Hillsborough County Public Schools

The Collaboratory Preparatory Academy 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	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	16
VI. Title I Requirements	19
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	20

The Collaboratory Preparatory Academy

6406 E CHELSEA ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[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.

Our mission is to prepare learners of Hillsborough, K through 5th grade, for high school, college, and for the work force by delivering a world class education through the arts in a collaborative environment fueled by a passion for learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To create an educational family which develops character driven, culturally literate, life-long learners who bring value to their community.

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
Smith, Cassandra	Principal	Ensuring the academic policies and curriculum are followed. Developing and tracking benchmarks for measuring success along with setting performance goals for the school. Assist teachers with maximizing their teaching potential. Meeting and listening to the concerns of parents, students, teachers, and administrators on a regular basis. Encouraging, guiding, and assisting student leaders and teachers. Assist with creating a budget for the school. Taking disciplinary action against students and staff members. Communicating with the board. And attending conferences related to the industry of education.
Malone, Tromoui	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal of Operations (APO) manages campus operations and is responsible for achieving operational excellence across non-instructional areas, including front office management, business office, facility maintenance, new construction management, technology coordination, student recruitment and enrollment.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The process for involving stakeholders will be through collaboration which will focus on the school needs. It is important for stakeholders to be provided with the data and other information needed to make the stakeholders productive around school 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))

SIP will be monitored quarterly by the school improvement team to monitor trends. Revision will be made off of data analytics and voted upon by a 50 plus one.

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 Elementary School	
(per MSID File) KG-5	
Primary Service Type K-12 General Education	
(per MSID File)	
2022-23 Title I School Status Yes	
2022-23 Minority Rate 97%	
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate 100%	
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 Black/African American Students (Bl	K)*
(subgroups with 10 or more students) Hispanic Students (HSP)	
(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) Economically Disadvantaged Studer (FRL)	ts
2021-22: C	
School Grades History 2019-20: C	
*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. 2018-19: C	
2017-18: F	
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									
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total	
Absent 10% or more days	7	3	5	1	1	3	0	0	0	20	
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide 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.	1	3	4	6	10	0	0	0	0	24	
	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			(Grad	de L	eve	l			Total
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	TOLAT
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	3	1	3	1	0	0	0	9

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

Indicator		Total								
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	4
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		Total								
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Absent 10% or more school days	6	1	5	0	4	3	0	0	0	19
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											
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total		
Students with two or more indicators	1	1	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	6		

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level											
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total		
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	1	1	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		
Accountability Component	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	16	50	53	34	53	56	30		
ELA Learning Gains				58			43		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	6	56	59	39	50	50	30		
Math Learning Gains				65			27		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*		50	54	35	59	59	21		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		59	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)							
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students							
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students							
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target							
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	22						
Total Components for the Federal Index	2						
Percent Tested	99						
Graduation Rate							

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index						
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students						
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target						
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index						
Total Components for the Federal Index	5					
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												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	15	Yes	4	1								
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	11	Yes	1	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													
ELL													
AMI													
ASN													
BLK	37	Yes	3										
HSP	59												

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												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	46											

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

	2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress	
All Students	16			6									
SWD													
ELL													
AMI													
ASN													
BLK	17			12							2		
HSP													
MUL													
PAC													
WHT													
FRL	16			6							2		

	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	34	58		39	65		35						
SWD													
ELL													
AMI													
ASN													

	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	18	47		23	59								
HSP	47	73		53	64								
MUL													
PAC													
WHT													
FRL	34	58		39	65		35						

	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	30	43		30	27		21							
SWD	15	30		15	30									
ELL														
AMI														
ASN														
BLK	14	38		14	14		10							
HSP	57			57										
MUL														
PAC														
WHT														
FRL	23	46		23	17		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. 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	*	53%	*	54%	*
04	2023 - Spring	13%	54%	-41%	58%	-45%

ELA							
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison	
03	2023 - Spring	*	46%	*	50%	*	

MATH								
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison		
03	2023 - Spring	*	55%	*	59%	*		
04	2023 - Spring	7%	59%	-52%	61%	-54%		
05	2023 - Spring	*	53%	*	55%	*		

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison	
05	2023 - Spring	*	47%	*	51%	*	

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

ELA and Math. Contributing factors to last year's low performance was due to lack of instruction and high teacher turnover which led to ineffective teaching.

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

The greatest in grades 3 and 4 from the prior school year in math and reading. The factors that contributed to the decline is lack of instruction and high teacher turnover.

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 was in reading due to the lack of instruction and resources...

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

PM 3 scores showed the most improvement in math and reading. New action aligned resources to the Florida BEST Standards, professional development series throughout the year, and quarterly data analysis.

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

Attendance and aligned instruction.

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

- 1. aligned curriculum
- 2. increase attendance in students and faculty
- 3. ensure effective instruction and evaluations
- 4. increase state performance scores
- 5. fully staffed certified teachers.

Area of Focus

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

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

It was identified through data and observations.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The school will utilize I-ready data and state testing data to track progress with the use of current curriculum that is aligned to the state standards.

Monitoring:

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

Quarterly I-Ready diagnostic and Progress Monitoring Assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cassandra Smith (cassandra.smith1@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.)

Based on scores students will be placed into tiers for interventions through MTSS.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

MTSS will be used because it is evidence-based interventions which shown effects at producing results.

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

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

First line of instruction is the curriculum that is aligned with the Florida Best Standards. MTSS interventions in Tiers 2 and 3, which includes push in and pull-out instruction with a reading endorsed teacher.

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

First line of instruction is the curriculum that is aligned with the Florida Best Standards. MTSS interventions in Tiers 2 and 3, which includes push in and pull-out instruction with a reading endorsed teacher.

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

I-Ready diagnostic and STAR progress monitoring

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

I-Ready diagnostic and FAST Progress Monitoring

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.

Areas of Focus will be monitored through quarterly data tracking of State Progress monitoring, I-Ready, and STAR.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Delange, Cinzia, 100151@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?

The programs that are being implemented strongly meets the Florida's definition of evidence based.

- * Yes
- * Yes

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 rationale for selecting the program, which is Wonders because it aligns with the Florida Best Standards.

- * Yes
- * Yes

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		
Literacy Leadership Evaluate the effect of their teaching FCPS and Florida Literacy Walkthrough	Delange, Cinzia, cinzia.delange@hcps.net		
Literacy Coaching Weakness will be evaluated by using data of observations and coaching will be implemented to strengthen those areas.	Delange, Cinzia, 100151@hcps.net		

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

The SIP will be made available will be public on school's website. Electronic notifications will go out to stakeholders once approved and posted. www.collaboratoryprep.org

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Through parent teacher conference night, community base activities, and sponsers.

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

Through afterschool tutoring and summer enrichment programs.

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

n/a

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

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

The school currently uses an outside company for counseling and mental health services. Frameworks is the company that is currently being used for Social Emotional Learning (SEL).

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

n/a

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

Our tiered 1 behavior model consist of ClassDojo. Tier 2 Behavior intervention consists of PBIS (Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports) which includes Individual behavior plans and teacher student check ins.

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

Teachers and Paraprofessionals participate in Bi-weekly professional developments that helps with improving instruction, data tracking, interventions, small group instruction, which will help in retaining effective teachers in high needed subject areas.

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

n/a

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00	
		Total:	\$0.00	

Budget Approval

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

Yes