeholders is important to build trust and support within the school culture and 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 2 - Moderate 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.

More parent information sessions, called Parent University, will be held to ensure parents have frequent information and communication.

Person Responsible: Amy Sams (amy.sams@charter.hcps.net)

By When: By the end of each quarter, at least two parent events will be held.

SOS folders will be used weekly and monitored at regular intervals (at least quarterly)

Person Responsible: Alicia Swank (alicia.swank@charter.hcps.net)

By When: By then end of each quarter, SOS folders will be checked by leadership team to ensure teachers, students, and parents are utilizing them with efficacy.

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).

ESSER III grant funds are used to provide a tutor per grade level (3-8) to support more small-group instruction. Budget funds are used for providing instructional software for all students and additional software (Lexia) for students in Tier 3 and ELL categories. Budget funds are used for the position of a reading specialist who provides Tier 3 interventions for middle school. The school has added the position of dean of curriculum in addition to the two curriculum resource teachers to provide increased teacher development and monitoring of student work.