
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	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	21

Renaissance Charter At Crown Point

83 WEST RD, Ocoee, FL 34761

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.

To provide world-class education with an unwavering dedication to student success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To "Nurture and develop strong, powerful minds and good hearts for the 21st century".

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
Taylor, Brett	Principal	To oversee the running of the K-8 school and to ensure that we are meeting the mission of CSUSA and the school's overall vision.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The Principal and leadership team will work together to review the data and determine the SIP initiatives for the 2023-24 school year. The leadership team will present our mission/vision and SIP initiatives with the faculty/staff during NTI and RTO.

The PTO will ensure that this information is provided to all families and other stakeholders throughout the course of the year.

At the end of the year, the impact of these initiatives will be gauged through the use of surveys (teachers, parents, and students).

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be regularly monitored by the leadership team, including CRT's to ensure effective implementation and to determine the impact on student learning. Each assessment period (FAST), the leadership team will review the FAST data to determine if the initiatives need to be further refined to ensure student learning gains.

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	87%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	65%
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) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 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	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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide 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

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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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*	45	56	53	47	57	55	44		
ELA Learning Gains				47			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47			38		
Math Achievement*	46	59	55	42	41	42	35		
Math Learning Gains				54			37		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58			45		
Science Achievement*	46	56	52	39	57	54	26		
Social Studies Achievement*	64	68	68	53	63	59	48		
Middle School Acceleration	82	74	70	75	52	51	55		
Graduation Rate		82	74		52	50			
College and Career Acceleration		46	53		71	70			
ELP Progress	50	55	55	59	73	70	50		

* 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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	385
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52

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	521
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
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	24	Yes	4	4
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN	63			
BLK	55			
HSP	51			
MUL	53			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	50			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	27	Yes	3	3
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN	57			
BLK	48			
HSP	54			

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	50			
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	49			

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	45			46			46	64	82			50
SWD	16			25			26				4	
ELL	41			41			39	60			6	49
AMI												
ASN	50			69			71				3	
BLK	45			42			35	60	88		6	
HSP	40			45			45	59	71		7	52
MUL	39			55			64				3	
PAC												
WHT	57			56			64	75			5	
FRL	37			41			40	58	80		7	52

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	47	47	47	42	54	58	39	53	75			59
SWD	6	31	37	10	42	59	0	33				
ELL	39	42	46	36	48	38	27	39				59
AMI												
ASN	59	36		69	61		60					

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	44	48	50	33	50	61	29	50	67			50
HSP	46	45	50	45	56	54	41	51	81			68
MUL	45	38		55	63							
PAC												
WHT	57	56	29	51	61	53	55	56	67			
FRL	39	44	47	34	51	57	30	45	77			69

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	44	45	38	35	37	45	26	48	55			50
SWD	12	30	31	14	35	39	16	20				
ELL	36	43	37	36	43	47	19	20				50
AMI												
ASN	42	47		55	35							
BLK	38	43	38	26	34	43	18	42	41			70
HSP	48	49	38	38	36	41	28	34	79			45
MUL	59	56		59	61		55					
PAC												
WHT	49	41	40	45	42	64	44	80	57			
FRL	36	40	37	28	38	46	23	41	50			51

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	50%	54%	-4%	54%	-4%
07	2023 - Spring	41%	45%	-4%	47%	-6%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	31%	46%	-15%	47%	-16%
04	2023 - Spring	47%	60%	-13%	58%	-11%
06	2023 - Spring	45%	44%	1%	47%	-2%
03	2023 - Spring	49%	52%	-3%	50%	-1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	36%	53%	-17%	54%	-18%
07	2023 - Spring	42%	38%	4%	48%	-6%
03	2023 - Spring	60%	59%	1%	59%	1%
04	2023 - Spring	49%	62%	-13%	61%	-12%
08	2023 - Spring	47%	58%	-11%	55%	-8%
05	2023 - Spring	47%	55%	-8%	55%	-8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	32%	50%	-18%	44%	-12%
05	2023 - Spring	51%	59%	-8%	51%	0%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	89%	47%	42%	50%	39%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	83%	45%	38%	48%	35%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	95%	63%	32%	63%	32%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	61%	61%	0%	66%	-5%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

The lowest performing subgroup for the 21-22 school year is the SWD. In 21-22, 6 students fell into the category of achieving in ELA. There is a gap in data from the 21-22 school year to the 22-23 school year that is unaccounted for in this data set. The SWD subgroup has consistently been below 32% in the past 3 years, however we have consistently made growth in the learning gains of this subgroup. In 2018-19 there was a 25% Learning Gains and a growth from 31% Learning Gains in 2020-21 to 37% Learning Gains in 2022-23. The contributing factors to this increase was the use of push-in tutoring for our SWD.

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

The data component showing the greatest decline in the number of students who are achieving in ELA for the SWD subgroup from 12 to 6. The students in this subgroup have not been consistent within our school, as some students have withdrawn and new students entered and new students being identified.

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.

There is no current data provided regarding state averages.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the LG for Math with our SWD subgroup. In the past 3 years, there has been an increase of 9% in learning gains for our SWD population (33% to 42%) and an increase by 7% from 2020-21 to 2021-22.

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

Based on the data discussed in the previous questions, the focus for this year will be on ELA. This year we will focus on increasing the number of SWD students that reach the level of achieving from 6 to 10 and increasing the number of students who make learning gains from 31 to 35.

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

1. Intentional Focus on Literacy
2. Establish a Data Driven Culture
3. Effective implementation of MTSS
4. Build a Culture of Wellness

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

Our SWD population have been overlooked when celebrating successes in the past as we have focused on proficiency rather than gains. This year, we will continue to focus on proficiency, but also begin to focus on Celebrating our SWD population by tracking their learning gains at the end of each FAST assessment to ensure that these students continue to feel seen and recognized for their accomplishments.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will use data from the FAST assessment to determine learning gains and proficiency of our SWD students and those that have shown a 5 point growth will be celebrated. By recognizing and celebrating these successes, we will see an improved culture of learning amongst our SWD population.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor this area of focus by utilizing a survey at the end of the year to determine if the celebrations of learning gains impacted the overall culture of learning at our school, as well as looking at learning gains and proficiency of our SWD population on the Spring FAST assessment to determine if our action steps led to an increase in proficiency and/or learning gains.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brett Taylor (brett.taylor@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.)

1. Track and monitor the growth of our SWD students in ELA utilizing FAST data both in the Fall and Winter
2. Identify learning needs/learning gaps after each assessment and determine a plan of action to differentiate learning for each student
3. Fill in learning gaps through targeted instruction with the ESE team.
4. Use small group targeted instruction in the core reading class, Parliament tutors for middle grade students (5-8) and Powerball for elementary students (K-4), after school tutoring,
5. Utilize critical reading strategies to assist students in improving comprehension of grade level texts within the core reading class.
6. Celebrate those students who demonstrate proficiency
7. Celebrate those students who demonstrate learning gains by at least 5 points

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To increase proficiency and learning gains of our SWD population.

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.

1. Meet with the testing coordinator following the PM2 assessment (Dec)
2. Analyze the scores of our SWD sub population to determine if there were any learning gains as a result of our actions (after school tutoring, Parliament in-school tutoring, MTSS tier 2/3, Powerball, and differentiated learning within the classroom setting) population made learning gains from PM1 to PM2.
3. Determine specific areas of growth and celebrate these successes with the teachers and students.
4. Determine the current needs for growth (by standard) and make a targeted plan to address these in the next semester.
5. Monitor student learning throughout each quarter through the use of IFA's on Progress Learning to ensure that the needs of the SWD are being targeted.
6. Meet as an ESE team to review student IEP plans, review and update accommodations; review with teachers to ensure student needs are being addressed.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Krutzler (skrutzler@crownpoincharter.org)

By When: PM2 Data reviewed in December; PM3 Data reviewed in May.

#2. 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.

One of our school initiatives this year is to ensure an environment of wellness for staff and students. This need was determined by the use of school surveys at the end of the 22-23 school year in which both students and staff alike expressed this as being an area in need of improvement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to increase the percentage of students and staff who express a positive experience towards wellness. We will measure this outcome by the end of year surveys sent out to parents, staff, and students. We will increase the percentage by 5% over last year.

Monitoring:

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

We will be monitoring the impacts of our Wellness PD's and schoolwide events as well as retention of teachers throughout the school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie Krutzler (skrutzler@crownpoincharter.org)

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.)

Chermica Barnes has been selected to run our wellness support alongside Ms. Amber Smith who will be responsible for utilizing LiveSchool to engage students and celebrate those who are making positive impacts on our school. In addition, Ms. Krutzler and the AVID Team will be recognizing teachers and students through the use of WICOR Wizards awards and induction into the AVID Ambassador program.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By recognizing the efforts of our teachers and students and taking the time to support, encourage, and highlight their achievements, we will see an increase in overall wellness.

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.

1. Culture Surveys provided to Students, Parents, Teachers, and Admin at least 3 times per year
2. Health/Wellness opportunities provided on campus for teachers
3. Health/Wellness opportunities provided on campus for students
4. Monthly recognition of students
5. Monthly recognition of teachers

Person Responsible: Brett Taylor (brett.taylor@ocps.net)

By When: Culture Surveys given in August, again in January, and finally again in May. All other items are done on a monthly basis.

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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 Principal will meet with the SOA to allocate funding for Parliament tutors, after school tutors, and celebration of learning gains/proficiency itemized expenses.

The Principal will work with the Dean of Curriculum to ensure that Parliament tutors are in place to support our MS students with a focus on our SWD population in the area of ELA.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$3,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
		Celebrations	1010 - Renaissance Charter At Crown Point	General Fund		\$3,000.00
			<i>Notes: Will hold a celebration for students who show learning gains after each assessment period.</i>			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment				\$8,250.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
		Improve staff and student wellness	1010 - Renaissance Charter At Crown Point	General Fund		\$8,250.00
			<i>Notes: Monthly teacher of the month awards Wellness PD/events monthly Renovated teacher lounge for more positive environment</i>			
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: -- Select below --:				\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: -- Select below --:				\$0.00
					Total:	\$11,250.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes