

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Henderson Hammock Charter School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	19
VI. Title I Requirements	21
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	22

Henderson Hammock Charter School

10322 HENDERSON RD, Tampa, FL 33625

www.hendersoncharter.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.

We will grow students to the best version of themselves.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To prepare every child for college or 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
Ramnath, Nirvani	Principal	

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.

Principal with staff evaluates data and presents data to all stakeholders quarterly during parent teacher conferences and Parent universities by grade level. Parents are given surveys to provide feedback on current processes and future needs. Here they can also make recommendations on action plan identified by the leadership team.

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))

Weekly team meeting with teachers and ESE department along with leadership where students data will be analyzed and adjustments will be made to current instructional plans to ensure students success.

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	92%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	79%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 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	30	41	33	27	34	26	32	52	36	311	
One or more suspensions	4	41	3	5	5	5	22	5	11	101	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	41	40	33	44	33	39	67	38	25	360	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	32	37	5	23	30	12	139	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	41	40	33	44	33	39	67	38	25	360	

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	12	29	20	29	13	27	24	22	8	184

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified retained:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level								Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	49	51	53	52	51	55	51		
ELA Learning Gains				52			61		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50			58		
Math Achievement*	56	50	55	55	41	42	47		
Math Learning Gains				64			52		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53			41		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	59	48	52	53	48	54	46		
Social Studies Achievement*	87	65	68	80	57	59	75		
Middle School Acceleration	97	70	70	91	51	51	82		
Graduation Rate		83	74		44	50			
College and Career Acceleration		33	53		68	70			
ELP Progress	51	52	55	63	73	70	42		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	436
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	613
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
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	50			
ELL	58			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	47			
HSP	62			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	61			

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	36	Yes	1	
ELL	59			
AMI				
ASN	73			
BLK	44			
HSP	62			
MUL	46			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	61			

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	49			56			59	87	97			51
SWD	31			38			35	90			5	55
ELL	43			50			53	81	98		7	51
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	43			49			50				3	
HSP	49			55			60	87	96		7	50
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	49			62			59		100		5	
FRL	48			54			56	86	97		7	50

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	52	52	50	55	64	53	53	80	91			63
SWD	26	41	47	33	46	36	24					
ELL	43	50	52	47	60	48	46	76	100			63
AMI												
ASN	64			82								
BLK	45	42	33	48	52	40	45					
HSP	51	52	53	54	65	55	52	77	93			64
MUL	46	55		38	45							
PAC												
WHT	63	53		64	61		63	84	89			
FRL	51	51	50	53	64	54	52	77	91			63

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	51	61	58	47	52	41	46	75	82			42
SWD	25	55	52	14	45	42	11	55				20
ELL	42	62	65	37	49	39	33	76				42

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	30			40								
BLK	36	50		31	55	45						
HSP	51	61	59	47	51	39	45	79	81			43
MUL	65	86		41	57							
PAC												
WHT	58	60		61	65	50	67	73				
FRL	48	59	58	44	51	39	44	75	83			43

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	40%	53%	-13%	54%	-14%
07	2023 - Spring	43%	47%	-4%	47%	-4%
08	2023 - Spring	62%	44%	18%	47%	15%
04	2023 - Spring	46%	54%	-8%	58%	-12%
06	2023 - Spring	49%	47%	2%	47%	2%
03	2023 - Spring	35%	46%	-11%	50%	-15%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	59%	53%	6%	54%	5%
07	2023 - Spring	57%	36%	21%	48%	9%
03	2023 - Spring	50%	55%	-5%	59%	-9%
04	2023 - Spring	49%	59%	-10%	61%	-12%
08	2023 - Spring	51%	57%	-6%	55%	-4%
05	2023 - Spring	27%	53%	-26%	55%	-28%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	52%	41%	11%	44%	8%
05	2023 - Spring	32%	47%	-15%	51%	-19%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	92%	55%	37%	50%	42%

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

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	99%	62%	37%	63%	36%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	80%	64%	16%	66%	14%

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.

The area with the lowest performance was in the area of English and Language Arts. Our school is a Title 1 school with 24% of the students enrolled in the ESOL program and 14% identified as students with disabilities. The contributing factor to the low performance was lack of Tier II instruction in the classroom.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was math with a 20% decline. Lack of teacher curriculum experience and the transition from Common Core to Florida BEST standards.

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 ELA. There is a high population of ESOL students who lack the vocabulary and comprehension of grade level text. Lack of teacher curriculum experience and pedagogy on how to instruction ESOL students contributed to this gap.

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 7th/8th grade Algebra and Geometry Accelerated Math. Teachers targeted level 2 students so they could obtain proficiency. Students participated in after school tutoring to support learning gaps. The teacher with the strongest content knowledge was placed to instruct this class.

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

The first area of concern was our Tier III students who lacked in reading foundational skills: phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary, and comprehension.

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

This upcoming school year highest priorities are Tier II and Tier III intervention, within the classroom and outside of the classroom. Another priority is to coach teachers to build their instructional capacity and improve purposeful planning. Providing students with access to rigorous courses (i.e. offering Algebra, Geometry, Biology)

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Individualized instruction will be provided for our SWD population in order to improve their ELA scores to the next proficiency level. We will increase ELA proficiency scores of SWD by 2 % by the end of the school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The school will use benchmarks such as NWEA and FAST to measure the growth of our SWD population. Another measurable outcome would be SWD students meeting their NWEA goal. 5% of our SWD population will meet their growth goals by the end of the school year.

Monitoring:

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

Student academic goals within their IEP will be monitored bi-weekly using Easy CBM by their ESE teacher. Also, teachers will be provided with an accommodation checklist to show proof of what accommodation they are using for the student task. ESE teachers will have a sign in sheet for classroom teachers to sign off on, to ensure that students are receiving their services. Tier 2 and 3 interventions will be provided weekly as required by certified teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nirvani Ramnath (nirvani.ramnath@charter.hcps.net)

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.)

The evidence-based intervention curriculum pieces being implemented are Fountas & Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention, iReady, and Heggerty.

Fountas & Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention and iReady incorporates foundational skills; phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, writing (minus iReady), and comprehension. Students are placed in instructional reading level groups in order to meet student's differentiated needs.

Heggerty is a phonemic awareness intervention for our non-reading students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We chose Fountas & Pinnell Leveled Literacy because studies show that students that participated in the program MAP (NWEA) scores had a minimum of double digits growth.

The i-Ready curriculum was chosen because it meets the criteria for ESSA level 3. According to i-Ready's research efficacy brief teachers that are using the i-Ready curriculum with their students show a significant increase in scores from fall to spring.

Heggerty was chosen because studies have shown that phonemic awareness is a foundational skill prior to being a fluent reader.

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. 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.

This school years area of focus, teacher retention and recruitment, was chosen because of teacher turnover and non certified teachers assigned to classrooms.

Measurable Outcome:

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

This school years measurable outcome is to retain 75% of our certified teachers.

Monitoring:

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

A staff quarterly survey will be sent to certified teachers to assess teacher morale and satisfaction with their work environment.

HR will send out an intent to return form to survey which certified teachers have intentions on returning the next school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nirvani Ramnath (nirvani.ramnath@charter.hcps.net)

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.)

The evidence-based intervention we will implement is our school wide mentorship program for all teachers. Each teacher and teacher leader will be assigned a mentor for the school year to build a positive accountability relationship. Twice a month mentors will meet with their mentee(s) for an intensive check in to discuss goals, mental health, and provide feedback.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research shows that mentoring programs have benefits for both the mentee and the mentor. When employees participate in a mentorship program retention rates are much higher. One statistic shows that mentees retention rate were at 72% for those who participated and 49% for those who did not.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

All funding will be used to hire certified interventionists/ teaching aides and instructional materials for our SWD population.

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

In grades K-2 we are adopting Orton-Gillingham as an instructional practice because OG is a direct, explicit, multi-sensory, structured way to teach literacy when reading, writing, and spelling does come easily to students.

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

In grades 3-5, we will be focusing on WICOR based strategies within instruction, since we are an AVID school, to increase vocabulary, comprehension, and writing skills/scores.

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

Our measurable outcome would be to decrease our students that score below a level 3 by 5-10%.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Our measurable outcome would be to decrease our students that score below a level 3 by 5-10%.

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.

To monitor student achievement outcomes we will use formative assessments, IFA's, DRA/RRR, and NWEA/FAST benchmarks.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Ramnath, Nirvani, nirvani.ramnath@charter.hcps.net

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?

Orton-Gillingham and AVID strongly meet the Florida's definition of evidence-based practices/programs.

Orton-Gillingham aligns with the Science of Reading and WIRCOR (AVID) is geared towards college and career readiness therefor aligns with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence based Reading Plan.

Orton-Gillingham focuses on phonics and reading fluency. WICOR incorporates strategies that focus on vocabulary, writing, inquiry, and reading comprehension.

Rationale:

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

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

The purpose for selecting Orton-Gillingham is because it is purposefully developed for children with disabilities where reading, writing, and spelling does not come easily to them.

The purpose for selecting WICOR strategies, which is based on AVID, is because studies show that students using these strategies have a high statistic for attending college or pursuing a career.

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
Literacy Leadership -Create a group comprised of school leadership, CRT's, and instructional support -Create goals that support improvement within reading	
Literacy Coaching -CRT's will support teacher with planning and implementation of Orton-Gillingham and WICOR strategies -CRT's will model to teachers how to effective implement Orton-Gillingham and WICOR strategies	
Assessment -Bi-weekly PLC's focused around data -Teachers will conference with students about personal goals (including reading growth or proficiency).	Ramnath, Nirvani, nirvani.ramnath@charter.hcps.net
Professional Learning -Grades K-2 will participate in a week long training about how to effectively use and implement the Orton-Gillingham program -During PLC's CRT's will use WICOR strategies that teachers can use within their own classrooms	

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

<https://www.hendersoncharter.org/>

In order to communicate the SIP with stakeholders, quarterly newsletters will be distributed and we will hold quarterly Parent University nights. This will allow us to keep stakeholders updated on where we are with the plan implementation.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school’s mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child’s progress.

List the school’s webpage* where the school’s Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

<https://www.hendersoncharter.org/>

We will foster positive relationships with our parents and community by engaging in regular communication to share relevant information and obtain parent feedback. Teachers will also send out weekly newsletters and adhere to our 24hr email response policy.

We will also hold an Open House where we will discuss curriculum, student expectations, and end of year goals.

Quarterly conference nights will take place each quarter to allow teachers and students to meet with parents to discuss the student grades, goals, and growth.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

We will use targeted interventions to identify areas of need and increase student proficiency in ELA and access to accelerated programs through our AVID implementation.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

n/a

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

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