
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	22

Kipp V.O.I.C.E Academy

1440 MCDUFF AVE N, Jacksonville, FL 32254

<http://www.kippjax.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.

Together with families and communities, we create joyful, academically excellent schools that prepare students with the skills and confidence to pursue the paths they choose - college, career, and beyond - so they can lead fulfilling lives and build a more just world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every child grows up free to create the future they want for themselves and their communities.

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
Woods, Richele	Principal	Provides the common vision and mission for KIPP VOICE through the use of data based decision-making. Ensures the school based team provides full implementation of the SIP.
Fullmore, Melissa	Other	Provides a common vision for KIPP Jacksonville region through the use of data based decision making and ensures of implementation.
Nazon, Patrece	Other	The Manager of Student Support Services helps to lead the implementation and compliance of the growing student services programs across KIPP Jacksonville region. She oversees the policies and procedures to ensure full compliance in our schools. The Manager of Student Support Services oversees the special programs and procedures related to Special Education with support to Federal Title Programs, English Language Learners, 504, Behavior and Mental Health programs.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

The KIPP VOICE Academy staff works with the School Leadership Team and the Regional Academic Team to assess student needs and develop or change plans for providing support to students. All assistance is determined by student needs and is provided to the fullest extent possible. Throughout the school year, the support is adaptable and responsive to changes. This process enables teacher teams to

investigate possible causes of identified needs, both within groups and with individual students.

At KIPP VOICE teachers plan meetings with the Student Study Team based on student data. The team, comprised of staff leaders such as classroom teachers, specialists, and the principal, assesses the students' progress and needs. The most important aspect of this plan is to match a solution and/or strategy to the identified academic challenge. The personalized plan is solution-focused.

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 School Improvement Plan will be a part of our weekly data meetings. Benchmarks will be set and reviewed at set times to determine areas of growth or needed improvement.

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	98%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	Yes
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)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: D 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	43	50	41	33	37	40	30	59	0	333
One or more suspensions	2	0	1	7	14	14	23	25	0	86
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	11	15	2	9	1	10	2	12	0	62
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	47	45	49	29	25	0	195
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	42	59	64	36	25	0	226
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	47	45	49	29	25	0	195

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	47	45	49	29	25	0	195

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	11	15	2	9	1	10	2	12	0	62
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		
The number of students identified retained:		
Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level								Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
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	
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	
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*	18	45	53	23	47	55	22		
ELA Learning Gains				48			39		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				62			50		
Math Achievement*	18	46	55	16	40	42	18		
Math Learning Gains				33			24		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49			26		
Science Achievement*	22	45	52	6	45	54	15		
Social Studies Achievement*	61	62	68		50	59	65		
Middle School Acceleration		73	70		45	51	54		
Graduation Rate		72	74		41	50			
College and Career Acceleration		54	53		65	70			
ELP Progress		47	55		68	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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	28
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	142
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	34

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	237
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
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	17	Yes	4	2
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	27	Yes	2	1
HSP	30	Yes	1	1
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	27	Yes	2	1

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	20	Yes	3	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	33	Yes	1	
HSP				

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				
FRL	32	Yes	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	18			18			22	61				
SWD	11			17			17	42			5	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	17			17			19	59			5	
HSP	35			24							2	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	19			18			17	60			5	

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	23	48	62	16	33	49	6					
SWD	11	33	37	12	20	29	0					
ELL												
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	22	47	62	15	33	50	5					
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	23	48	63	17	30	37	5					

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	22	39	50	18	24	26	15	65	54			
SWD	7	33	40	10	22	25	13	31				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	21	39	52	17	24	26	15	65	53			
HSP	29	38		28	12							
MUL	29	40		33	36							
PAC												
WHT	36			30								
FRL	20	36	48	16	21	23	13	63	52			

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.

Grade	Year	ELA				
		School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	11%	47%	-36%	54%	-43%
07	2023 - Spring	20%	40%	-20%	47%	-27%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
04	2023 - Spring	20%	50%	-30%	58%	-38%
06	2023 - Spring	20%	38%	-18%	47%	-27%
03	2023 - Spring	22%	46%	-24%	50%	-28%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	18%	43%	-25%	54%	-36%
07	2023 - Spring	33%	40%	-7%	48%	-15%
03	2023 - Spring	18%	59%	-41%	59%	-41%
04	2023 - Spring	19%	58%	-39%	61%	-42%
05	2023 - Spring	13%	52%	-39%	55%	-42%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	22%	48%	-26%	51%	-29%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	60%	63%	-3%	66%	-6%

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.

After analyzing our FAST performance data, we identified that the lowest performance component is ELA with an average of 18.6% proficiency in grades 3-8. We believe that the following factors contributed to these results include:

The retention of certified teachers. The need to hire and build capacity of new and novice teachers with the implementation of standards based instruction and content knowledge in ELA. There is a need for more professional development aligned to the BEST standards. Students need additional supports in

place that will allow them practice and strengthen reading skills. Daily student attendance continues to be challenge. 15% of our students have missed 18 or more days and in grades K-8 our total ADA average was at a low 83%.

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

ELA continues to be the area that showed the greatest decline with a 4% decrease of proficiency from 2021-22 to 2022-2023. We believe the following factors contributed to this decline:

The retention of certified teachers. The need to hire and build capacity of new and novice teachers with the implementation of standards based instruction and content knowledge in ELA. There is a need for more professional development aligned to the BEST standards. Daily student attendance continues to be challenge. 15% of our students have missed 18 or more days and in grades K-8 our total ADA average was at a low 83%.

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 data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is 5th grade ELA. Our 5th grade ELA proficiency is 11%. This is a 4% decrease from the 2021-22 school year. We believe the following factors contributed to this decline:

The need to hire a certified ELA teacher for 5th grade. The average daily student attendance for 5th graders averages 78%.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the Civics EOC with 60% proficiency. As research shows, the number one indicator was having a certified and effective teacher in the 7th grade Civics classroom.

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

1. There is a need to implement strategies to increase the attendance rate in all grade levels.
2. The percent of students scoring proficiency (on grade level).

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

1. Increase the overall ELA performance to include proficiency and learning gains
2. Increase professional development for teachers to ensure clear understanding of essential skills, standards based instruction and the BEST standards
3. Increase the overall math performance to include proficiency and learning gains with a focus on 3-5.
4. Increase the attendance rate in all grade levels (K-8)

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 Early Warning System

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.

There is a critical need to improve behavior and supports. During the 2022-2023 school year there were 2,984 behavior referrals. After analyzing our referral data the hiring of an additional behavior support person allowed us to be able to decrease the amount of level 2 & 3 referrals to 363 behavior referrals. Our classroom teacher surveys continue to express disruptions and misbehaviors as a contributing factor to lower than desired academic support. In addition, we are continuing to lose teachers who do not feel supported and capable of providing a safe, learning community due to the amount of classroom disruptions. By creating a positive behavior team, we can efficiently implement restorative practices and improve student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Decrease the number of referrals by 25% for the 2023-2024.

Monitoring:

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

Monthly each grade level will be monitored to see if we are meeting our goal of 25%. The grade bands will be as follows: K-2, 3-5, & 6-8.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Richele Woods (rwoods@kipjax.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.)

Hire an additional school culture specialist to assist with de-escalation, restorative practices and reentry.

Teachers will receive and utilize strategies from the professional development sessions on culturally relative education, restorative practices, code of conduct and school-wide rituals and routines.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The primary role of the school culture specialist will be to support and promote a positive learning culture, provide support and implement restorative practices in order to increase student achievement.

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?

Yes

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.

Hire an additional school culture specialist to assist with de-escalation, restorative practices and re-entry.

Person Responsible: Richele Woods (rwoods@kipjax.org)

By When: Immediately

Teachers will participate in professional development that will focus on key areas such as culturally relevant pedagogy & classroom management.

Person Responsible: Richele Woods (rwoods@kipjax.org)

By When: TBD

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

There is a critical need to increase overall mathematics proficiency. After analyzing our performance data we identified that the overall performance levels in the area of math, showed significantly low levels of proficiency in grades 3-7. The proficiency data consists of: Grade 3- 18%, Grade 4- 19%, Grade 5 - 13%, Grade 6- 18% and Grade 7- 33%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase FAST Math Data (PMA 3) by 10 points
 Increase FAST Math Learning gains by 10 points
 Increase FAST Math Lowest Performing Quartile by 10 points

Monitoring:

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

The FAST PMA 1 & 2 will be analyzed to determine student progress.
 NWEA MAP will be administered and analyzed. 35% of students will be considered proficient by scoring in the 50th percentile on NWEA MAP in math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Richele Woods (rwoods@kipjax.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.)

I-Ready Standards Mastery and professional development will be used to identify student strengths and areas of instruction.

Teachers will be provided professional development and a resource to help with understanding of the BEST standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When analyzing our FAST data we noticed that students were in need of various supports. We believe that by building teacher capacity to first understand how to unpack the standards and then pinpoint what students know and exactly where they need support we will be able to increase student achievement.

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?

Yes

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Purchase I-ready Standards Mastery
2. Provide professional development to teachers on how to implement tiered instruction
3. Teachers will utilize resource to provide tiered-instruction

Person Responsible: Richele Woods (rwoods@kipjax.org)

By When: TBD

#3. 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.

There is a critical need to increase overall ELA proficiency. After analyzing our performance data we identified that the overall performance levels in the area of ELA, showed significantly low levels of proficiency in grades 3-7. The proficiency data consists of: Grade 3- 22%, Grade 4- 21%, Grade 5 - 11%, Grade 6- 20% and Grade 7- 19%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase FAST ELA Data (PMA 3) by 10 points
 Increase FAST ELA Learning gains by 10 points
 Increase FAST ELA Lowest Performing Quartile by 10 points

Monitoring:

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

PMA 1 & 2 will be used to determine students' progress.
 NWEA MAP will be administered and analyzed. 35% of students will be considered proficient by scoring in the 50th percentile on NWEA MAP in ELA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Richele Woods (rwoods@kipjax.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.)

I-Ready Standards Mastery and professional development will be used to identify student strengths and areas of instruction.

Teachers will be provided professional development and a resource to help with understanding of the BEST standards.

Additional support staff will be used to provide targeted small group lessons to students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When analyzing our FAST data we noticed that all students in all subgroups were in need of various supports. We believe that by building teacher capacity to first understand how to unpack the standards and then pinpoint what students know and exactly where they need support we will be able to increase student achievement.

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?

Yes

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Purchase I-ready Standards Mastery
2. Provide professional development to all teachers including ESE and intervention teachers on how to implement tiered instruction
3. Purchase additional laptops for student use to allow for individualization, differentiation and small group center time
4. All teachers including ESE teachers will utilize resource to provide tiered-instruction

Person Responsible: Richele Woods (rwoods@kipjax.org)

By When: Upon grant approval

Hire three (3) additional support staff

Person Responsible: Richele Woods (rwoods@kipjax.org)

By When: upon approval of the grant

In order for students to learn, they have to be in school. Average daily attendance was about 83%. We will implement various strategies such as motivators and incentives for students and families, wellness visits from the social worker and daily phone calls to improve attendance.

Person Responsible: Richele Woods (rwoods@kipjax.org)

By When: immediately

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).

Our school encourages input from stakeholders such as teachers, parents, business and faith based partners. Stakeholders provide input on a variety of services, programs and instructional resources.

Our ESE and RTI Team monitors the implementation of the MTSS. The team facilitates professional development and shares interventions strategies with school faculty and staff on RTI practices; Our team members collaborate with the Principal to allocate resources to support daily instruction; The MTSS/RTI Team members utilize the problem solving method to probe for causation, analyze and disaggregate student performance data to identify next steps for improvement; Monitor the implementation of the Response to Intervention model; Assess school needs for teachers and staff based upon the individual needs of students, class size and certified teachers.

Other activities such as Professional Learning Communities (PLC's), grade level teams carry the work forward with smaller groups of students. This academic and behavioral work will include the following, beginning with Tier 1 explicit instruction and continues through Tier 2 interventions: Identifying systematic patterns of student need, identifying appropriate evidence-based differentiation and intervention strategies, overseeing and monitoring, analyzing progress and determining next steps.

Instructional Coaches facilitate professional development and modeling of lessons for teachers utilizing a standards-based curriculum and best practices.

Focus grades 3, 4, and 5 have been identified in order to provide additional supports for classroom teachers and interventions within small group instruction. We call this WIN time. The acronym stands for "What I Need?".

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: Early Warning System				\$53,392.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	6100	160	1271 - Kipp V.O.I.C.E Academy	UniSIG	1.0	\$41,200.00
<i>Notes: Behavior Interventionist Salary</i>						
	5100	310	1271 - Kipp V.O.I.C.E Academy	UniSIG		\$5,000.00
<i>Notes: MDAM Cultural Pedagogy & Classroom Management PD: full day faculty PD, two 4-hr trainings, 2 instructors, and materials</i>						
	6100	200	1271 - Kipp V.O.I.C.E Academy	UniSIG		\$7,192.00
<i>Notes: Behavior Interventionist Benefits</i>						
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$37,761.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5900	510	1271 - Kipp V.O.I.C.E Academy	UniSIG		\$32,200.00
<i>Notes: Afterschool Tutoring - ELA: Gr2-8, January - May, Teacher Tutor Rate @\$100/hour, Lead Teacher Rate @\$150/hour, 2 days/week</i>						
	5100	510	1271 - Kipp V.O.I.C.E Academy	UniSIG		\$5,561.00
<i>Notes: i-Ready Standards Mastery License: Gr3-8 ELA, 720 students</i>						
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$248,509.64
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	369	1271 - Kipp V.O.I.C.E Academy	UniSIG		\$22,903.00
<i>Notes: Achieve 3000 Literacy License: Gr 6-8, 300 students</i>						
	5100	510	1271 - Kipp V.O.I.C.E Academy	UniSIG		\$5,560.80
<i>Notes: i-Ready Standards Mastery License: Gr3-8 Math, 720 students</i>						
	5100	150	1271 - Kipp V.O.I.C.E Academy	UniSIG	3.0	\$106,800.00
<i>Notes: Paraprofessional Salary</i>						
	5100	510	1271 - Kipp V.O.I.C.E Academy	UniSIG		\$6,021.00
<i>Notes: Professional Development Library: "Comprehensive Roadmaps" B.E.S.T. ELA; GrK-2: 24 X \$90.00/each, Gr3-5: 20 X \$90.00/each, Gr6-8: 21 X \$130.00/each</i>						

	5100	643	1271 - Kipp V.O.I.C.E Academy	UniSIG		\$34,924.84
			<i>Notes: Laptops: 131 laptops @219.50 + \$33.00 (console license) + \$10.00 (ACS fee) + \$500 (shipping)</i>			
	5900	510	1271 - Kipp V.O.I.C.E Academy	UniSIG		\$32,200.00
			<i>Notes: Afterschool Tutoring - Math: Gr2-8, January - May, Teacher Tutor Rate @\$100/hour, Lead Teacher Rate @\$150/hour, 2 days/week</i>			
	6400	120	1271 - Kipp V.O.I.C.E Academy	UniSIG		\$17,900.00
			<i>Notes: Afterschool Tutoring - Math: Gr2-8, January - May, Teacher Tutor Rate @\$100/hour, Lead Teacher Rate @\$150/hour, 2 days/week</i>			
	5100	200	1271 - Kipp V.O.I.C.E Academy	UniSIG		\$22,200.00
			<i>Notes: Paraprofessional Benefits</i>			
					Total:	\$339,662.64

Budget Approval

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

No