Endeavor Academy School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Endeavor Academy

14063 KEN AUSTIN PKWY, Brooksville, FL 34613

www.edline.net/pages/hcsb_star

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To create a safe, caring and structured environment for at-risk students. Students are empowered to take responsibility for their social, behavioral, and academic goals.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To develop a "new" beginning for at-risk students aimed at success. "Vita Nova"

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
Burgess, Laura	Principal	Monitor overall operation of the school.
Crisp, Aimee	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Crisp teaches middle school ELA and is in the Aspiring Leaders Academy. Mrs. Crisp oversees professional development and is the SAC secretary.
Brown, Calvin	Dean	Mr. Brown handles discipline referrals and helps with the overall operation of the school.
Hoblit, Tiffany	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Hoblit teaches middle school science. She is in the Aspiring Leaders Academy and is overseeing MTSS/PBIS and Assessment.
Webster, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Webster is the Endeavor Team Leader. She assists with the Endeavor Academy student schedules.
Arey, Erin	Teacher, ESE	Ms. Arey is the Discovery Academy Team Leader. She assists with Discovery student schedules.

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.

Met with students and families. Surveyed teachers and staff members. Met with SAC which includes community leaders. Their input was used in developing needs and goals for School Improvement.

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))

Endeavor is a school for at-risk students, and, as such, the majority of our students are in the categories where there are achievement gaps. The SIP will be monitored monthly during staff meetings and SAC meetings to ensure that steps are taken to meet the goals, and to determine if goals need to be revised or updated. SAC will determine how funds are allocated to support SIP goals.

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)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	48%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
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)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* White Students (WHT)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: MAINTAINING 2018-19: MAINTAINING 2017-18: MAINTAINING 2016-17: UNSATISFACTORY
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	21	34	113
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	20	22	96
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	8	7	21	56
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	24	62
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	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	17	22	34	120

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	21	34	67
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	20	22	56
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	8	7	21	36
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	24	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	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	17	22	34	73

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*	6	42	50	14	44	51	9		
ELA Learning Gains				21			31		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	26	32	38	11	35	38	6		
Math Learning Gains				29			17		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*	16	58	64	24	41	40	8		
Social Studies Achievement*	25	57	66	23	43	48	20		
Middle School Acceleration					40	44			
Graduation Rate	0	90	89	0	57	61	0		
College and Career Acceleration		49	65		57	67			
ELP Progress		52	45						

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](https://www.floridacims.org).

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	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	73
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	93
Graduation Rate	0

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	17
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	122
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	90
Graduation Rate	0

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	9	Yes	3	3
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	15	Yes	4	4
FRL	14	Yes	4	4

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	9	Yes	2	2
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	5	Yes	1	1
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	20	Yes	3	3
FRL	17	Yes	3	3

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	6			26			16	25		0		
SWD	8			10							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	6			24			29				4	
FRL	5			25			12				3	

| 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	14	21		11	29		24	23		0		
SWD	0	17		0	0		30					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK				0	10							
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	8	20		14	29		30					
FRL	13	21		7	23		20					

| 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	9	31		6	17		8	20		0		
SWD	13	36		11	19		17					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	0			0								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	0	25		0	20		0			0		
FRL	4	33		4	13		6					

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
10	2023 - Spring	9%	44%	-35%	50%	-41%
05	2023 - Spring	*	56%	*	54%	*
07	2023 - Spring	13%	40%	-27%	47%	-34%
08	2023 - Spring	14%	35%	-21%	47%	-33%
09	2023 - Spring	0%	48%	-48%	48%	-48%
06	2023 - Spring	*	42%	*	47%	*

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	0%	44%	-44%	54%	-54%
07	2023 - Spring	14%	52%	-38%	48%	-34%
08	2023 - Spring	31%	40%	-9%	55%	-24%
05	2023 - Spring	*	50%	*	55%	*

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	13%	43%	-30%	44%	-31%
05	2023 - Spring	*	55%	*	51%	*

ALGEBRA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	8%	46%	-38%	50%	-42%

GEOMETRY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	18%	42%	-24%	48%	-30%

BIOLOGY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	24%	57%	-33%	63%	-39%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	21%	61%	-40%	66%	-45%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	21%	56%	-35%	63%	-42%

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.

Based on 2022-2023 FAST data, our lowest performance is evident in the amount of students scoring on grade-level (3 or higher) in ELA (10%). Learning gains for students tested during PM3 was also low at 20.5%. Our school services students at-risk of not graduating, with all students either being expelled or retained at least one academic year. ELA is an area our students have historically struggled in as it lays the foundation for success in all other subjects. This was also the first year implementing FAST assessments tied to the BEST standards.

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

When reviewing proficiency levels from 2021-2022, science showed the greatest decline. The percentage earning a level 3 or higher dropped from 24% to 13%. A potential factor is the span of content and skills tested in the middle school science assessment is typically introduced before our students come to us. Our credit recovery and advancement methods for at-risk students typically requires students to take a more rigorous high school course, therefore students are not exposed to a percentage of the content on the assessment.

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.

When comparing proficiency in each subject to the state average, the greatest gap was identified in 6th grade math where 0% of students showed proficiency, compared to the state average of 54%. We typically don't have a large quantity of 6th graders – only 11 were tested - and a portion of those tested were our elementary students who started 6th grade math during the second semester and didn't have the full year to receive instruction on the tested skills.

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

8th grade math showed the most improvement during the 2022-2023 school year with 31% on grade-level and only a 9% gap between the school and district data. Students received targeted support from an increase of math teachers in their classrooms, as two of the special education teachers assigned to a number of the math periods also carry math certifications.

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

One area of concern getting in the way of student success is attendance. Many of the students miss over 10% of school days with unexcused and excused absences. An additional area of concern is the amount of student receiving suspensions. While we are an alternative school, valuable instruction time is lost when students are receiving high quantities of in-school and out-of-school suspensions.

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

1. Suspensions
2. Instructional practices - learning gains
3. Attendance

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.

Due to a high number of suspensions resulting in lack of instructional time, one area of focus will be increasing PBIS at both the classroom and school level.

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

The measurable outcome will be the percentage of students who are eligible to return to their zoned schools meeting program requirements. One of the main barriers of students completing the alternative school program is their number of suspensions.

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

Progress monitoring will be completed through ongoing tracking of Endeavor point cards, as well as program completion data at the end of each semester.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laura Burgess (burgess_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Designation of a site-based PBIS coach, Tiffany Hoblit, who will attend monthly district MTSS/PBIS trainings. Professional development specific to classroom management and PBIS strategies as well as the development of a PBIS committee.

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

Targeted professional development will ensure that teachers and staff have the tools to address behaviors in their classrooms and through the utilization of violence prevention counselors, reducing the amount of discipline referrals and suspensions. A PBIS committee will collaborate and implement schoolwide incentives throughout the academic year, in conjunction with our PBIS field trip grant from the Hernando County Education Foundation.

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.

Endeavor point card input and monitoring used to determine students that are eligible and on track for program completion.

Person Responsible: Calvin Brown (brown_c@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly

Scheduling of professional development regarding PBIS and classroom management strategies

Person Responsible: Laura Burgess (burgess_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing

Monitoring of in and out-of-school suspension rates.

Person Responsible: Laura Burgess (burgess_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

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.

This area of focus is in response to low performance on grade-level across the content areas. Professional learning communities will be implemented to analyze student data and inform instruction to increase learning gains. There will be a focus on reading across the content areas, as data showed limited proficiency in ELA and reading comprehension is vital to success in all subjects.

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

The most recent measure of learning gains calculated in the school improvement rating was 33% for ELA and 32% for mathematics. The specific desired outcome is to raise both learning gain percentages to at least 40% for the 2023-2024 academic year.

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

PLCs will engage in progress monitoring using the online curriculum Edgenuity and the intensive reading program Achieve3000. The elementary program will also utilize data from I-Ready assessments. Data will also be monitored using the PM1 and PM2 FAST assessment results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laura Burgess (burgess_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

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.)

PLCs will increase collective teacher efficacy which has a strong correlation to student achievement.

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

PLCs will allow teachers to collaborate to problem solve student progress on lessons completed and standard mastery. Formative data will also be analyzed to inform instruction, leading to increased learning gains. Teachers will be able to share strategies for enhancing reading across the subject areas in relation to the core curriculum, Edgenuity.

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.

Designation and scheduling of Professional Learning Communities.

Person Responsible: Laura Burgess (burgess_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly

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).

School improvement funding allocations will be reviewed by the School Advisory Council in order to include all stakeholders.