

Orange County Public Schools

Renaissance Charter School At Goldenrod School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	24
VI. Title I Requirements	26
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	27

Renaissance Charter School At Goldenrod

6004 S GOLDENROD RD, Orlando, FL 32822

www.charterschoolsusa.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.

Renaissance Charter School at Goldenrod will provide rigorous learning experiences that inspire students to reach their full academic potential, foster higher levels of self-worth, spark commitment to bettering our world in a safe and nurturing environment that cultivates our future leaders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To become the premier school of choice in Central Florida.

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
Tirado, Miriam	Principal	The principal leads the day-to-day operations of the building. We strive to build an inclusive team through open lines of communication. We monitor academics by conducting walkthroughs and providing teachers with intentional and purposeful support. Administration provided support with lesson planning and analyzing data to support instruction in the classroom.

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.

Stakholder input is obtained through meeting with the student, staff and family lighthouse teams and disgusting the schoolwide data, goals and initiatives. The discussion drives the decision-making process around how to best support the school and drive instruction in the classrooms.

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))

As students take assessments the school will analyze data and revisit the school improvement plan to ensure we are on track to meet the goals we have set. We will be able to adjust accordingly if we are not on track and provide support in areas of need. The school improvement plan will be revisited after each benchmark assessment (Fall, Winter and Spring)

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	94%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	79%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
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: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: 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	1	4	2	1	2	3	0	2	2	17
One or more suspensions	0	14	6	8	12	3	19	26	43	131
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	17	30	7	2	11	20	87
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	11	10	6	2	20	19	68
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	58	46	55	66	54	286
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	70	53	69	55	27	274
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	1	7	30	3	1	1	0	44

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	7	30	3	1	1	0	42

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	7	0	0	1	0	5	13
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	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	7	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	37	56	53	35	57	55	38		
ELA Learning Gains				47			42		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50			46		
Math Achievement*	40	59	55	34	41	42	33		
Math Learning Gains				48			34		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54			48		
Science Achievement*	35	56	52	34	57	54	29		
Social Studies Achievement*	56	68	68	64	63	59	36		
Middle School Acceleration	73	74	70	59	52	51	60		
Graduation Rate		82	74		52	50			
College and Career Acceleration		46	53		71	70			
ELP Progress	51	55	55	48	73	70	46		

* 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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	334
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	473
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
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	20	Yes	4	3
ELL	33	Yes	4	
AMI				
ASN	60			
BLK	34	Yes	2	
HSP	48			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	50			
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	28	Yes	3	2
ELL	40	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN	70			
BLK	35	Yes	1	
HSP	46			

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	46			
FRL	45			

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	37			40			35	56	73			51
SWD	8			15			0				5	58
ELL	25			30			17	38			6	51
AMI												
ASN	60			60							2	
BLK	36			33			33				4	
HSP	35			39			35	57	79		7	49
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	48			52							2	
FRL	35			37			35	56	65		7	49

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	35	47	50	34	48	54	34	64	59			48
SWD	9	37	50	14	46	35	3					33
ELL	24	45	50	30	48	57	21	39	39			48
AMI												
ASN	70			70								

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	36	37	30	34	42	38	25					
HSP	34	48	51	34	48	53	31	59	57			48
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	43	46		33	36		70					
FRL	33	44	45	31	47	54	34	62	53			49

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	38	42	46	33	34	48	29	36	60			46
SWD	7	18	22	8	35	55	6	19				36
ELL	26	41	51	29	35	48	15	34				46
AMI												
ASN	70			70								
BLK	34	41		22	27	40	0					
HSP	37	41	46	33	34	48	30	35	55			46
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	47	42		33	28		33					
FRL	34	36	42	30	35	52	29	33	55			40

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	27%	54%	-27%	54%	-27%
07	2023 - Spring	31%	45%	-14%	47%	-16%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	36%	46%	-10%	47%	-11%
04	2023 - Spring	32%	60%	-28%	58%	-26%
06	2023 - Spring	35%	44%	-9%	47%	-12%
03	2023 - Spring	36%	52%	-16%	50%	-14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	38%	53%	-15%	54%	-16%
07	2023 - Spring	59%	38%	21%	48%	11%
03	2023 - Spring	33%	59%	-26%	59%	-26%
04	2023 - Spring	36%	62%	-26%	61%	-25%
08	2023 - Spring	49%	58%	-9%	55%	-6%
05	2023 - Spring	16%	55%	-39%	55%	-39%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	28%	50%	-22%	44%	-16%
05	2023 - Spring	26%	59%	-33%	51%	-25%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	80%	47%	33%	50%	30%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	69%	45%	24%	48%	21%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	84%	63%	21%	63%	21%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	47%	61%	-14%	66%	-19%

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.

Students with disabilities is our lowest performing area.
 Contributing factors included:
 Learning loss due to the pandemic
 Achievement gaps
 General education teacher and ESE teacher collaboration
 Teacher inexperience.

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

All data points are on an upward trend. We did not make significant gains but we did make small gains.

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.

Students with disabilities had the greatest gap in comparison to the state. Having an inexperienced team and turn over in the ESE department contributed to gaps. In addition, turn over in the department contributed to the team having to continually start over.

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

Students with disabilities and Black subgroups both had an increase of 5 points. The school conducted professional development for teachers about equity and how to support students that fall into each subgroup. The school also worked to increase collaboration between the general education teacher and ESE teachers.

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

Two potential areas of concern are the number of suspensions we have particularly in middle school. We have to work to lower that number because it potentially correlates with our proficiency numbers which are low in grades 5-8. Our second area of concern is the number of level 1 students we have in both ELA and Math.

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

- 1) Increasing proficiency for students with disabilities in ELA and Math
- 2) Lowering the number of student suspensions
- 3) Increasing proficiency for ELL students.

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.

We are working to create a positive culture and environment for both our staff and students. In an effort to support teacher retention we will provide an environment where open dialogue is encouraged, staff voice matters and we facilitate staff led action teams. Teachers and staff will receive professional learning that they feel best suits their areas of growth and we will provide new teachers to the school with a peer mentor so that they have a person campus that can help encourage them and support them through the school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will measure this by tracking the teacher pipeline from recruitment to hire to amount of time staying at the school. We will be able to track overall percentage of teachers staying at the school.

Monitoring:

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

This area will be monitored by monthly check ins with each team but administration offering teachers face time so that they feel as though their voice is being heard and working alongside them to reach their goals. We will revisit our retention number at the end of each quarter to ensure that we are on track.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Miriam Tirado (miriam.tirado@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.)

We are screening teachers to identify certified teachers in all areas to best support our students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Without strong teachers in the classrooms our students will struggle. We want to provide our students with the best possible education.

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.

Work with talent acquisition team to support recruiting certified teachers.

Person Responsible: Miriam Tirado (miriam.tirado@ocps.net)

By When: This is ongoing throughout the year.

Professional learning offered to teachers weekly both in person and virtually.

Person Responsible: Miriam Tirado (miriam.tirado@ocps.net)

By When: On going. PLC's are held during planning on Monday and Tuesday every week and Professional development is conducted every Wednesday afternoon. All sessions are mandatory.

#2. 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.

Renaissance Charter School at Goldenrod will focus on improving the ELA and Math proficiency of our black students by providing them with small group and differentiated opportunities within their subject area period. We will also provide remediation during their MTSS block to spiral skills and benchmarks not mastered. Students may receive MTSS interventions as well.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Renaissance Charter School at Goldenrod will increase proficiency by 5 points of the course of the school year.

Monitoring:

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

Renaissance Charter School at Goldenrod will track student unit assessments and benchmark data to monitor benchmark mastery which will reflect more students achieving proficiency. MTSS data will be tracked to ensure students are making growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Miriam Tirado (miriam.tirado@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.)

Students will receive MTSS tier 2 and/or 3 using Saavas intervention curriculum or SIPPS for tier 3.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By providing MTSS interventions students will receive interventions at their level which will help bridge gaps they may have. Data will be reviewed every 6-8 weeks to monitor if the interventions are successful.

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.

MTSS coordinator/ administrator was assigned to revamp the MTSS process at the school level to ensure appropriate students are receiving the interventions necessary for them to be successful in both ELA and Math.

Person Responsible: Miriam Tirado (miriam.tirado@ocps.net)

By When: This was completed 8/10/23. MTSS coordinator in place.

SIPPs materials purchased and professional learning provided to the team to allow for research-based resource to be used with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Miriam Tirado (miriam.tirado@ocps.net)

By When: SIPPs purchased 9/2023 and Professional learning conducted 10/2023.

Child study meetings held on a monthly basis with appropriate team members and parents.

Person Responsible: Miriam Tirado (miriam.tirado@ocps.net)

By When: This is ongoing throughout the year.

MTSS data chats conducted with leadership team.

Person Responsible: Miriam Tirado (miriam.tirado@ocps.net)

By When: Data is presented to the leadership team bi-weekly to ensure students are growing and not we revisit the interventions in place for the child.

#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.

Renaissance Charter School at Goldenrod will focus on improving the ELA and Math proficiency of ELL students by providing them with small groups and differentiated opportunities within their subject area period. We will also utilize instructional software to support their language acquisition.

Measurable Outcome:

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

100% of ELL students at Renaissance Charter School at Goldenrod will reach proficiency as monitored by their ACCESS assessment and progress monitoring data.

Monitoring:

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

Students are administered progress monitoring assessments three times a year. Instructional software data, specifically Lexia English can be tracked weekly to monitor student progress. The ELL team and general education teachers will have monthly data chats to review student progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Miriam Tirado (miriam.tirado@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.)

Renaissance Charter School at Goldenrod will focus on explicit teaching, routines, repetition, modeling and practice, and frequent opportunities to respond for their students who are ELL.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The focus will be on language acquisition and closing foundational gaps for ELL 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.

Purchase Lexia English and Headphones with a mic

Person Responsible: Miriam Tirado (miriam.tirado@ocps.net)

By When: Purchased 8/2023

Provide professional learning around how to full implement Lexia english.

Person Responsible: Miriam Tirado (miriam.tirado@ocps.net)

By When: 10/2023

Professional Learning on cognates and I can statements from WIDA

Person Responsible: Miriam Tirado (miriam.tirado@ocps.net)

By When: PD conducted 9/2023 by ESOL coordinator as well as ESOL CSUSA support.

Walkthroughs and feedback specifically looking for ELL strategies and implementation.

Person Responsible: Miriam Tirado (miriam.tirado@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year.

#4. 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.

Renaissance Charter School at Goldenrod will focus on improving the ELA and Math proficiency of students with disabilities by providing them with small groups and differentiated opportunities within their subject area period. Providing students with experience ESE personnel who partner with general education teachers to ensure collaboration which will drive student success.

Measurable Outcome:

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

100% of students with disabilities at Renaissance Charter School at Goldenrod will show growth on state assessments as evidenced by their progress on FAST assessments and compared from PM 1 to PM 3.

Monitoring:

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

Student data will be monitored after each progress monitoring assessment. Administration will hold data chats with all teachers to ensure teacher instruction aligns with supporting the gaps of students with disabilities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Miriam Tirado (miriam.tirado@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.)

Students with disabilities to demonstrate the need for academic intervention will continue to receive MTSS Tier 2 & 3 support. Teachers will use SIPPS (Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words) as their curriculum resource to support students in the MTSS process.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students with disabilities are performing at 28% proficient so we want to focus on closing the foundational gaps that they have and this resource focuses on foundational skills.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 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.

Provide teachers with professional learning around what ESE accommodations look like in the general education setting and the gen ed teachers role in the support of ESE students.

Person Responsible: Miriam Tirado (miriam.tirado@ocps.net)

By When: 8/2023, 10/2023, 1/2024 and 3/2024

Provide ESE team with specific curriculum resources to support the team with ensuring they are meeting the students goals through research based resources.

Person Responsible: Miriam Tirado (miriam.tirado@ocps.net)

By When: 8/2023

Targeted walkthroughs to provide ESE teachers with specific feedback.

Person Responsible: Miriam Tirado (miriam.tirado@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year.

Data chats with a focus on only ESE students to identify gaps in learning so that additional support can be provided.

Person Responsible: Miriam Tirado (miriam.tirado@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year with a focus on PM data as well as unit assessment to track benchmark mastery.

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).

School improvement funds would be reviewed by stakeholders and distributed by highest need area first and then broken down from there. Currently, students with disabilities is our lowest area so the funds would be allocated to hire highly qualified personal and purchase curriculum resources that support closing the achievement gap.

The funds would then be broken down to support Black students and then ELL students for personnel, resources and tutoring. Providing students with additional instructional minutes in a small group can help them increase their level of understanding as well as increase proficiency. Providing programming that supports students with acquiring the language would be a priority for ELL students.

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

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

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

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

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.

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?

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?

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

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school’s webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

N/A

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school’s mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child’s progress.

List the school’s webpage* where the school’s Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

N/A

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

N/A

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

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: Black/African-American	\$0.00

3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$0.00
4	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.

Yes