Florida Connections Academy School

2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Florida Connections Academy

13008 N TELECOM PKWY, Temple Terrace, FL 33637

www.connectionsacademy.com/florida-online-school-launch

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 Florida Connections Academy is to create a personalized, student-centered learning experience with certified teachers dedicated to helping students succeed in school and in life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Florida Connections Academy will be the premier online K-12 school in Florida where all students will achieve their academic and personal goals.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ross, Esilda	Principal	Esilda Ross is the School Leader for FCA.
Gill, Dana	Principal	Dana Gil is the Elementary Principal for FCA.

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 Florida Connections Academy (FCA) School Improvement Plan (SIP) is developed in several phases with stakeholder input. First, the School Leadership Team (School Leader, Principals, Special Education Manager, and Manager of Counseling Services) analyzes student achievement data and school operational metrics over the summer. The team discusses areas of growth and future development, organized into three K-12 focus goals. Each grade level or team then drafts action plans based on the focus goals.

During teacher pre-planning, the School Leader facilitates the State of the School presentation that presents a summary of last school year's goals and the direction for the upcoming school year. All staff are invited to share feedback on the data presented and the drafted K-12 school goals. Grade level and team Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) then work together to finalize their action plans based on their specific data shared by their Leadership Teams. The School Leadership Team then finalizes the K-12 goals following the pre-planning working sessions.

In the fall, the School Leader presents the SIP to the FCA Governing Board for their review and feedback. The Governing Board is given the opportunity to review student achievement data and school operational metrics throughout the school year, and the School Leader will connect these data presentations back to the SIP.

The school leadership team will provide regular updates on the school improvement plan initiatives to families throughout the school year. These sessions will also provide families the opportunity to provide feedback and suggestions for continued improvement actions.

The FCA SIP is monitored and updated monthly based on current student data available through the school's platforms. SIP updates are shared regularly at staff meetings, allowing all staff the opportunity to ask questions and provide additional suggestions for improvement. In the spring, the grade level and team PLCs analyze the available data to determine the results of their goals, reflect on success and opportunities, and start brainstorming action steps for the following school year.

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 FCA SIP is monitored and updated monthly based on current student data available through the school's platforms. Grade level and team PLCs discuss the data at least monthly and revise action steps as needed. The school leadership team also reviews progress towards the K-12 goals at least monthly to determine how to support teachers with MTSS and personalized instruction.

FCA's Instructional Coaches work in partnership with course teachers to review student performance on state standards, using data from various sources including, but not limited to, FAST ELA and Mathematics PM1 and PM2, course performance, and supplemental instructional programs.

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	59%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	46%
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)* Native American Students (AMI)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) Pacific Islander Students (PAC)* 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: C 2018-19: 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	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)	19	12	41	70	28	51	99	152	146	618
Course failure in Math	13	14	34	69	43	57	99	139	103	571
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	24	52	62	55	66	99	358
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	22	98	109	124	109	108	570
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified retained:

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more school days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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*	49	51	53	49	51	55	58		
ELA Learning Gains				51			54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39			40		
Math Achievement*	30	50	55	27	41	42	37		
Math Learning Gains				43			32		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45			27		
Science Achievement*	42	48	52	35	48	54	55		
Social Studies Achievement*	53	65	68	42	57	59	61		
Middle School Acceleration	24	70	70	34	51	51	27		
Graduation Rate		83	74		44	50			
College and Career Acceleration		33	53		68	70			
ELP Progress	44	52	55	44	73	70	76		

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	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	282
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	94
Graduation Rate	

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	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	409
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	86
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	19	Yes	3	2
ELL	25	Yes	3	1
AMI				
ASN	74			
BLK	32	Yes	3	
HSP	38	Yes	1	
MUL	43			
PAC	47			
WHT	42			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	31	Yes	3	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	27	Yes	2	1
ELL	34	Yes	2	
AMI	20	Yes	1	1
ASN	70			
BLK	36	Yes	2	
HSP	43			
MUL	43			
PAC	37	Yes	1	
WHT	47			
FRL	37	Yes	2	

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	49			30			42	53	24			44
SWD	21			14			23	28			5	
ELL	26			16			13	22			6	44
AMI												
ASN	77			71			58	91			4	
BLK	41			20			30	43	12		6	
HSP	48			28			36	50	23		7	43
MUL	53			29			43	60	36		6	

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	67			27							2	
WHT	50			34			50	54	23		6	
FRL	41			23			34	42	11		7	34

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	49	51	39	27	43	45	35	42	34			44
SWD	22	37	28	12	33	32	21	27				
ELL	29	45	34	16	39	41	16	38				44
AMI	20											
ASN	78	63		62	74		65	78				
BLK	41	49	40	19	36	37	29	46	29			
HSP	49	51	38	27	43	47	37	51	38			50
MUL	54	48	36	33	43	35	37	55				
PAC	35			38								
WHT	53	52	41	36	43	54	50	66	31			
FRL	44	49	40	24	37	40	33	49	30			20

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	58	54	40	37	32	27	55	61	27			76
SWD	31	48	37	18	23	28	30	39	10			
ELL	48	54	35	18	24	28	38	33				76
AMI												
ASN	81	72		67	45		63					
BLK	42	43	34	15	18	24	36	54	9			
HSP	60	57	40	34	33	28	49	52	31			75
MUL	59	48	35	41	33	28	62	70				
PAC												
WHT	62	56	45	45	36	29	68	67	26			
FRL	51	51	40	30	30	28	47	56	14			

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
10	2023 - Spring	46%	50%	-4%	50%	-4%
05	2023 - Spring	45%	53%	-8%	54%	-9%
07	2023 - Spring	49%	47%	2%	47%	2%
08	2023 - Spring	48%	44%	4%	47%	1%
09	2023 - Spring	55%	48%	7%	48%	7%
04	2023 - Spring	49%	54%	-5%	58%	-9%
06	2023 - Spring	50%	47%	3%	47%	3%
03	2023 - Spring	39%	46%	-7%	50%	-11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	30%	53%	-23%	54%	-24%
07	2023 - Spring	37%	36%	1%	48%	-11%
03	2023 - Spring	28%	55%	-27%	59%	-31%
04	2023 - Spring	27%	59%	-32%	61%	-34%
08	2023 - Spring	39%	57%	-18%	55%	-16%
05	2023 - Spring	24%	53%	-29%	55%	-31%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	34%	41%	-7%	44%	-10%
05	2023 - Spring	27%	47%	-20%	51%	-24%

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	27%	49%	-22%	48%	-21%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	56%	62%	-6%	63%	-7%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	51%	64%	-13%	66%	-15%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	54%	65%	-11%	63%	-9%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

The data shows that overall math achievement is the lowest accountability component. When breaking this down into subgroups, students with disabilities have the lowest performance with math achievement. This aligns to our initial data analysis of the 2023 Math PM 3 and EOC results.

Student performance in mathematics continues to be our school's greatest area of improvement. Students enroll in FCA often needing math interventions as they are struggling to master grade level standards. Our school data shows that students enrolling are typically one to two years behind in math performance and are also off-cohort. Further work may be needed to ensure alignment between the curriculum, MTSS procedures, and the state assessments.

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

Science achievement had the greatest decline from the prior year. Looking at the 2023 initial data in Science, we expect that the achievement may have declined again. This decline may have been

attributed to school-based work in alignments, and the lack of a K-12 intervention program to support the grade levels who administer science state assessments.

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.

Overall student achievement in math has the greatest gap when compared to state averages. As noted above, many of our students need specific interventions in math.

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

While overall math achievement is our greatest area of improvement, FCA did show growth in Math Learning Gains and Math Lowest 25%. Our school is focused on providing small group instruction to students based on their identified greatest area of need. FCA also hired interventionists at the K-8 level to work directly with students in the MTSS process. Finally, we have added iReady to support students at the elementary level and have tightened MTSS instructional procedures.

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

The potential area of concern is the percentage of students passing an ELA and/or Math course when compared to the student proficiency percentage on state assessments.

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

Increase student achievement in mathematics (FAST PM 3 and EOCs)
Increase math achievement for students with disabilities
Increase student achievement in science for grades 5 and 8
Increase graduation rate

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.

FCA needs to meet students at their point of need in order to decrease frustration and increase student achievement and success

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

FCA will increase course pass rates and proficiency levels on state assessments when comparing results from 2022-23 to 2023-24.

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

The school leadership teams will review course pass rates monthly and discuss with individual teachers during their regular meetings. Benchmark data will also be analyzed following progress monitoring windows to guide MTSS and small group instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Esilda Ross (esilda.ross@charter.hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The evidence-based interventions include, but are not limited to, iReady, Read 180, Imagine Math, and Math XL.

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

These interventions are evidenced-based to best support 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 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.

The FCA Leadership Team will review course pass rates weekly to identify students that may need additional support with core courses.

Person Responsible: Esilda Ross (esilda.ross@charter.hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing during the school year

Teachers will provide small group LiveLessons focused on course standards to assist students with understanding and application of course material.

Person Responsible: Esilda Ross (esilda.ross@charter.hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing during the school year

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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

FCA needs to meet individual student needs to increase student achievement and success.

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

FCA will increase course pass rates and proficiency levels on state assessments when comparing results from 2022-23 to 2023-24. For this subgroup, FCA will increase the Federal Percent of Points Index to 32.

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

The school leadership teams will review course pass rates monthly and discuss with individual teachers during their regular meetings. Benchmark data will also be analyzed following progress monitoring windows to guide MTSS and small group instruction. Additionally, the special education team will ensure SPED compliance and ensure students' IEPs are being implemented with fidelity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Esilda Ross (esilda.ross@charter.hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The evidence-based interventions include iReady, Read 180, Imagine Math, Math XL, and small group special education direct instruction LiveLessons..

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

These interventions are evidence-based to best support 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 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.

The leadership team will review course pass rate data weekly and discuss with teachers for additional supports and interventions. The data will be broken into specific subgroups.

Person Responsible: Esilda Ross (esilda.ross@charter.hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing

The special education team will ensure SPED compliance and that students' IEPs are being implemented with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Esilda Ross (esilda.ross@charter.hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

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.

FCA needs to meet individual student needs to increase student achievement and success.

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

FCA will increase course pass rates and proficiency levels on state assessments when comparing results from 2022-23 to 2023-24. For this subgroup, FCA will increase the Federal Percent of Points Index to 41.

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

The school leadership teams will review course pass rates monthly and discuss with individual teachers during their regular meetings. Benchmark data will also be analyzed following progress monitoring windows to guide MTSS and small group instruction. EL students are provided with small group instruction focused on specific skills and standards using the SIOP Model.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Esilda Ross (esilda.ross@charter.hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The interventions include, but are not limited to, iReady, Read 180, Imagine Math, and Math XL, and small group instruction.

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

These interventions are evidence-based to best support 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 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.

The leadership team will review course pass rate data weekly and discuss with teachers for additional supports and interventions. The data will be broken into specific subgroups.

Person Responsible: Esilda Ross (esilda.ross@charter.hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing

PM1 data will be analyzed to guide MTSS procedures and small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Esilda Ross (esilda.ross@charter.hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing during state assessment windows.

EL students are provided small group instruction focused on specific skills and standards using the SIOP model.

Person Responsible: Esilda Ross (esilda.ross@charter.hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to American Indian

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.

FCA needs to meet individual student needs to increase student achievement and success.

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

FCA will increase course pass rates and proficiency levels on state assessments when comparing results from 2022-23 to 2023-24. For this subgroup, FCA will increase the Federal Percent of Points Index to 32.

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

The school leadership teams will review course pass rates monthly and discuss with individual teachers during their regular meetings. Benchmark data will also be analyzed following progress monitoring windows to guide MTSS and small group instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Esilda Ross (esilda.ross@charter.hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The interventions include, but are not limited to, iReady, Read 180, Imagine Math, and Math XL, and small group instruction.

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

These interventions are evidence-based to best support 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 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.

The leadership team will review course pass rate data weekly and discuss with teachers for additional supports and interventions. The data will be broken into specific subgroups.

Person Responsible: Esilda Ross (esilda.ross@charter.hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

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.

FCA needs to meet individual student needs to increase student achievement and success.

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

FCA will increase course pass rates and proficiency levels on state assessments when comparing results from 2022-23 to 2023-24. For this subgroup, FCA will increase the Federal Percent of Points Index to 41.

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

The school leadership teams will review course pass rates monthly and discuss with individual teachers during their regular meetings. Benchmark data will also be analyzed following progress monitoring windows to guide MTSS and small group instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Esilda Ross (esilda.ross@charter.hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The interventions include, but are not limited to, iReady, Read 180, Imagine Math, and Math XL, and small group instruction.

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

These interventions are evidence-based to best support 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 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.

The leadership team will review course pass rate data weekly and discuss with teachers for additional supports and interventions. The data will be broken into specific subgroups.

Person Responsible: Esilda Ross (esilda.ross@charter.hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Pacific Islander

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.

FCA needs to meet individual student needs to increase student achievement and success.

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

FCA will increase course pass rates and proficiency levels on state assessments when comparing results from 2022-23 to 2023-24. For this subgroup, FCA will increase the Federal Percent of Points Index to 41.

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

The school leadership teams will review course pass rates monthly and discuss with individual teachers during their regular meetings. Benchmark data will also be analyzed following progress monitoring windows to guide MTSS and small group instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Esilda Ross (esilda.ross@charter.hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The interventions include, but are not limited to, iReady, Read 180, Imagine Math, and Math XL, and small group instruction.

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

These interventions are evidence-based to best support 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 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.

The leadership team will review course pass rate data weekly and discuss with teachers for additional supports and interventions. The data will be broken into specific subgroups.

Person Responsible: Esilda Ross (esilda.ross@charter.hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing

#7. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged

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.

FCA needs to meet individual student needs to increase student achievement and success.

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

FCA will increase course pass rates and proficiency levels on state assessments when comparing results from 2022-23 to 2023-24. For this subgroup, FCA will increase the Federal Percent of Points Index to 41.

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

The school leadership teams will review course pass rates monthly and discuss with individual teachers during their regular meetings. Benchmark data will also be analyzed following progress monitoring windows to guide MTSS and small group instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Esilda Ross (esilda.ross@charter.hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The interventions include, but are not limited to, iReady, Read 180, Imagine Math, and Math XL, and small group instruction.

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

These interventions are evidence-based to best support 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 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.

The leadership team will review course pass rate data weekly and discuss with teachers for additional supports and interventions. The data will be broken into specific subgroups.

Person Responsible: Esilda Ross (esilda.ross@charter.hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing

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).

Florida Connections Academy, as a virtual charter school, does not receive school improvement funding allocations.