Slam Academy At Apollo Beach School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Slam Academy At Apollo Beach

5150 N US HWY 41, Apollo Beach, FL 33572

[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.

The mission of SLAM Apollo is to provide an engaging, challenging, and supportive learning environment that will motivate all students to be the best they can be in and out of the classroom and prepare them for the future success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to position students for future success in a global job market, equip them with the skills to pursue their passions and develop their character to make a positive impact on society.

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
Williamson, Meredith	Principal	The principal serves as the instructional leader, engages stakeholders, and collaborates with others.
Bleck, Merrissa	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal serves as a back up to the principal and works with staff to collaborate and drive instruction.
Davis, Erika	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal serves as a back up to the principal and works with staff to collaborate and drive instruction.
Pritts, Victoria	School Counselor	The school counselor uses school data to identify and assist individual students who do not perform on grade level and creates yearly, data-driven goals that advance student outcomes in areas of academics and social emotional growth.
Tomas, Israel	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal serves as a back up to the principal and works with staff to collaborate and drive instruction.

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

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

School leadership team, parents, and school staff helped to develop the plan.

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 plan will be regularly monitored for effective implementation by the school leadership team and reviewed during the parent involvement team meetings.

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-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	68%
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)* 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
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	59	40	28	21	21	27	25	21	25	267
One or more suspensions	1	0	5	2	3	8	9	5	24	57
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	3	1	25
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	33	35	22	29	32	10	161
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	38	35	51	31	36	10	201
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	8	17	19	17	21	11	15	16	11	135
	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	0	2	1	0	3	2	2	5	15

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	3	7	4	8	3	2	9	7	15	58
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
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	40	34	27	24	27	16	27	24	29	248
One or more suspensions	1	3	2	2	4	6	12	22	23	75
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	10
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	28	26	22	34	29	30	169
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	21	25	29	37	24	31	167
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	15	20	5	14	5	10	0	0	0	69

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	1	1	1	2	1	5	6	10	27

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	3	2	2	4	4	13	12	0	40
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	11	14

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	43	51	55	36		
ELA Learning Gains				50			43		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43			38		
Math Achievement*	38	50	55	41	41	42	29		
Math Learning Gains				51			33		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55			34		
Science Achievement*	23	48	52	30	48	54	33		
Social Studies Achievement*	62	65	68	48	57	59	50		
Middle School Acceleration	36	70	70	53	51	51	49		
Graduation Rate		83	74		44	50			
College and Career Acceleration		33	53		68	70			
ELP Progress	38	52	55	45	73	70	28		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	289
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	46

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	459
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	16	Yes	2	1
ELL	34	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	1	
HSP	39	Yes	2	
MUL	43			
PAC				
WHT	45			
FRL	35	Yes	2	

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	33	Yes	1	
ELL	39	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	40	Yes	1	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	48			
PAC				
WHT	51			
FRL	39	Yes	1	

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			38			23	62	36			38
SWD	17			19			0	23			5	
ELL	32			26			18	58			6	38
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	44			35			16	47			5	
HSP	41			30			17	73	30		7	38
MUL	41			41			31				4	
PAC												
WHT	51			47			30	57	44		6	
FRL	38			32			13	53	24		7	35

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	43	50	43	41	51	55	30	48	53			45
SWD	18	48	50	16	35	46	16					
ELL	28	40	38	32	48	54	17	47				45
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	39	47	50	37	53	44	9	47				
HSP	35	46	36	33	50	59	22	49	31			43
MUL	48	58		35	54		45					
PAC												
WHT	52	54	44	52	52	46	45	51	67			
FRL	33	47	43	35	47	55	18	45	29			42

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	36	43	38	29	33	34	33	50	49			28
SWD	3	22	17	14	36	29	18	25				
ELL	14	31	27	16	30	35	8	22				28
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24	42	55	23	26		29	50				
HSP	28	38	33	18	30	38	28	31	31			32
MUL	50	63		42	25							
PAC												
WHT	49	44	33	44	39	25	40	60	60			
FRL	26	36	30	20	31	30	26	33	33			26

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	45%	53%	-8%	54%	-9%
07	2023 - Spring	55%	47%	8%	47%	8%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	36%	44%	-8%	47%	-11%
09	2023 - Spring	40%	48%	-8%	48%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	43%	54%	-11%	58%	-15%
06	2023 - Spring	49%	47%	2%	47%	2%
03	2023 - Spring	45%	46%	-1%	50%	-5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	43%	53%	-10%	54%	-11%
07	2023 - Spring	42%	36%	6%	48%	-6%
03	2023 - Spring	45%	55%	-10%	59%	-14%
04	2023 - Spring	47%	59%	-12%	61%	-14%
08	2023 - Spring	42%	57%	-15%	55%	-13%
05	2023 - Spring	28%	53%	-25%	55%	-27%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	13%	41%	-28%	44%	-31%
05	2023 - Spring	29%	47%	-18%	51%	-22%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	30%	55%	-25%	50%	-20%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	90%	49%	41%	48%	42%

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

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	62%	64%	-2%	66%	-4%

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.

SLAM Apollo's 5th grade Math proficiency was 28% which is the lowest area in Math. SLAM Apollo's 8th grade ELA proficiency was 36% which is the lowest area in ELA. A contributing factor is a change in staff members for the 8th grade ELA classes and 5th grade math last school year.

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

SLAM Apollo's 5th grade Math data declined from 44% to 28% due to a change in math teacher throughout the year.

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.

SLAM Apollo's 4th grade Math showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average (9 point difference). A contributing factor and school-wide trend appears to be students struggling to close the learning gap due to the years on remote instruction.

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

SLAM Apollo's 7th grade ELA increased from 31% to 55% with a total of a 24% increase. Our 7th grade ELA teacher remained the same and she did an amazing job with driving her instruction and progress monitoring students throughout the year.

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

Attendance for students at SLAM is a potential area of concern due to the number of students with 10 or more absences a year.

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

1. Increasing our overall 5th grade Math percentage for the 2023-2024 school year.
2. Increasing our overall 8th grade ELA percentage for the 2023-2024 school year.
3. Increasing our overall 3rd grade ELA percentage for the 2023-2024 school year.

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to 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.

Our Math overall focus will be our 5th grade proficiency. This grade had the lowest preforming data across the school in 22-23. The passing rate also decreased by 16% when compared to the 21-22 scores.

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

To increase the Math proficiency rate in 5th grade from 28% to 33% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

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

Throughout the school year, there will be progress monitoring check ins with our assistant principal and 5th grade Math teachers. Formative and summative assessments will be implemented with feedback and instruction will be driven based on results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Erika Davis (015059@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.)

SLAM Apollo has implemented STEMScopes for the core math curriculum as well as iReady for individual lessons that differentiate for the students. Reflex math will be used to build math fluency as well as daily math talks and fluency sprints.

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

STEMScopes will help strengthen the core curriculum provided to students in grades K-5 and will allow struggling students to close gaps in their fluency and mental math facts. Reflex math and daily math talks with fluency sprints will enhance the students basic math skills.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

Our ELA area of focus will be our overall 8th grade proficiency. This was our lowest performing grade level in the area of ELA across the school. The passing rate also decreased by 8% when compared to the 22-23 scores.

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

To increase the ELA proficiency rate in the 8th grade from 28% to 33% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

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

Throughout the school year, there will be progress monitoring check ins with our assistant principal and 8th grade ELA teacher. Formative and summative assessments will be implemented with feedback and instruction will be driven based on results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Israel Tomas (itomas@slamapollo.com)

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.)

Students will be provided intensive reading if they scored a level 1 or 2 on PM3 data in Spring 2022. Students are provided with an iReady diagnostic test 3 times throughout the year and given tiered support based on their scores. Students also complete iReady targeted lessons that differentiate their instruction as well as Reading Plus lessons to build their comprehension.

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

Students will continue to build their comprehension knowledge with the use of Reading Plus. iReady will target each students deficiencies and teachers will assign lessons to strengthen their comprehension and fluency.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. 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.

Our area of focus for positive culture and environment is to raise our staff retention rate and to increase our overall recruitment of teachers.

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

To increase our retention rate of staff members from 75% to 85% by the following school year and recruiting teachers graduating from teacher preparation programs.

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

SLAM Apollo will monitor the retention rate by renewing contracts for staff before the end of the current year.
SLAM Apollo will monitor college teacher preparation programs and advertise for these positions on their college network boards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Meredith Williamson (meredith.williamson@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.)

SLAM Apollo will continuously provide feedback to teachers/staff and create a positive work environment for staff to continue working in each year.

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

Creating a positive work environment for all staff will open the opportunity for positive staff members to want to remain in their positions or to grow within the school.

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

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).

SLAM Apollo has been identified as an ATSI school. The new curriculum, STEMScopes, purchased from operating for Math will be implemented this year to promote and close gaps in students overall performance. The curriculum in ELA, StudySync, will provide middle/high teachers with the spiraled content to meet the B.E.S.T. standards.
iReady diagnostic and teacher toolkit will help to differentiate for the student's needs and close gaps in their individual learning.
Reflex Math and Reading Plus will provide students with ways to increase their fluency in math facts and reading comprehension.

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.

We will discuss the SIP plan with our school community during ESAC meetings quarterly. We will display the SIP plan on the schools website (www.slamapollo.com).

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))

SLAM Apollo communicates weekly with parents through a week ahead email and shares the agenda for the week's plan. SLAM Apollo builds positive relationships with families and community stakeholders by holding community events for families to attend and participate in throughout the year (Trunk or Treat, Winter Games, etc.)

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))

SLAM Apollo plans to hold fall and spring mandatory tutoring throughout the 2023-2024 school year and increase the learning time past the normal school hours. We do not participate in early release days to allow consistency throughout each month, rather opting for one teacher planning day a month for staff.

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))

SLAM Apollo is a Community Eligibility Provision School for the 2023-2024 school year. All students are provided free breakfast and lunch.

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))

SLAM Apollo is equipped with school counselors to provide school based mental health services and counseling. The school counselor has created a mentorship program for our middle/high students to mentor elementary students and promote role models within our school. Our counselors provide SEL lessons to K-5 students in the classroom through guidance lessons and monthly during Team Huddles for middle/high students. SLAM Apollo also offers clubs and sports for students to participate in extracurricular activities outside the school day.

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))

SLAM Apollo offers middle/high students with electives that are classified as academy wheels including Sports Broadcasting, Sports Marketing, and Career Research. Students will be able to pick a track they would like to complete in high school once they have sampled the academies in middle school. SLAM students have the opportunity to participate in DECA, Debate Team and Mock Trials to allow them to have experiences in areas that will promote possible careers.

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).

SLAM Apollo follows the Hillsborough County Code of Conduct for behavior. SLAM Apollo uses Class Dojo across Kindergarten through 10th grade classrooms. The school wide positive behavior system is awarding students with dojo points to earn a monthly reward as the positive incentive. Students can earn these points anywhere in the school from any staff member.

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))

SLAM Apollo will provide staff with monthly professional development areas including daily programs that are used in the classroom, classroom management strategies, specifically designed instruction, and numerous topics to help build more understanding and confidence in the daily use of these practices. Staff will participate in weekly professional learning communities (PLCs) to discuss data and student performance to identify positive and negative trends and drive their instruction.

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))

SLAM Apollo does not have a preschool program, but in Kindergarten students transition well to the classroom due to our teachers preparing them with the day to day schedule and providing breaks often to help with the transition into Elementary school.