Cornerstone Academy Charter School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Cornerstone Academy Charter

906 WALTHAM AVENUE, Belle Isle, FL 32809

www.cornerstonecharter.com

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission: To provide a college preparatory educational environment with a curricular emphasis on biotechnology and life sciences. That furthers the philosophy of respect and high expectations for all, enabling students to become confident, self-directed, and responsible life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To provide a top shelf innovative, public education opportunity of choice in a safe, sound environment. Which:
* Has as its foundation a solid, core academic curriculum
* Offers curricular emphasis on life sciences and biotechnology
* Attracts families to live in our community
* Employs talented and passionate teachers and administrators
* Utilizes technology tools conducive to advanced learning
* Substantially involves parents, community and corporate partners
* Provides a full spectrum of extracurricular activities
* Instills a sense of community service and pride
* Prepares our students for college and a fulfilling and meaningful career

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
Pancoast, Renee	Principal	
Downey, Paula	Assistant Principal	
Casey, Michelle	Assistant Principal	
Heffelfinger, Carmen	Instructional Coach	
Reynolds, Alyson	Instructional Coach	
Hickey, Tawny	Instructional Coach	

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.

We have multiple stakeholders: Teachers, parents and students. Teachers attend regular data chats with the leadership team throughout the year to make data driven goals and decisions. Teachers utilize student data chats in their classrooms in order to make more specific goals. In addition, the leadership

team presents school wide data to the school board, the SAC and student government. The leadership team takes the feedback from each of these entities to drive the school based decisions.

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))

Every year we utilize all the provided data to determine which goals were met as well as create goals for the new school year. The data is shared with all stakeholders and the MTSS team, ESE team and ESOL team. This is to ensure those with the largest gap have specific plans in place that include direct interventions and monitoring systems established.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	49%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	36%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	6	14	9	11	10	3	7	8	19	87
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	3	0	2	4	7	13	30
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	2	7	14	11	14	16	64
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	12	16	8	13	55
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	4	12	11	7	0	0	0	0	35

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	2	3	4	8	9	9	6	12	53

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	3	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	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	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*	71	56	53	67	57	55	69		
ELA Learning Gains				57			60		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38			49		
Math Achievement*	74	59	55	71	41	42	66		
Math Learning Gains				69			51		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				60			38		
Science Achievement*	70	56	52	70	57	54	64		
Social Studies Achievement*	70	68	68	81	63	59	70		
Middle School Acceleration	62	74	70	83	52	51	71		
Graduation Rate		82	74		52	50			
College and Career Acceleration		46	53		71	70			
ELP Progress	59	55	55	76	73	70	68		

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	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	480
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	67

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	672
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	37	Yes	4	
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN	84			
BLK	64			
HSP	61			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	57			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	38	Yes	3	
ELL	58			
AMI				
ASN	89			
BLK	41			
HSP	61			

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	63			
PAC				
WHT	72			
FRL	59			

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	71			74			70	70	62			59
SWD	33			42			26	33			5	
ELL	55			64			57	46	9		6	59
AMI												
ASN	85			83			88		80		4	
BLK	62			66			59	67			4	
HSP	62			65			63	49	48		7	56
MUL	52			68			67				3	
PAC												
WHT	77			80			75	82	63		6	
FRL	65			66			58	49	41		7	47

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	67	57	38	71	69	60	70	81	83			76
SWD	25	38	27	29	57	63	23	40				
ELL	46	46	41	57	68	56	52	79				76
AMI												
ASN	89	75		93	95		80	92	100			

						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	55	46	12	55	50	25	43					
HSP	55	54	40	57	67	58	63	71	73			76
MUL	50	47		72	82							
PAC												
WHT	75	59	48	78	69	67	79	87	86			
FRL	54	50	27	58	63	57	62	69	79			67

						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	69	60	49	66	51	38	64	70	71			68
SWD	25	39	34	25	42	39	26					60
ELL	53	50	47	49	43	46	27	46				68
AMI												
ASN	82	77		84	55		67					
BLK	61	58	38	55	38	24	50	67				
HSP	57	50	46	53	52	46	45	60	50			72
MUL	74	57		79	50							
PAC												
WHT	76	65	57	72	51	35	77	75	75			
FRL	57	48	35	51	47	37	48	60	58			75

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	71%	54%	17%	54%	17%
07	2023 - Spring	63%	45%	18%	47%	16%

ELA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	67%	46%	21%	47%	20%
04	2023 - Spring	76%	60%	16%	58%	18%
06	2023 - Spring	71%	44%	27%	47%	24%
03	2023 - Spring	71%	52%	19%	50%	21%

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	60%	53%	7%	54%	6%
07	2023 - Spring	59%	38%	21%	48%	11%
03	2023 - Spring	75%	59%	16%	59%	16%
04	2023 - Spring	78%	62%	16%	61%	17%
08	2023 - Spring	85%	58%	27%	55%	30%
05	2023 - Spring	73%	55%	18%	55%	18%

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	52%	50%	2%	44%	8%
05	2023 - Spring	78%	59%	19%	51%	27%

ALGEBRA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	94%	47%	47%	50%	44%

GEOMETRY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	45%	55%	48%	52%

BIOLOGY

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

| CIVICS | | | | | | |
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	70%	61%	9%	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.

Science is our lowest performance. We had a new 8th grade science teacher. She needs to go back and scaffold information from the prior year.

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

Social Studies showed the greatest decline form the prior year. There were several factors that contributed including using a different resource for progress monitoring. In addition, the group of students had lower reading scores entering the 7th grade than the prior year which would also directly influence their social studies score.

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.

8th grade science had the biggest gap in comparison with the state average. In the past, we have stayed above the state average so this is not a continuing trend, it is new to this year. The teacher was new to the subject this year and needs more support in covering all three year's worth of science standards. Additional progress monitoring would also assist the teacher.

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

Middle school math had the most improvement last year. We adopted a new progress monitoring plan for the middle school math team. Data chats were consistent and teachers utilized the data from PM to drive their instruction. In addition, intensive math classes were added in grades 7 and 8 to support the lowest learners. Many of those students were able to achieve a passing score for the first time in math. 6th grade math did not have intensive classes so there was additional instructional support added to those classrooms to assist the struggling 6th grade students and their teacher.

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

The number of level 1 readers, particularly in middle school, is the largest area of concern. These struggling readers are also performing low on social studies and science assessment. Closing the gap in reading will also improve their social studies and science scores.
In addition, the 7th grade Civics teacher will need additional support utilizing the PM data throughout the school year to differentiate instruction.

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

1. Moving the level one readers
2. Improving social studies scores
3. Improving 8th grade Science scores
4. Focus on our ESE population and their growth
5. Focus on our ESOL population and their growth

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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

Particularly in middle school, there was a higher rate of teacher turnover than in years past. When teachers are successful and their students are also successful then the teachers will respond to the positive trend and more likely to want to continue in education. The leadership team needs to find ways to give more support to teachers through the form of mentors and helping to break some of the barriers in the classroom that hinder a teachers ability to thoroughly teach.

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

At the end of the year, no more than 2 K-8 teachers will leave the school.

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

Anonymous staff feedback
Mentor & mentee feedback
Monthly new teacher trainings and meetings
Individual data chats that include discussion points regarding school culture

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carmen Heffelfinger (cheffelfinger@cornerstonecharter.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.)

Intervention is a mentor/mentee established relationship and specific tasks.

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

Mentors can document their meetings and they will have a specific area of focus each month that they can develop a plan of action/improvement. This should allow for additional support in the areas outside of the classroom that new teachers tend to struggle with balancing.

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.

Mentors will take the Clinical Educator course
Mentors will be matched with mentees by administrators
Mentors will meet during pre-planning
Mentors and mentees will create a goal and focus area
Mentors and mentees will meet monthly to discuss progress
Mentors will meet with mentee at the end of the year to debrief

Person Responsible: Paula Downey (pdowney@cornerstonecharter.com)

By When: May 2024

#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.

38% of K8 ESE students showed adequate progress on state assessments. The school needs to be at a minimum of 41% of ESE students showing adequate progress.

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

By the end of 2024, a minimum of 41% of ESE students will demonstrate adequate growth.

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

FAST PM1 and FAST PM2 data will be used to specifically monitor the growth of our ESE students

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Megan Kirby (mkirby@cornerstonecharter.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.)

K5 implementing a collaborative teaching and planning model
6-8 has added an additional ESE teacher that will include support facilitation

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

Lower school students will be able to spend more time in the general education classroom and have a more inclusive environment. 6-8 students will also be provided more support in the general education classroom.

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.

K-5 teachers will take the collaborative teaching and learning course through FDLRS.
Students will be matched with a teacher and class using academic, social, behavioral data
A collaborative teaching model will be used to instruct students
Teams will meet monthly to plan and evaluate progress

Person Responsible: Paula Downey (pdowney@cornerstonecharter.com)

By When: My 2024

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).

The end of last year data was evaluated to find the areas of need. As a result additional support was provided in the form of a literacy coach and math coach. This allowed the MTSS teacher and instructional coach more time to focus on specific teacher and student needs. The lower school restructured their MTSS and ESE format to provide more support in the general education classroom.

The budget will be reviewed again in the spring, alongside new data, to determine if the restructuring allowed us to improve our teacher retention rates and close more educational gaps.

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

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.

N/A

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

N/A

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?

N/A

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

N/A

Title I Requirements

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))

N/A

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).

N/A

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))

N/A

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: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$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.

No