Cornerstone Charter Academy High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Cornerstone Charter Academy High

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	
Casey, Michelle	Assistant Principal	
Heffelfinger, Carmen	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)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	60%
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) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 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	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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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*	55	49	50	61	49	51	63		
ELA Learning Gains				58			56		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			41		
Math Achievement*	51	34	38	52	36	38	53		
Math Learning Gains				46			32		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44			31		
Science Achievement*	67	66	64	79	31	40	73		
Social Studies Achievement*	72	66	66	75	43	48	76		
Middle School Acceleration					44	44			
Graduation Rate	93	87	89	99	62	61	99		
College and Career Acceleration	68	65	65	52	70	67	55		
ELP Progress		45	45						

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	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	406
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	93

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61

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	608
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	99

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	40	Yes	3	
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN	78			
BLK	54			
HSP	63			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	73			
FRL	60			

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	39	Yes	2	
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN	78			
BLK	55			
HSP	55			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	55			

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	55			51			67	72		93	68	
SWD	19			0						46	4	
ELL	23			31			58	73			5	
AMI												
ASN	78										1	
BLK	57			44				60			3	
HSP	46			44			67	68		61	6	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	61			61			64	76		76	6	
FRL	46			45			63	59		58	6	

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	61	58	42	52	46	44	79	75		99	52	
SWD	20	47	50	0						100	17	
ELL	40	55	40	27	39		67			100	29	
AMI												
ASN	83	73										

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	45	50		25	21		83	64		100	55	
HSP	53	54	44	41	38	42	73	63		100	39	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	68	61	37	67	60	69	86	88		100	61	
FRL	51	50	50	48	40	39	69	64		100	43	

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	63	56	41	53	32	31	73	76		99	55	
SWD	21	50	40	24				38				
ELL	57	45		46	31			43		93	54	
AMI												
ASN	100	60										
BLK	54	63	40	38	29		55			100	45	
HSP	57	50	38	45	42	31	63	73		98	47	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	64	58	48	60	23	30	87	79		100	64	
FRL	46	51	42	45	30	24	58	65		97	46	

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	54%	49%	5%	50%	4%
09	2023 - Spring	61%	46%	15%	48%	13%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	30%	47%	-17%	50%	-20%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	66%	45%	21%	48%	18%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	66%	63%	3%	63%	3%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	71%	62%	9%	63%	8%

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.

Math proficiency was the area with the lowest performance. The Algebra 1 scores were lower than normal in all sections, regardless of the instructor. There needs to be better and more frequent progress monitoring systems set-up in the Algebra class. In addition, the MTSS process should be used more effectively to ensure that students are receiving the interventions needed to be successful.

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

Science had the largest decline with a 13 point decrease from the prior year. The same teacher taught the class, however, the students had a much wider range of knowledge and background. There are some gaps in the 8th grade science classes that need to be addressed in order to help improve the Biology scores.

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.

Our largest gap is Math proficiency. As seen above, there was a lack of proficiency with all Algebra students. There needs to be a better MTSS process to identify the needs of these students. In addition, the Geometry scores had a strong pass rate but there were very few students scoring 4s and 5s. With so many students in the middle there were lots on the bubble that can be pushed up a level with better progress monitoring.

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

There were not any areas of significant improvement. However, social studies had the most consistent progress.

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

Math proficiency is the largest area of concern. This will be addressed as explained in question 3.

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

1. Math proficiency - Algebra 1
2. Focus on our ESE population and their growth
3. Focus on our ESOL population and their growth
4. Improving Biology EOC scores

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.

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 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.

Monthly faculty meetings for upper school will be implemented by the entire leadership team. Meetings will include school wide data on both academics and behavior. A system for teacher feedback will be implemented and showcased at each meeting in order to increase support of all teachers.

Person Responsible: Michelle Casey (mcasey@cornerstonecharter.com)

By When: Once per month throughout 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.

39% of 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:

[no one identified]

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

An additional ESE teacher has been hired to increase the amount of students that receive support facilitation and not just attend learning strategies.

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

This will allow students more time and support in their general education classes.

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.

Progress monitoring of ESE students specifically in both reading and math. Classroom teachers, ESE teachers and MTSS coaches will collect data to report to the assistant principal

Person Responsible: Michelle Casey (mcasey@cornerstonecharter.com)

By When: This will be done three times per year.

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.