

School District of Osceola County, FL

Kissimmee Charter Academy 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	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	23
VI. Title I Requirements	28
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	31

Kissimmee Charter Academy

2850 BILL BECK BLVD, Kissimmee, FL 34744

<http://www.imaginekca.org/home/>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Osceola County School Board on 10/10/2023.

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.

We partner with parents to provide the highest quality of education which prepares students for a lifetime of leadership, academic excellence, and exemplary character.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We educate and inspire every child to succeed!

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
Fornes, Jennifer	Principal	Overview of school-wide goals, implementation of instructional objectives, and strategies for meeting SIP goals.
Robinet, Patricia	Assistant Principal	Overview of school-wide goals, implementation of instructional objectives, and strategies for meeting SIP goals.
Bader, Leigh	Instructional Coach	Provide disaggregated data to identify trends within our SIP.
Cruz, Keri	Instructional Coach	Support implementation of instructional strategies and classroom support for teachers.
Estrada, Erick	Assistant Principal	Overview of school-wide goals, implementation of instructional objectives, and strategies for meeting SIP goals.

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.

Stakeholder input is collected through surveys and feedback sessions tailored to each group, and the received feedback is carefully analyzed to identify common themes and priorities. The SIP committee is formed, comprising representatives from each stakeholder group, to set measurable goals and develop action plans for the SIP.

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))

Regular review, refinement, and finalization of the plan involve continuous engagement with stakeholders. Implementation, reporting, and evaluation of the SIP also include ongoing communication with the school community. Our monthly meetings with our regional support team include walkthroughs related to the school-wide SIP goals and focused on instructional improvement efforts. Revision of strategies will be included to support the goal attainment.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	88%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
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)* 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: 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	11	13	7	18	15	15	11	20	15	125	
One or more suspensions	7	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	11	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in Math	0	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	5	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	26	27	13	23	27	135	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	20	32	29	16	12	8	117	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	4	3	5	2	7	7	28

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*	42	48	53	48	50	55	47		
ELA Learning Gains				43			50		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45			36		
Math Achievement*	47	47	55	37	42	42	38		
Math Learning Gains				39			31		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				38			33		
Science Achievement*	36	46	52	42	45	54	49		
Social Studies Achievement*	78	67	68	51	53	59	72		
Middle School Acceleration	86	75	70	52	45	51	51		
Graduation Rate		77	74		46	50			
College and Career Acceleration		59	53		67	70			
ELP Progress	39	53	55	59	73	70	35		

* 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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	369
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	454
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	25	Yes	3	3
ELL	38	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	60			
HSP	50			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	53			

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	24	Yes	2	2
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	44			

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	44			
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	42			47			36	78	86			39
SWD	15			26			8				4	50
ELL	29			36			24	67			6	39
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	55			53			38	92			4	
HSP	39			44			31	74	85		7	40
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	54			58			56	90			4	
FRL	42			47			36	78	86		7	39

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	48	43	45	37	39	38	42	51	52			59
SWD	19	26	32	17	26	29		18				
ELL	31	42	50	25	36	34	23	36				59
AMI												
ASN												

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	50	45		32	36							
HSP	46	43	43	37	40	39	42	48	51			51
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	54	41		39	33		45		50			
FRL	47	41	45	36	40	36	45	50	51			63

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	47	50	36	38	31	33	49	72	51			35
SWD	10	31	30	4	27	36						27
ELL	35	44	32	29	30	33	29	47				35
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42	41		30	33		35	58				
HSP	46	50	34	37	30	34	47	72	51			34
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	55	63		45	26		76	82				
FRL	45	48	31	37	29	31	47	73	55			38

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	32%	44%	-12%	54%	-22%
07	2023 - Spring	48%	39%	9%	47%	1%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	39%	40%	-1%	47%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	44%	49%	-5%	58%	-14%
06	2023 - Spring	47%	39%	8%	47%	0%
03	2023 - Spring	38%	44%	-6%	50%	-12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	42%	40%	2%	54%	-12%
07	2023 - Spring	61%	39%	22%	48%	13%
03	2023 - Spring	47%	49%	-2%	59%	-12%
04	2023 - Spring	40%	48%	-8%	61%	-21%
08	2023 - Spring	44%	48%	-4%	55%	-11%
05	2023 - Spring	42%	41%	1%	55%	-13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	38%	35%	3%	44%	-6%
05	2023 - Spring	29%	40%	-11%	51%	-22%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	87%	40%	47%	50%	37%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	36%	64%	48%	52%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	65%	*	63%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	76%	63%	13%	66%	10%

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.

During the past school year, the data component that showed the lowest performance was our subgroup of students with disabilities (SWD).

A significant contributor to the low performance of SWD students was the challenge of providing appropriate scaffolded Tier I instruction to meet their unique needs. Tier I instruction is the foundational level of support and curriculum that is intended for all students in a general education classroom. However, for students with disabilities, this level of instruction often requires additional scaffolding and tailored strategies to ensure meaningful access to the curriculum.

Scaffolding is particularly crucial for SWD students who may require different approaches, accommodations, or modifications to the standard curriculum. The challenge lies in striking the right balance between maintaining high academic standards and providing the necessary support to help SWD students succeed.

The low performance in the SWD data component shows the importance of individualized and differentiated instruction. What was needed was a deeper understanding of the specific challenges and strengths of each student, allowing teachers to tailor their instructional strategies.

To address this issue and improve the performance of SWD students, our school plans to focus on professional development and collaboration among teachers. Teachers received training in inclusive practices and strategies for accommodating SWD students within the general education classroom. This included learning how to read the student's Individual Education Plan, utilize assistive technology, and implement effective accommodations.

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

One of the most significant challenges we faced in the past academic year was the noticeable decline in the performance of our third-grade students, particularly in the subject of reading. This decline was particularly striking when compared to previous years and it prompted us to take a closer look at the factors contributing to this unsettling trend.

One of the key contributing factors to the decline in third-grade reading scores was the introduction of three new teachers at this grade level. While welcoming new educators can bring fresh perspectives and ideas to the classroom, it also presents a unique set of challenges. These new teachers, while enthusiastic and dedicated were still in the process of developing their pedagogical skills and

understanding our curriculum. Teacher preparation and sufficient knowledge in delivering appropriate instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners were areas that required focused attention.

In addition to teacher preparedness, it was essential that these educators gained a comprehensive understanding of the new Florida standards for third-grade reading. These updated standards demanded a more rigorous approach to teaching, with a greater emphasis on critical thinking, analytical skills, and a deeper comprehension of literary texts. Mastery of these standards was not just a matter of teaching to a test; it was about equipping students with the skills they needed for success.

Effective instructional planning was another critical element. It was not enough to simply cover the material; teachers needed to create lesson plans that engaged students and provided opportunities for active learning. To achieve this, our teachers had to develop a clear understanding of what effective instructional planning looked like in the context of these new standards. It meant designing lessons that were not only aligned with the curriculum but also catered to the diverse learning needs of students.

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.

The greatest gap and the lowest decline were both in third-grade reading. Same statement as above.

One of the most significant challenges we faced in the past academic year was the noticeable decline in the performance of our third-grade students, particularly in the subject of reading. This decline was particularly striking when compared to previous years and it prompted us to take a closer look at the factors contributing to this unsettling trend.

One of the key contributing factors to the decline in third-grade reading scores was the introduction of three new teachers at this grade level. While welcoming new educators can bring fresh perspectives and ideas to the classroom, it also presents a unique set of challenges. These new teachers, while enthusiastic and dedicated were still in the process of developing their pedagogical skills and understanding our curriculum. Teacher preparation and sufficient knowledge in delivering appropriate instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners were areas that required focused attention.

In addition to teacher preparedness, it was essential that these educators gained a comprehensive understanding of the new Florida standards for third-grade reading. These updated standards demanded a more rigorous approach to teaching, with a greater emphasis on critical thinking, analytical skills, and a deeper comprehension of literary texts. Mastery of these standards was not just a matter of teaching to a test; it was about equipping students with the skills they needed for success.

Effective instructional planning was another critical element. It was not enough to simply cover the material; teachers needed to create lesson plans that engaged students and provided opportunities for active learning. To achieve this, our teachers had to develop a clear understanding of what effective instructional planning looked like in the context of these new standards. It meant designing lessons that were not only aligned with the curriculum but also catered to the diverse learning needs of students.

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

Our Algebra end-of-course assessment showed the most improvement over prior year results and can be attributed to the implementation of a series of strategic measures. Perhaps the most significant was the assignment of a highly effective educator to the classroom setting. This teacher has a passion for mathematical concepts and a deep understanding of instructional practices. Deliberate planning and progress monitoring with the instructional and data coach along with pacing the instructional of the Florida standards supported improvement seen in this subject area. Lesson planning included innovative instructional practices incorporating creative approaches that catered to diverse learning styles. She

introduced real-world applications of algebraic concepts, illustrating the relevance of the subject in everyday life and making it more relevant.

This teacher leveraged digital tools and online resources to supplement their instruction, providing students with interactive exercises and virtual simulations that reinforced algebraic principles. This integration of technology not only made learning more engaging but also facilitated individualized instruction, allowing students to progress at their own pace and receive immediate feedback.

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

One of the primary areas of concern is the low performance of students with disabilities (SWD). This is a critical concern because it indicates that a significant portion of the student population is not achieving at the desired level. The fact that SWD showed the lowest level of achievement suggests that there may be systemic issues in place that require attention and improvement.

Another area of concern relates to the challenge of providing appropriate scaffolded Tier I instruction for SWD students. This concern is twofold. First, it underscores the importance of ensuring that educational practices are inclusive and adaptable to the diverse learning needs of SWD students. Second, it highlights the potential gap in teacher preparedness and training to effectively address these needs. The need for additional scaffolding and tailored strategies for SWD students indicates that there might be room for improvement in teacher professional development programs and curriculum planning to better support these students.

The overarching concern here is the need for a more inclusive and individualized approach to education that addresses the unique strengths and challenges of SWD students. It also emphasizes the importance of ongoing teacher training and collaboration to equip educators with the skills and strategies necessary to provide high-quality instruction to all students, regardless of their abilities or disabilities.

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

Learning gains and proficiency increases in SWD
Teacher planning and preparation for Tier I instruction

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.

Teacher retention is a critical need, particularly when assigning new teachers to classrooms. Consistent teacher presence in the classroom ensures stability in instruction and classroom management. Experienced teachers possess a deep understanding of their students' needs, curriculum, and effective teaching methods. This continuity promotes a high-quality and dependable educational experience for all students. Teacher retention also significantly impacts student achievement. Experienced educators are more effective in helping students meet academic standards, narrowing achievement gaps, and fostering a positive learning environment. Frequent teacher turnover and the introduction of new educators can disrupt this progress.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the school year, the % of staff with an understanding of our school-wide shared values of Justice, Integrity, and Fun will grow from 95% last year to 97% this year, with a participation rate of 90% or more, as measured by the annual Imagine Schools Staff Survey.

Monitoring:

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

School climate and culture will be monitored by regular collection of data including surveys and check-ins for teachers, regular monthly meetings highlighting the understanding of the school-wide shared values, celebrating the achievements of teachers and staff in monthly meetings, sharing these stories school-wide through the school weekly newsletters, in staff workrooms, and through student assemblies.

Surveys and check-ins will be used to gather feedback. The collected data will be analyzed to identify trends and areas requiring attention. This analysis will pinpoint specific issues within the school's climate and culture. Adjustments will be made to support teachers as identified from the surveys and check-ins. In addition, the school leader will maintain open channels for feedback and communication with teachers and staff to address concerns and track progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Fornes (jennifer.fornes@imaginekca.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.)

An evidence-based intervention for improving teacher climate and culture on campus is the implementation of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PLCs are collaborative structures that bring teachers together to work collectively on improving instruction, student learning outcomes, and the overall school environment. PLCs contribute to a positive teacher culture by promoting a sense of belonging, collaboration, and shared responsibility. When teachers feel valued and supported in their professional growth, it can lead to higher job satisfaction and a more favorable school environment. Supporting teachers in their collaborative work among grade levels and acclimating new teachers to the way of work at the school builds their understanding of our school-wide shared values.

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 3 - Promising 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

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

The area of focus on improving the academic outcomes for students with disabilities is to enhance teacher instructional practices and planning. This focus is driven by the imperative need to provide equitable and effective education for all students, including those with disabilities. It involves implementing evidence-based strategies and support systems to ensure that teachers are well-equipped to meet the diverse needs of their students with disabilities, ultimately fostering inclusive and equitable learning environments.

Student performance data reveals persistent achievement gaps between students with disabilities and their peers without disabilities. These disparities highlight the urgency of improving instructional practices to address this inequity.

A review of enrollment data indicates a growing number of students with disabilities in the school, suggesting an increased demand for specialized instruction and support. This demographic shift highlights the need to equip teachers with the necessary skills and tools.

Professional learning opportunities are needed as there are new teachers in our school as well as understanding the best instructional approach for providing the greatest effect size to improve our subgroup of students with disabilities. Including support for Tier I instruction and best first instruction a priority so that students with disabilities.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the school year, 50% of students with disabilities will show learning gains as measured by FAST.

Monitoring:

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

Students take the FAST three times a year. After the assessment, our ESE team, Data Coach, and School leadership team will meet to disaggregate the data and identify additional support for students not making the required gains. In addition, students are monitored using Star and this data will also be used to provide personalized pathways to support their academic needs. Our monthly ESE meetings will be focused on specific student support and interventions used for students to improve their academic outcomes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Fornes (jennifer.fornes@imaginekca.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.)

Providing targeted professional learning opportunities to teachers to improve Tier I instruction with differentiation and scaffolded support will be used to improve the academic outcomes of students with disabilities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To address this issue and improve the performance of SWD students, our school plans to focus on professional learning and collaboration among teachers. Teachers received training in inclusive practices and strategies for accommodating SWD students within the general education classroom. This included

learning how to read the student's Individual Education Plan, utilize assistive technology, and implement effective accommodations, differentiation, and scaffolded support.

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

#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.

The area of focus on improving the academic outcomes for students with disabilities is to enhance teacher instructional practices and planning. This focus is driven by the imperative need to provide equitable and effective education for all students, including English language learners. It involves implementing evidence-based strategies and support systems to ensure that teachers are well-equipped to meet the diverse needs of ELL students, ultimately fostering inclusive and equitable learning environments.

Student performance data reveals persistent achievement gaps between ELL students and their peers. These disparities highlight the urgency of improving instructional practices to address this inequity.

Professional learning opportunities are needed as there are new teachers in our school as well as understanding the best instructional approach for providing the greatest effect size to improve our subgroup of ELL students.

A review of enrollment data indicates a growing number of ELL students in the school, suggesting an increased demand for specialized instruction and support. This demographic shift highlights the need to equip teachers with the necessary skills and tools.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the school year, 50% of ELL students (more than two years in the United States) will show learning gains as measured by FAST.

Monitoring:

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

Students take the FAST three times a year. After the assessment, our ELL team, Data Coach, and School leadership team will meet to disaggregate the data and identify additional support for students not making the required gains. In addition, students are monitored using Star and this data will also be used to provide personalized pathways to support their academic needs. Our monthly ELL meetings will be focused on specific student support and interventions used for students to improve their academic outcomes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Fornes (jennifer.fornes@imaginekca.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.)

Providing targeted professional learning opportunities to teachers to improve Tier I instruction with differentiation and scaffolded support will be used to improve the academic outcomes of ELL students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To address this issue and improve the performance of ELL students, our school plans to focus on professional learning and collaboration among teachers. Teachers received training in inclusive practices and strategies for accommodating ELL students within the general education classroom.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

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 process of reviewing school improvement funding allocations to ensure that resources are allocated based on the needs of teacher climate and culture, students with disabilities, and English language learners are data-driven and focused on the highest impact we can provide our teachers to increase outcomes in the focus areas.

For the collection of comprehensive data related to the needs of teacher climate and culture, students with disabilities, and English language learners our team used surveys, assessment results, demographic information, teacher feedback, and input from stakeholder groups. Data was analyzed to identify specific areas of need within each of the three focus areas. The team looked for trends, patterns, and disparities that require attention and resource allocation. Priorities were established within teacher climate and culture, students with disabilities, and English language learners. A budget was developed to reflect the prioritized needs in each focus area to support specific initiatives for school climate and culture, personnel assignments in the ESE and ELL program, professional learning calendar for teachers to support Tier1 instruction, differentiation, and scaffolding learning, interventions aimed at addressing student needs, and PLC's to unpack the standards.

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

Implement Targeted Reading Interventions Rooted in the Science of Reading is an evidence-based instructional practice designed to address the specific needs of Kindergarten through Grade 2 students with disabilities and English language learners (ELLs) in early reading development.

The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2023 statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

1st grade: 54% (All students in grade level - Spring 2023 Star report) not on track

2nd grade: 51% (All students in grade level - Spring 2023 Star report) not on track

- Provide explicit instruction in phonemic awareness, focusing on developing students' ability to recognize and manipulate individual sounds in words. Activities may include phoneme segmentation and blending exercises.

- Deliver systematic and explicit phonics instruction to teach students the relationship between sounds (phonemes) and letters (graphemes). Ensure students understand sound-symbol correspondences and practice decoding words.

- Promote vocabulary growth through exposure to rich and varied language experiences. Use context clues, semantic mapping, and word study to expand students' word knowledge.

- Implement fluency-building activities, including repeated readings of texts and timed reading exercises. Help students read with accuracy, appropriate speed, and expression.

- Teach comprehension strategies such as predicting, summarizing, questioning, and making connections to help students understand and engage with texts. Encourage active reading and critical thinking.

- Utilize structured literacy approaches that integrate phonological awareness, phonics, and language comprehension in an explicit and systematic manner.

- Engage students in multisensory activities that involve auditory, visual, and kinesthetic elements to reinforce reading skills.

- Tailor instruction to individual student needs, providing additional support for those who require it while challenging advanced readers appropriately.

- Conduct small-group reading sessions to facilitate targeted instruction, practice, and discussion. These groups can be organized based on student's specific needs and skill levels.

- Use ongoing formative assessments to monitor student progress and adjust instruction accordingly. Identify areas where students may need additional support or reteaching.

Rationale for Identifying the Critical Need:

Coordinated Screening and Progress Monitoring (2022-2023): Data from the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system (Star) demonstrated that a notable percentage of students in these grade levels were not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide reading assessment. This indicated persistent reading difficulties requiring immediate attention, especially within a Science of Reading framework.

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

Implement Targeted Reading Interventions Rooted in the Science of Reading is an evidence-based instructional practice designed to address the specific needs of 3rd through 5th grade students with disabilities and English language learners (ELLs) in reading. This approach provides scientifically sound interventions and strategies to offer comprehensive support.

The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2023 statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

3rd grade: 60% (All students in grade level - Spring 2023 Star report) not on track - FAST data shows 72% not on track

4th grade: 51% (All students in grade level - Spring 2023 Star report) not on track -FAST data shows 55% not on track

5th grade: 70% (All students in grade level - Spring 2023 Star report) not on track - FAST data shows 67% not on track

- Continue to develop phonemic awareness skills, especially for students who may have gaps in this foundational area. Engage in activities like phoneme segmentation, blending, and manipulation.

- Provide explicit instruction in advanced phonics, including prefixes, suffixes, and more complex sound-letter correspondences. Reinforce decoding skills for multisyllabic words.
- Promote vocabulary growth by exploring challenging words within the context of texts. Encourage students to use context clues and learn strategies for deciphering unfamiliar terms.
- Focus on improving reading fluency by practicing timed readings, expression, and pacing. Provide opportunities for students to read aloud and silently with increased accuracy and confidence.
- Teach advanced comprehension strategies such as inferencing, summarization, and critical thinking. Encourage students to delve deeper into text analysis and make connections to real-world experiences.
- Help students recognize and understand various text structures (e.g., cause and effect, compare and contrast) to enhance their ability to navigate and comprehend different types of texts.
- Develop skills for understanding vocabulary in context by exploring synonyms, antonyms, and figurative language within texts.
- Encourage close reading of complex texts, prompting students to examine text details, author's purpose, and evidence within the text to support their understanding.
- Promote collaborative discussions about texts to enhance comprehension. Encourage students to express their opinions, ask questions, and engage in meaningful dialogue.
- Employ ongoing formative assessments to monitor student progress and tailor instruction accordingly. Identify areas where students may need additional support or advanced challenges.

Rationale for Identifying the Critical Need:

Statewide Reading Assessment Data (2023): Analysis revealed a significant percentage of 3rd through 5th grade students, particularly those with disabilities and ELLs, scoring below Level 3 on the 2023 statewide, standardized reading assessment. This data indicated a substantial achievement gap necessitating targeted intervention rooted in the Science of Reading.

Coordinated Screening and Progress Monitoring (2022-2023): Data from the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system (Star) demonstrated that a notable percentage of students in these grade levels were not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide reading assessment. This indicated persistent reading difficulties requiring immediate attention, especially within a Science of Reading framework.

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

By the end of the academic year, students in 1st grade will improve from 45% being on track to at least 50% on track to pass the state ELA assessment as measured by Star.

By the end of the academic year, students in 2nd grade will improve from 48% being on track to at least 50% on track to pass the state ELA assessment as measured by Star.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By the end of the academic year, students in 3rd grade will improve from 28% being on track to at least 50% on track to pass the state ELA assessment.

By the end of the academic year, students in 4th grade will improve from 45% being on track to at least 50% on track to pass the state ELA assessment.

By the end of the academic year, students in 3rd grade will improve from 33% being on track to at least 50% on track to pass the state ELA assessment.

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.

At the beginning of the academic year, students will take the initial Star assessment. This assessment will serve as the baseline measurement and will provide data on the percentage of students who are initially on track for success on the state ELA assessment. Throughout the academic year, regular Star assessments will be administered to track individual student progress in reading and ELA skills. The data collected from the baseline assessment, ongoing progress monitoring assessments, and end-of-year assessment will be analyzed. Specifically, the percentage of students who are on track to pass the state ELA assessment will be determined for each grade. The results of the end-of-year Star assessments will be compared to the measurable outcomes established for each grade. If the percentage of students on track to pass the state ELA assessment meets or exceeds the targeted 50% threshold, the outcome will be considered achieved. Based on the assessment results, instructional strategies will be adjusted to continue supporting students who need additional assistance and challenging those who are excelling. By utilizing Star assessments at multiple points throughout the academic year, teachers can closely monitor individual student progress and overall grade-level proficiency in reading and ELA skills. This data-driven approach allows for timely interventions and adjustments to instructional practices to help students reach and exceed the desired 50% proficiency rate on the state ELA assessment as measured by Star and FAST assessments.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Fornes, Jennifer, jennifer.fornes@imaginekca.org

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?

The school will utilize Foundations as a Phonics-Based Reading program of instruction. Teachers will implement a comprehensive, systematic phonics-based reading program that emphasizes explicit instruction in phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.

The school will utilize Wit and Wisdom as a structured literacy approach that allows for the integration of the science of reading strategies to support students in acquiring reading and language comprehension.

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?

Foundations is chosen as an evidence-based program for improving reading because it has demonstrated a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes. Foundations is supported by a robust body of research and has been extensively studied. Multiple research studies have shown that students who receive instruction through Foundations make substantial gains in phonemic awareness, phonics skills, vocabulary development, fluency, and comprehension. Foundations aligns with best practices in phonics instruction, emphasizing explicit and systematic teaching of foundational reading skills. It adheres to the principles of the science of reading, which research has consistently shown to be effective in improving reading outcomes. Foundations provides a structured and consistent framework for teachers to deliver phonics-based instruction. It ensures that all students receive high-quality, research-backed instruction, reducing variability in teaching approaches. The program incorporates ongoing assessment and progress monitoring, allowing teachers to make data-informed decisions about individual student needs. This data-driven approach supports early identification of struggling readers and targeted interventions.

Wit and Wisdom is chosen as an evidence-based program for reading and language comprehension because it integrates the science of reading strategies, which have a strong research base supporting their effectiveness. It emphasizes explicit and systematic instruction in phonological awareness, phonics, vocabulary development, fluency, and comprehension. The program integrates best practices in reading and language instruction, aligning with the evidence-based principles of structured literacy. It recognizes the importance of building strong foundational skills while engaging students in rich and meaningful content. The program encourages students to analyze, synthesize, and apply their understanding of texts. It promotes critical thinking and deep comprehension skills.

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
Area of Focus: Improving Literacy	
Literacy Leadership:	
Action Step 1: Establish a Literacy Leadership Team Form a dedicated Literacy Leadership Team consisting of experienced teachers, instructional leaders, and literacy specialists.	
Action Step 2: Develop a Comprehensive Literacy Vision and Plan Utilize the Literacy Position Paper to craft a clear and comprehensive literacy vision and strategic plan.	
Literacy Coaching:	
Action Step 1: Implement Literacy Coaches Assign experienced literacy coaches to work closely with teachers, providing ongoing support, modeling effective instruction, and offering feedback on instructional practices.	
Action Step 2: Provide Collaborative Planning Time Allocate dedicated time for teachers to collaborate with literacy coaches and colleagues.	Fornes, Jennifer, jennifer.fornes@imaginekca.org
Assessment:	
Action Step 1: Implement a Comprehensive Assessment System Utilize a comprehensive assessment system that includes formative, summative, and progress-monitoring assessments.	
Professional Learning:	
Action Step 1: Provide Ongoing Professional Learning Offer regular, job-embedded professional development sessions focused on evidence-based literacy practices, including the implementation of Foundations and Wit and Wisdom.	
Action Step 2: Foster a Culture of Collaboration Promote a collaborative professional learning community where teachers can share experiences, successes, and challenges related to literacy instruction.	

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.

Methods for Dissemination:

School Website: www.imaginekca.org

The SIP will be uploaded and updated as needed. It will be translated to parents as needed.

In-person parent meetings and workshops will be held semesterly engage parents and guardians in discussions related to the SIP. These events will provide opportunities for parents to ask questions and seek clarification.

Periodic updates will be provided through school newsletters. These newsletters will be sent electronically to parents ensuring broad dissemination.

Parent-Teacher Conferences staff will discuss the school-wide goals with parents individually, addressing any concerns or questions.

To ensure accessibility and understanding by parents, the school will provide translated versions of key documents, including the SIP, in languages spoken by the diverse community of parents and guardians and also provide translators during meetings and school-wide events.

In cases where parents may have limited digital access, printed copies of the SIP will be made available upon request at the school's front office.

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))

The school recognizes the importance of strong partnerships with parents, families, and community stakeholders in fulfilling its mission, supporting students' needs, and keeping parents informed of their child's progress. To achieve this, the school has developed a comprehensive Family Engagement Plan, which outlines the strategies and actions for building positive relationships. This plan is publicly available on the school's website at www.imaginekca.org.

The school has several key strategies for building positive relationships:

Regular Communication: The school will maintain open lines of communication with parents and families through various channels, including emails, newsletters, and phone calls. Teachers will provide regular updates on student progress, assignments, and classroom activities to ensure parents are well-informed.

Parent-Teacher Conferences: The school will organize regular parent-teacher conferences to provide opportunities for face-to-face discussions about students' academic and social development. These conferences will be scheduled at convenient times for parents and will accommodate virtual meetings if needed.

Family Engagement Events: The school will host family engagement events and workshops throughout

the year, covering topics such as academic support, college and career readiness, and social-emotional well-being.

These events will encourage parents to actively participate in their child's education.

To ensure accessibility, the school will provide translation services and support in languages spoken by parents and families who have limited English proficiency. Information, including the Family Engagement Plan, will be available in multiple languages.

Family Resource Center: The school will establish a Family Resource Center on campus, providing a welcoming space for parents to access information, resources, and engage in school activities.

Online Portal: The school will maintain an online portal or platform where parents can access student grades, attendance records, and assignment details. This portal will provide real-time information on students' academic progress.

Public Availability of Family Engagement Plan: The school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available on the school's official website. The plan outlines the school's commitment to fostering positive relationships with parents, families, and community stakeholders, as well as the specific strategies and actions that will be implemented to achieve this goal.

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))

The school is committed to enhancing its academic program to provide students with a rigorous, well-rounded education that prepares them for success. This effort aligns with the Area of Focus identified in Part II of the School Improvement Plan (SIP). The following strategies and actions will be implemented to achieve these goals:

1. **Curriculum Enhancement:** The school will review and revise its curriculum to align with state standards and best practices. Curriculum enhancements will focus on incorporating the latest research-based instructional methods, including those from the Science of Reading, to improve literacy outcomes. An updated and research-aligned curriculum ensures that students receive instruction that reflects current educational standards and research on effective teaching practices.

2. **Extended Learning Opportunities:** The school provides whole school intervention, before and after school tutoring, Saturday academies, and summer enrichment programs. Extended learning opportunities provide students with additional academic support and enrichment, helping to bridge achievement gaps and accelerate their learning.

3. **Differentiated Instruction:** Teachers will receive training in differentiated instruction techniques to tailor their teaching to individual student needs. This approach ensures that all students, including those with disabilities and English language learners, receive the appropriate level of challenge and support. Differentiated instruction allows educators to meet students where they are academically, providing both targeted support and opportunities for advanced learning.

4. **Data-Driven Instruction:** The school will implement a robust data analysis system to monitor student progress, identify areas of need, and adjust instruction accordingly. Regular assessments and formative feedback will inform instructional decisions. Data-driven instruction enables educators to identify students who require additional support, track progress, and tailor interventions to address specific learning gaps.

5. **Enrichment Programs:** The school will develop and expand enrichment programs in areas such as

Music, STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics), arts, and extracurricular activities. Enrichment programs provide students with opportunities to explore their interests and talents, fostering a love for learning and a well-rounded education.

6. Professional Development: Teachers and staff will engage in ongoing professional learning to enhance their instructional skills and stay updated on the latest educational research and practices. Effective professional development empowers educators to implement evidence-based strategies and deliver high-quality instruction.

7. Parent and Community Involvement: The school will actively engage parents and the community in supporting the academic program. This may involve workshops, volunteer opportunities, and partnerships with local organizations. Engaging parents and the community creates a collaborative and supportive environment that reinforces student learning.

8. Formative Assessment: Formative assessment practices will be emphasized in classrooms. Teachers will regularly assess students' understanding and adjust instruction based on the results. Formative assessment provides real-time feedback to teachers, enabling them to adapt their teaching methods to meet students' immediate needs.

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

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

No