Innovation Preparatory Academy School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Innovation Preparatory Academy

7800 AVERY SCOPE VIEW, Wesley Chapel, FL 33545

https://www.innovation-prep.org

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At Innovation Preparatory Academy we believe that all students have the ability to learn to their fullest potential in a safe, student-centered, innovative environment. Students will be engaged through modernized spaces, project-based learning and encouraged collaboration that will empower students to become career-ready, lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Innovation Preparatory Academy is to develop the whole child through forward thinking, technology-based, innovative learning models focused on Science, Health, and Wellness.

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
Glover, Meagan	Principal	Lead the instructional improvement process in the school including analysis of data, research and instructional design, professional development, support with implementation, mentoring, and review of implementation performance.
Silvers, Jennifer	Other	Lead the instructional improvement process in the school including analysis of data, research and instructional design, professional development, support with implementation, mentoring, and review of implementation performance.
Reynolds, Danielle	Assistant Principal	Lead the instructional improvement process in the school including analysis of data, research and instructional design, professional development, support with implementation, mentoring, and review of implementation performance.

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.

Spring data was shared with teachers and staff at BOY faculty meeting. Staff members worked in collaborative groups to brainstorm school-wide initiatives and action steps to meet each goal. Similarly, survey data is shared with parents and students to collect feedback and use the data to create the plan.

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))

Continuous weekly data chats to analyze standards, as well as deeper data dives at PM1 and PM2 to make revisions, as needed. Additionally, the MTSS team will meet monthly to review tiered students and make instructional plans to address necessary gaps and ensure resources are effective and implemented with fidelity.

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	62%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	40%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* 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
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	20	14	16	9	9	1	32	27	128
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	0	6
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	11	7	0	2	0	0	0	20
Course failure in Math	0	0	7	0	2	2	13	12	2	38
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	22	19	21	19	15	117
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	26	22	16	17	5	29	115
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	21	22	19	21	19	15	117

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	2	1	4	6	3	5	12	9	42

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Absent 10% or more school days		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more school days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	53	58	53	58	60	55	59		
ELA Learning Gains				47			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38			47		
Math Achievement*	51	62	55	58	40	42	58		
Math Learning Gains				46			57		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40			41		
Science Achievement*	66	59	52	60	60	54	63		
Social Studies Achievement*	72	79	68	76	60	59			
Middle School Acceleration	89	64	70		49	51			
Graduation Rate		80	74		50	50			
College and Career Acceleration		55	53		76	70			
ELP Progress	62	53	55	53	67	70			

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	448
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53

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	476
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100
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	28	Yes	2	2
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	48			
HSP	56			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	69			
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	31	Yes	1	1
ELL	38	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	48			
HSP	42			

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	65			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	48			

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	53			51			66	72	89			62
SWD	22			27			35				3	
ELL	31			33			55				4	62
AMI												
ASN	78			83							2	
BLK	43			34			68				3	
HSP	48			48			58	62	69		7	58
MUL	64			61			69				3	
PAC												
WHT	56			54			68	78	100		6	
FRL	40			40			58	58	69		7	63

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	58	47	38	58	46	40	60	76				53
SWD	15	28	25	38	45	38	30					
ELL	28	41	31	42	41		33					53
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	47	37		41	52	54	55					
HSP	48	40	26	51	33	21	43	73				
MUL	69	60		69	60							
PAC												
WHT	65	52	45	65	48	39	71	85				
FRL	43	44	37	48	46	37	59	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	59	51	47	58	57	41	63					
SWD	25	30		39	50							
ELL	28			56								
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	52			36								
HSP	58	54		61	54							
MUL	45			50								
PAC												
WHT	64	51		65	54		69					
FRL	48	50		56	50		47					

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	60%	51%	9%	54%	6%
07	2023 - Spring	52%	48%	4%	47%	5%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	52%	46%	6%	47%	5%
04	2023 - Spring	56%	55%	1%	58%	-2%
06	2023 - Spring	45%	46%	-1%	47%	-2%
03	2023 - Spring	52%	48%	4%	50%	2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	33%	54%	-21%	54%	-21%
07	2023 - Spring	*	48%	*	48%	*
03	2023 - Spring	46%	50%	-4%	59%	-13%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	54%	1%	61%	-6%
08	2023 - Spring	52%	67%	-15%	55%	-3%
05	2023 - Spring	62%	52%	10%	55%	7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	45%	46%	-1%	44%	1%
05	2023 - Spring	73%	49%	24%	51%	22%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	94%	50%	44%	50%	44%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	49%	51%	48%	52%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	84%	65%	19%	63%	21%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	69%	70%	-1%	66%	3%

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.

8th Grade Science - students in this class are students that struggle with reading proficiency which impacts them negatively when taking the 8th grade Science FCAT.

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

6th and 7th Grade Math - students struggles with the transition of the new BEST math standards and were lacking foundational skills needed to be successful.

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.

None.

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

5th Grade Science - teacher was provided more support and professional development around the standards. More hands-on experiments were implemented, which gave students the opportunity to apply their learning in a meaningful way.

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

Attendance for students in grades 7 and 8 the effect this is having on their school grades and test scores.

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

1. Wellness Schoolwide
2. Building Teacher Capacity
3. Student Growth in All Subjects
4. Parent and Student Engagement

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 Other

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

We would like to build a positive school culture and have more parents and families engaged and invested in our school.

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

We will increase parent/family involvement in our school so 90% of all families complete volunteer hours by May 26, 2024.

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

We will make efforts to reach parents in a a variety of platforms (offer meeting via zoom and in person) as well as have different types of activities and events to ensure all families have the opportunity to be involved. We will monitor parent volunteer hours to determine if families are involved in our school.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Silvers (jsilvers@inprepcharter.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.)

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Implementation of a Parent Teacher Cooperative

Person Responsible: Danielle Reynolds (dreynolds@inprepcharter.org)

By When: September, 2023

Implementation of a Parent Teacher Cooperative

Person Responsible: Danielle Reynolds (dreynolds@inprepcharter.org)

By When: September, 2023

Implementation of Sponsorship program

Person Responsible: Danielle Reynolds (dreynolds@inprepcharter.org)

By When: September 2023

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning

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

We will provide professional development and feedback to teachers to help build capacity.

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

Based on walkthrough evaluations, staff will increase their teaching capacity to be effective teachers by May 26, 2024.

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

We will meet with staff weekly for PLCs and provide feedback based on walkthroughs to help improve teaching capacity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Meagan Glover (mglover@inprepcharter.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.)

We will use PLCs to provide professional development to teachers to help improve teaching capacity.

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

Many of our teachers are young educators. They have the heart and passion for teaching but need support in instructional strategies and classroom management.

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.

Weekly PLCs with each grade level

Person Responsible: Jennifer Silvers (jsilvers@inprepcharter.org)

By When: August 2023

TLC Program

Person Responsible: Danielle Reynolds (dreynolds@inprepcharter.org)

By When: September 2023

Teacher Dashboard Presentations to administration. Teachers will analyze their student data and present it to administration.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Silvers (jsilvers@inprepcharter.org)

By When: January 2023

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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.

Based on our student data from FAST PM 3 we will increase student proficiency for all students.

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

We will increase math and reading proficiency to 58% based on FAST PM3.

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

We will use NWEA, FAST PM1 and FAST PM 2 to monitor student progress throughout the school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Danielle Reynolds (dreynolds@inprepcharter.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.)

We will use student data to group students and target instruction based on students individual needs. We will also incorporate Cambridge instruction to help ensure academic growth for all students.

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

Many of our high level students are proficient but don't get the academic growth they should achieve. Cambridge will help us to reach all levels of students and provide high level instruction to challenge our highest level of leaners.

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.

Initial Cambridge Training

Person Responsible: Danielle Reynolds (dreynolds@inprepcharter.org)

By When: July 2023

Cambridge professional development

Person Responsible: Danielle Reynolds (dreynolds@inprepcharter.org)

By When: October 2023

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

All students in grades K-2 will take the NWEA for Reading. Based on this data we will group students according to their ability and skill level. Students that fall below 50th percentile will be placed on MTSS for interventions. Tier 2 interventions include Lexia Core 5 and Tier 3 interventions include small group instruction based on student need.

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

All students in grades 3-5 will take the NWEA for Reading. Based on this data we will group students according to their ability and skill leve. Students that fall below the 50th percentile will be placed on MTSS for interventions. Tier 2 interventions include Lexia Core 5 for grade 3 and I-Ready for grades 4-5. Tier 3 interventions include small group instruction based on student need. Students on Tier 2 and Tier 3 will also be invited to after school tutoring for additional support.

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

65% of students in grades 3-5 will score at or above grade level according to NWEA B3.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

65% of students in grades 3-5 will score a level 3 or above on FAST PM 3.

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.

We will be monitoring student progress through the use of NWEA benchmarks. They will be given in August, December and May. We will also monitor student progress through the use of FAST data.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Glover, Meagan, mglover@inprepcharter.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?

We use My View for ELA instruction. Teachers follow curriculum maps to ensure that all standards are taught throughout the year. Our teachers use a collaborative model to work together to provide students opportunities to learn from different teachers. Our teachers use small group instruction to meet the needs of students at all levels.

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?

My View is written based on Florida standards. It incorporates all standards students need to master in each grade level as well as integrate other subjects into ELA.

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
Professional Learning- we will implement PLCs on a weekly basis for all teachers. This will help us to coach them and build their capacity as teachers.	Silvers, Jennifer, jsilvers@inprepcharter.org
Implementation of Cambridge - we are implementing Cambridge for all grades K-8. This will help provide teachers with instructional strategies and provide a deeper level of instruction for all students.	Reynolds, Danielle, dreynolds@inprepcharter.org
PLP's - We will implement Personal Learning Plans for each student. This will help students set goals and work towards achieving individual goals throughout the school year.	Reynolds, Danielle, dreynolds@inprepcharter.org