

Orange County Public Schools

Central Florida Leadership Academy Charter School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	20

Central Florida Leadership Academy Charter

427 N PRIMROSE DR, Orlando, FL 32803

www.cflacademy.org

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.

To provide college preparatory academics in combination with after school activities and family-based character education in an environment that changes attitudes and develops leaders, enabling each student to achieve his or her best.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be the school with the highest growth in Florida in academics, competency and character.

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
Corlew, Joshua	Principal	Supervision of School: Academics, Safety, Extracurriculars, Family Partnerships Recruitment & Enrollment FTE Supervise Athletics & Performing Arts, After School Program & Extracurriculars Facilities & Technology Budget Safety & Emergency Management School Security Family & Community Communication Fidelity to Hyde Model & Principles (DISCO, etc.) Instructional growth and achievement Discipline (HS) Discipline Reporting (SESIR) Professional Development Professional Evaluations School Calendar State, District & Charter Compliance Marketing & Social Media Management Website management

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.

All instructional stakeholders in the school - administration, instructional support staff and faculty - have met to discuss an improvement plan for the coming year. The full plan was drafted in December 2022, shared with our school's Board in January 2023 and presented to faculty for feedback and revision in March 2023.

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))

Each quarter we complete a faculty-wide data monitoring review. If, at any point in those checkpoints, we believe additional or adjusted supports are needed, we will modify the plan.

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 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	84%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	45%
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)	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: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
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	1	2	2	5	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	7	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	7	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	7	
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	4	3	7

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	0	
One or more suspensions	0	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	0	
Course failure in Math	0	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	0	
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	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	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*	43	49	50	33	49	51	46		
ELA Learning Gains				40			46		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile							50		
Math Achievement*	48	34	38	29	36	38	31		
Math Learning Gains				34			34		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile							54		
Science Achievement*	45	66	64	37	31	40	25		
Social Studies Achievement*	61	66	66	82	43	48	50		
Middle School Acceleration				10	44	44	64		
Graduation Rate	92	87	89	93	62	61	85		
College and Career Acceleration	18	65	65	38	70	67	18		
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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	307
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	92

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	396
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	93

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	54			
HSP	36	Yes	2	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				

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	45			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	26	Yes	1	1
HSP	33	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	42			

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	43			48			45	61		92	18	
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	48			58				57			3	
HSP	29			29			50				3	
MUL												

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												
WHT												
FRL	38			38			36	67			4	

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	33	40		29	34		37	82	10	93	38	
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	23	7		23	7		15	80				
HSP	30	47		17	36							
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	70			60								
FRL	28	33		17	27		29	69		90		

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	46	46	50	31	34	54	25	50	64	85	18	
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25	33		29	48			30				
HSP	50	60		26	26			50				
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	91	50										
FRL	35	37	50	27	31	50		41				

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	69%	49%	20%	50%	19%
07	2023 - Spring	26%	45%	-19%	47%	-21%
08	2023 - Spring	27%	46%	-19%	47%	-20%
09	2023 - Spring	*	46%	*	48%	*
06	2023 - Spring	73%	44%	29%	47%	26%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	64%	53%	11%	54%	10%
07	2023 - Spring	44%	38%	6%	48%	-4%
08	2023 - Spring	31%	58%	-27%	55%	-24%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	20%	50%	-30%	44%	-24%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	47%	47%	0%	50%	-3%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	36%	45%	-9%	48%	-12%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	77%	63%	14%	63%	14%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	53%	61%	-8%	66%	-13%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	67%	62%	5%	63%	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.

7th and 78th grade results were drastically lower than all other grades. This includes ELA, Math and Science.

Several contributing factors included patterns of poor attendance in this grade levels as well as difficulty sustaining a level of rigor in the classroom equivalent to State Standards expectations.

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

Social Studies overall fell the most from the prior year. This is partly because we had a 100% pass rate in High School U.S. History in the prior, which was going to be hard to maintain, and that we did not have a stable teacher in Middle School Social Studies (including in Civics) for the entirety of the school year. Our High School Social Studies achievement was far above State average, despite the drop, but our Civics percentages fell from 60% to 53%, a trend that must be reversed in this coming year.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

8th Grade Math/Pre-Algebra had the greatest disparity between achievement and State average (a 25% spread).

This continues an overall trend since the pandemic. The greatest contributing factor we've identified is a

lack of a truly robust, responsive system of interventions to support students with their critical needs throughout the year. Addressing this concern is our top priority entering the new year.

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

High School English, particularly Grade 10, showed drastic improvement, going from 30% achievement to 69%.

Some of the actions we took to bring about this improvement included:

- Increasing the rigor of the texts we used in our classes
- Coordinating with electives (such as Theatre) to improve the overall rigor and collaboration on reading texts; also creating more opportunities to cognitively engage with grade-level text analysis
- Improved systems of identifying student academic needs in this area and differentiating instruction to support them

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

Attendance issues were severe last year, as the EWS data attests. We are most concerned about this pattern continuing if not immediately, and effectively addressed. These issues affected behavior and academic performance in very notable ways.

We have implemented a stricter, more robust system to handle absences and encouraged attendance this year.

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

1. Implement a robust, dynamic, school-wide system of student intervention & support
2. Intensive instructional coaching & modeling in Middle School to improve 7th and 8th grade outcomes
3. Addressing pervasive attendance issues with a system of notification, support and accountability
4. Creating a more collaborative, teacher-led instructional culture

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.

Improving Attendance Rates

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will improve chronic absenteeism by reducing it from 30% to 10%. Specific subgroups will not have a chronic absenteeism rate higher than their percentage of the school.

Monitoring:

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

- Bi-weekly enrollment & attendance meetings to review rates
- Caution email sent after 2nd unexcused absence in a quarter
- Mandatory family meeting triggered by every third unexcused absence in a quarter

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joshua Corlew (joshua.corlew@ocps.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.)

- Attendance Incentives (including eligibility for special events and Badges of Excellence)
- Ladder of family interventions, including family contact after 2nd UE absence in a quarter, and Family Meeting after the 3rd

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We are improving accountability for families and students and exercising stronger oversight and responsiveness to a potential absence issue quickly before it escalates too far.

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.

Establish new system for tracking attendance EWS, including clear checkpoints with families when absences are above 3 per quarter

Person Responsible: Joshua Corlew (joshua.corlew@ocps.net)

By When: Quarter 1 (10/12/23)

Provide before school care to encourage early-drop off of students for families with work conflicts.

Person Responsible: Joshua Corlew (joshua.corlew@ocps.net)

By When: 8/10/23

Develop family-specific improvement plans at the beginning of each quarter if the family demonstrated a pattern of absences in the prior quarter

Person Responsible: Joshua Corlew (joshua.corlew@ocps.net)

By When: Each quarter

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention**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.

School-Wide Intervention Structure Embedded in School Schedule

Measurable Outcome:

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

Learning Gains will be at 70% for each tested subject.

Monitoring:

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

- FAST PM Tests
- In-class formative assessments
- Teacher 1-on-1 Meetings
- Quarterly Data Meetings

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.)

Our intervention time provides students with opportunities for specific intervention in the areas where they have the greatest need and strong enrichment for students who do not need extra support. Within the intervention blocks, teachers are provided resources and training to deliver evidence-based interventions with proper curriculum, such as ExactPath.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Rather than trying to "fit" interventions into a busy day, we prioritize it on a daily basis for the whole school, ensuring it is delivered and can be easily tracked for effectiveness.

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.

Schedule all students into intervention/enrichment groups based on PM1 or prior year assessment data

Person Responsible: Joshua Corlew (joshua.corlew@ocps.net)

By When: 8/31/23

Deliver diagnostic & review diagnostic data at beginning of each quarter to determine student progress within Intervention Groups

Person Responsible: Joshua Corlew (joshua.corlew@ocps.net)

By When: 5/31/23

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System				\$15,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
		Paraprofessional	0149 - Central Florida Leadership Academy Charter	Other Federal		\$15,000.00
			<i>Notes: An additional paraprofessional to support student academic needs and assist with attendance interventions.</i>			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Intervention				\$3,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	Intervention Systems	Intervention Software	0149 - Central Florida Leadership Academy Charter	Other Federal		\$3,500.00
			<i>Notes: Purchasing ELA & Math intervention software programs to help facilitate interventions.</i>			
Total:						\$18,500.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes