

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# Early Beginnings Academy School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

**Table of Contents**

---

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>                                   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>I. School Information</b>                                       | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>                            | <b>11</b> |
| <b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>                               | <b>15</b> |
| <b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>                       | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b> | <b>18</b> |
| <b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>                                    | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>                       | <b>21</b> |

## Early Beginnings Academy

1411 NW 14TH AVE, Miami, FL 33125

[www.earlybeginningsacademy.org](http://www.earlybeginningsacademy.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),<br>(7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B)<br>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.**

The purpose of Early Beginnings Academy is to provide an optimum learning environment that will have the greatest academic and social/emotional impact on early learning for students from Pre-Kindergarten to 5th grade with a developmental disability or delay. We are committed to teaching and guiding young children to reach their potential through the use of research-based strategies and developmentally appropriate practices.

The mission of Early Beginnings Academy is to offer every student a holistic education focused on multi-sensory learning, meaningful relationships, guided growth, and artistic expression in a safe and compassionate environment. Our mission is driven by family partnerships and culturally responsive practices designed to inspire creativity, curiosity, and celebrate individual differences.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

Early Beginnings Academy fills a unique need in the community – allowing students with disabilities to begin their foundation of lifelong learning at the youngest possible age with typically developing daycare children to increase the possibility of transitioning to a general education setting based on psycho-educational testing and/or M-Team recommendations. Early Beginnings Academy will also provide continuity for Kindergarten through 5th grade students with significant cognitive delays to learn in a small structured environment on a modified curriculum until they enter 6th grade. Parents have the option of having their child with Early Beginnings Academy throughout their entire elementary school career.

### 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  |
|----------------|----------------|--|
| Eason, Ayanna  | Principal      | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Determine overall educational goals and outcomes measures to include status goals, FSAA testing, and growth based on access points.</li> <li>2. Set up curriculum and monitor effective and monitor effectiveness, ensuring fidelity to Access Point requirements.</li> <li>3. Develop and coordinate training for all staff.</li> <li>4. Ensure all IEP therapy logs are maintained for compliance</li> <li>5. Monitor therapy schedules</li> <li>6. Work collaboratively with QA principal to ensure charter compliance documents are completed and submitted</li> <li>7. Supervise all EBA staff members</li> <li>8. Provide training related to classroom structure, lesson planning, and IEP development</li> <li>9. Monitor classroom activities and ensure all policies are followed</li> <li>10. Communicate with family members regarding school enrollment, child progress, and school policies.</li> <li>11. Ensure ESOL compliance for MDCPS (testing, IEP, lesson planning)</li> <li>12. Attend MDCPS trainings</li> <li>13. Create/modify the SIP</li> <li>14. Review and disseminate MDCPS weekly briefings for compliance needs</li> <li>15. Facilitate standardized testing as the SAC</li> <li>16. Meet with each teacher monthly to review children's progress</li> <li>17. Ensure compliance with FLDOE, District, and State Compliance</li> <li>18. Recruit, hire, and manage all staff in conjunction with the COO, Executive Director, and Charter Board</li> </ol>                                 |
| Gasch, Meaghan | Principal      | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Coordinate therapy requests for district compliance</li> <li>2. Coordinate therapy requests and documentation</li> <li>3. Determine overall educational goals and outcome measures to include status of goals, FSAA testing, and growth based on access points</li> <li>4. Create and disseminate IEP calendar to EBA staff and therapists</li> <li>5. Ensure all IEP therapy logs are maintained for compliance</li> <li>6. Coordinate and act as LEA at IEP meetings with teachers, therapists, and the district for compliance</li> <li>7. In collaboration with the Principal and Social Worker, coordinate/supervise RT meetings</li> <li>8. Provide training, supervision, and overview of IEP process, cumulative files</li> <li>9. Create and monitor therapy schedules</li> <li>10. Work collaboratively with EBA Administrative Assistant to ensure certifications and Out of Field agreements are in compliance</li> <li>11. Work collaboratively with the Principal to ensure charter compliance documents are completed and submitted</li> <li>12. Provide supervision and training to teachers and ensure quality programs through effective teaching practices, data collection, assessment review, compliance with curriculum components, etc.</li> <li>13. Assist the Principal with creation and monitoring of SIP</li> <li>14. Oversee FBA/SE-BIP process for all teachers, support and monitor for accuracy on a quarterly basis</li> <li>15. Review and disseminate MDCPS Weekly Briefings</li> </ol> |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|------|----------------|--|
|      |                | 16. Export and review grade verification reports on a quarterly basis and follow-up with teachers<br>17. Assist in transition process, including arranging IEP meetings in collaboration with the LEA, district, and corresponding schools<br>18. Ensure compliance with FLDOE, District, and State Compliance<br>19. Recruit, hire, and manage all staff in conjunction with the COO, Executive Director, and Charter Board |

### 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.

Early Beginnings Academy has access to multiple stakeholders within the school, governing organization and community that contribute to student achievement and positive school culture. EBA's parents that participate on the ESSAC committee provide valuable insight regarding school changes, information, and community updates. EBA also partners multiple therapy companies throughout the community to ensure students are receiving high-quality care for occupational, physical, and speech therapy needs. In addition, EBA provides music therapy services for all students and facilitates a nationally approved internship program that trains students from all over the country to aid with Social Emotional Learning.

### SIP Monitoring

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

The administrative staff of Early Beginnings Academy will ensure all classrooms teachers have access to materials that are applicable to our student population with implementation of a modified ELA curriculum. The administrative staff will also provide professional development opportunities relating directly to the ELA curriculum and resources for instructional staff members based on our students IEP's. Supervise the creation and implementation of ELA lesson plans in alignment with Access Points using the B.E.S.T. standards and the curriculum. Meet with each instructional team monthly to review ELA data, including but not limited to work samples, pictures, videos, data sheets, and online progress monitoring tools. Lastly, review annual student IEPs to ensure ELA goals are appropriate and that the IEP's contain necessary accommodations or supports for students to experience growth and success.

### Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

|   |                           |
|---|---------------------------|
| <b>2023-24 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)                | Active                    |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)          | Special Education         |



|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>   | No  |
| <b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>   | 96%   |
| <b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>   | 10%   |
| <b>Charter School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>RAISE School</b>  | No  |
| <b>ESSA Identification</b><br>*updated as of 3/11/2024   | CSI   |
| <b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>  | No  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)*<br>English Language Learners (ELL)*<br>Black/African American Students (BLK)*<br>Hispanic Students (HSP)*<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)* |
| <b>School Grades History</b><br>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.  |   |
| <b>School Improvement Rating History</b>   | 2021-22: MAINTAINING  |
| <b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>   |   |

### Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator   | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|-------|
|   | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |    |       |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 1           | 5  | 5  | 3  | 5  | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |       |
| 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 ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |    |       |
| Level 1 on statewide 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. | 8           | 11 | 13 | 12 | 14 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 |       |

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 | 1           | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23    |

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 |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|-------|
|   | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Absent 10% or more days   |             | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6     |
| One or more suspensions   |             | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |
| Course failure in ELA   |             | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |
| Course failure in Math  |             | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   |             | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  |             | 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. | 6           | 11 | 13 | 15 | 15 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68    |

**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 | 1           | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6     |

**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) 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 days   | 1           | 1  | 1  | 1  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6  |       |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |    |       |
| Course failure in 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 ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |    |       |
| Level 1 on statewide 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. | 6           | 11 | 13 | 15 | 15 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 |       |

**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 | 1           | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6     |

**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*            | 10     | 60       | 53    | 3      | 62       | 56    | 15     |          |       |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 11     |          |       |        |          |       |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       |        |          |       |        |          |       |
| Math Achievement*           | 10     | 66       | 59    | 14     | 58       | 50    | 15     |          |       |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 53     |          |       |        |          |       |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       |        |          |       |        |          |       |

| Accountability Component        | 2023   |          |       | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                                 | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Science Achievement*            |        | 58       | 54    | 18     | 64       | 59    |        |          |       |
| Social Studies Achievement*     |        |          |       |        | 71       | 64    |        |          |       |
| Middle School Acceleration      |        |          |       |        | 63       | 52    |        |          |       |
| Graduation Rate                 |        |          |       |        | 53       | 50    |        |          |       |
| College and Career Acceleration |        |          |       |        |          | 80    |        |          |       |
| ELP Progress                    |        | 63       | 59    | 21     |          |       |        |          |       |

\* 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)               | CSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 15  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | Yes |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 4   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 45  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 3   |
| Percent Tested                                 | 97  |
| Graduation Rate                                |     |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index                     |     |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)               | CSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 20  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | Yes |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 5   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 120 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 6   |
| Percent Tested                                 | 100 |
| Graduation Rate                                |     |

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**

| <b>2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY</b> |  |                           |  |  |
|---|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| <b>ESSA Subgroup</b>                      | <b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b> | <b>Subgroup Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b> |
| SWD                                       | 15                                     | Yes                       | 2  | 2  |
| ELL                                       | 8                                      | Yes                       | 2  | 2  |
| AMI                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| ASN                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| BLK                                       | 20                                     | Yes                       | 2  | 2  |
| HSP                                       | 6                                      | Yes                       | 2  | 2  |
| MUL                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| PAC                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| WHT                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| FRL                                       |  |                           |  |  |

| <b>2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY</b> |  |                           |  |  |
|---|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| <b>ESSA Subgroup</b>                      | <b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b> | <b>Subgroup Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b> |
| SWD                                       | 20                                     | Yes                       | 1  | 1  |
| ELL                                       | 21                                     | Yes                       | 1  | 1  |
| AMI                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| ASN                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| BLK                                       | 11                                     | Yes                       | 1  | 1  |
| HSP                                       | 22                                     | Yes                       | 1  | 1  |
| MUL                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| PAC                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| WHT                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| FRL                                       | 20                                     | Yes                       | 1  | 1  |

**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                                   | 10       |        |             | 10        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| SWD  | 10       |        |             | 10        |         |              |          |         |           |                   | 3                   |              |
| ELL  | 7        |        |             | 8         |         |              |          |         |           |                   | 2                   |              |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 20       |        |             | 20        |         |              |          |         |           |                   | 2                   |              |
| HSP  | 5        |        |             | 6         |         |              |          |         |           |                   | 2                   |              |
| MUL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |

| 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                                   | 3        | 11     |             | 14        | 53      |              | 18       |         |           |                   |                     | 21           |
| SWD  | 3        | 11     |             | 14        | 53      |              | 18       |         |           |                   |                     | 21           |
| ELL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     | 21           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 7        |        |             | 15        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 0        | 20     |             | 13        | 50      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     | 25           |
| MUL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 3        | 11     |             | 14        | 53      |              | 18       |         |           |                   |                     | 21           |

| 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                                   | 15       |        |             | 15        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| SWD  | 15       |        |             | 15        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ELL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |

| 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 |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 17       |        |             | 17        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| MUL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 15       |        |             | 15        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |

### 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.

## 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.**

ELA is the lowest scoring subject area for 3rd to 5th grade students who completed the FSAA. Students at EBA have significant communication deficits which may impact how they interact with standardized testing. Classrooms had also just begun to implement the Superkids curriculum and had not been adequately trained on how to apply it to students with significant disabilities.

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

FSAA test scores for ELA students. Teacher turnover and inadequate use of ELA curriculum could have contributed to students not making progress.

**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 majority of EBA students scored level 1 and level 2 across all FSAA subjects while the district and state wide data are more proportionate across levels 1-4. This could be a reflection of the population of students served at EBA where all students are on a modified curriculum in the most restrictive setting. Students at EBA have a global cognitive IQ of below 67 and require significant support in all academic areas.

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

Scores were similar from the 2020-2021 to the 2021-2022 school year.

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

Students with excessive absences continue to require intensive ELA support. Additionally, the majority of students with absences are still not able to identify letters of the alphabet or communicate wants and needs appropriately.

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

1. Increasing ELA scores for 3rd - 5th grade students
2. Improving Math scores for 3rd - 5th grade students
3. Ensuring ELA curriculum is implemented with fidelity
4. Introduce and utilize the Renaissance Star reading assessment with students who have emerging reading skills.
5. Ensuring Math curriculum is implemented with fidelity.

#### **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.

EBA has experienced significant teacher turnover which has disrupted student learning and our ability to utilize curriculum resources with fidelity. ELA scores have not improved even with new curriculums being introduced to Kinder-5th grade students.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

EBA will utilize training and professional development opportunities to hire and retain 80% of classroom teachers and key personnel from September 2023 to June of 2024.

**Monitoring:**

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

New hires will participate in targeted training opportunities each week/month, including attendance logs and quality assurance assessments to determine effectivity. New staff will participate in a 3-month probationary evaluation to ensure they are aware of goals and challenges.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Ayanna Eason (ayannaeason@uco-ucpsfl.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.)

On the job training practices that target specific skills including classroom management and understanding students with disabilities. New hires will also participate in events that promote a positive organizational culture and teamwork.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

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

FSAA ELA scores for 3rd to 5th grade students due to lack of improvement from the 2020-2021 to 2021-2022 school year.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By June 2023, 80% of 3rd to 5th grade students will show an improvement in ELA scores from the 2022-2023 to 2023-2024 school year.

**Monitoring:**

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

Teachers will utilize Superkids and Star reading resources to support ELA learning and skill development.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Ayanna Eason (ayannaeason@uco-ucpsfl.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.)

Renaissance STAR reading assessments support student reading development using a targeted approach that is individualized for each student

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students currently do not participate in any sort of testing that shows subject-specific skills or approximate grade level. Utilizing the STAR assessment would allow teachers to target specific learning areas such as phonics, reading comprehension, fluency, etc.

**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***

## 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**

Evidenced-based curriculums that provide high- quality instructional resources are the best practice that is implemented with fidelity. Differentiated instruction, modified curriculum, and classroom accommodations are all components of the student Individualized Education Plan for our student population. 50 percent or more of our students with significant cognitive disabilities score below Level 3 in the area English Language Arts. As a result, we explicitly implement small group instruction to reinforce subject area content and allow students to learn at their own pace.

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

Evidenced-based curriculums that provide high- quality instructional resources are the best practice that is implemented with fidelity. Differentiated instruction, modified curriculum, and classroom accommodations are all components of the student Individualized Education Plan for our student population. 50 percent or more of our students with significant cognitive disabilities score below Level 3 in the area English Language Arts. As a result, we explicitly implement small group instruction to reinforce subject area content and allow students to learn at their own pace.

**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 June 2024, EBA students will achieve higher scores in the FSAA ELA assessment compared to the previous 2022-2023 testing data.

**Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes**

By June 2024, EBA students will achieve higher scores in the FSAA ELA assessment compared to the previous 2022-2023 testing data.

## 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.

Teachers will meet with the principal or other administrative team members monthly to review ELA data, lesson plans using access points/BEST standards, and student portfolios to ensure the curriculum is being used with fidelity and students have access to appropriate resources. All classrooms will also be observed four times a year at minimum to ensure instructional staff are implementing lesson plans and ELA curriculum successfully and effectively.

### Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Eason, Ayanna, [ayannaeason@uco-ucpsfl.org](mailto:ayannaeason@uco-ucpsfl.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?

Evidence-based curriculums are critical for student growth. The Super Kids and Unique Learning curriculums are both research-based and appropriate for students with significant cognitive disabilities given necessary modifications and adaptations. Based on best practices, EBA students require access and exposure to high-quality content together with modifications and accommodations as needed to meet the individual needs of each learner and of the state of Florida standards.

### Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Evidence-based curriculums that provide high quality instructional resources are a best practice for both the district and the state. Differentiated instruction, modified curriculum, and classroom accommodations

are all components of the students' Individualized Education Plan as students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. Multi-sensory learning and individualized instruction is provided during English Language Arts to ensure students are provided with adequate support and opportunities for learning and reading growth.

### 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              |
|---|--|
| Ensure all classrooms are adequately supported with curriculum materials, access to multiple instructional tools, and resources to implement explicate and direct ELA instruction.              | Eason, Ayanna,<br>ayannaeason@uco-ucpsfl.org   |
| Provide professional development opportunities related to direct instruction and ELA curriculum and resources for instructional staff members.  | Eason, Ayanna,<br>ayannaeason@uco-ucpsfl.org   |
| Supervise the creation and implementation of ELA lesson plans in alignment with Access Points using the B.E.S.T. Florida standards and ELA curriculum.  | Eason, Ayanna,<br>ayannaeason@uco-ucpsfl.org   |
| Meet with each instructional team members monthly to review ELA data, including but not limited to student work samples, pictures, videos, data trackers, and online progress monitoring tools. | Eason, Ayanna,<br>ayannaeason@uco-ucpsfl.org   |
| Review annual student IEP's to ensure ELA goals are appropriate and that the IEP's contain necessary accommodations or supports for students to experience growth and success.                  | Gasch, Meaghan,<br>meaghangasch@uco-ucpsfl.org |

## 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: Instructional Practice: ELA   | \$0.00 |
| Total: |        |  | \$0.00 |

### Budget Approval

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

Yes