Duval Charter School At Coastal School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Duval Charter School At Coastal

12800 BEACH BLVD, Jacksonville, FL 32224

www.coastalcharter.org

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At Coastal We Learn, Lead, and Laugh:

•While igniting a passion for learning in all students and staff through collaboration, modeling, and celebration.
•While fostering future leaders within a community of reflective and responsible citizens to inspire others through trust, transparency, and integrity.
•While nurturing relationships between school, home, and community to create a comfortable space for laughter, learning, and leading.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to empower a generation of confident, respectful, and empathetic leaders who leave footprints through their unique contributions to our world.

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
Hilliker, Mike	Principal	Serve as Educational Leader of the School Serve as a Chief Administrator of the School Supervise and Develops Staff; Cultivate leadership in others Communicate with Stakeholders Shape the vision of success for all students within the CSUSA framework Lead the team, including all stakeholders, on a journey to sustainable success through long-term planning with ongoing monitoring, support and measurable milestones. Create a climate conducive to student success Improve teacher practice through ongoing observations, coaching, feedback and support Manage people, data and processes with the goal of school improvement Professional Standards for Educational Leaders Develop, advocate, and enact a shared mission, vision, and core values of high-quality education and academic success and well-being of each student Act ethically and according to professional CSUSA norms Strive for equity of educational opportunity and culturally responsive practices Develop and support intellectually rigorous and coherent systems of curriculum, instruction, and assessment Cultivate an inclusive, caring, and supportive school community Develop the professional capacity and practice of school personnel Foster a professional community of teachers and other professional staff Engage families and the community in meaningful, reciprocal, and mutually beneficial ways Manage school operations and resources Act as agents of continuous improvement

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.

School leadership team meets in the summer including teachers and interested parents to determine our yearly goals. Several times a year in conjunction with teachers, staff and community members examine our goals and assess these goals. In addition, we work with our state team to evaluate our goals and determine our next steps.

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))

Several times a year in conjunction with teachers, staff and community members examine our goals and assess these goals. In addition, we work with our state team to evaluate our goals and determine our next steps.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	55%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	48%
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: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	29	25	30	11	10	11	14	18	25	173
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4	12	22
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	2	1	0	1	1	0	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	17	16	40	54	69	62	49	59	0	366
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	2	5	19	61	107	85	52	45	6	382
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	22	16	44	49	76	68	55	65	53	448

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	4	4	3	7	10	15	12	1	1	57

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	4

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified retained:

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

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

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

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

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	51	45	53	61	47	55	58		
ELA Learning Gains				55			49		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43			50		
Math Achievement*	59	46	55	63	40	42	64		
Math Learning Gains				55			32		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50			34		
Science Achievement*	55	45	52	50	45	54	55		
Social Studies Achievement*	76	62	68	85	50	59	78		
Middle School Acceleration	88	73	70	79	45	51	59		
Graduation Rate		72	74		41	50			
College and Career Acceleration		54	53		65	70			
ELP Progress	55	47	55	61	68	70	68		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	446
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	602
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	37	Yes	2	
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN	75			
BLK	49			
HSP	56			
MUL	59			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	57			

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	35	Yes	1	
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN	59			
BLK	50			
HSP	56			

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	63			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	58			

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	51			59			55	76	88			55
SWD	29			28			30	60			5	
ELL	28			43			30	72	80		6	55
AMI												
ASN	58			73			77	79	87		5	
BLK	44			35			46	73			5	
HSP	39			49			43	74	90		7	45
MUL	56			56			64				3	
PAC												
WHT	59			67			57	81	88		7	71
FRL	40			49			48	71	90		7	49

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	61	55	43	63	55	50	50	85	79			61
SWD	27	37	36	29	47	39	23	43				
ELL	33	48	52	52	46	60	17	86				61
AMI												
ASN	66	57	30	71	53		56	82				

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	53	55	43	45	55	41	26	82				
HSP	48	49	38	56	55	53	38	79	64			75
MUL	61	63		65	63							
PAC												
WHT	70	57	44	69	56	50	62	88	83			57
FRL	55	54	42	52	52	55	41	91	79			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	58	49	50	64	32	34	55	78	59			68
SWD	25	29	37	35	24	31	30	56				
ELL	43	55	63	63	49	50	56	85	50			68
AMI												
ASN	64	40		76	26		76		85			
BLK	47	47	43	35	24	29	48	71	62			
HSP	53	45	48	61	30	24	48	78	54			72
MUL	38	32		54	21		36					
PAC												
WHT	66	55	61	72	38	46	60	79	58			75
FRL	52	43	45	54	29	29	45	73	48			68

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	46%	47%	-1%	54%	-8%
07	2023 - Spring	45%	40%	5%	47%	-2%

ELA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	52%	41%	11%	47%	5%
04	2023 - Spring	54%	50%	4%	58%	-4%
06	2023 - Spring	48%	38%	10%	47%	1%
03	2023 - Spring	57%	46%	11%	50%	7%

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	54%	43%	11%	54%	0%
07	2023 - Spring	49%	40%	9%	48%	1%
03	2023 - Spring	77%	59%	18%	59%	18%
04	2023 - Spring	49%	58%	-9%	61%	-12%
08	2023 - Spring	47%	45%	2%	55%	-8%
05	2023 - Spring	52%	52%	0%	55%	-3%

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	41%	35%	6%	44%	-3%
05	2023 - Spring	47%	48%	-1%	51%	-4%

ALGEBRA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	90%	52%	38%	50%	40%

GEOMETRY

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

BIOLOGY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	93%	64%	29%	63%	30%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	75%	63%	12%	66%	9%

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.

Our students with disabilities subgroups showed the lowest performance the last school year. Consistency of staff was a contributing factor to the low performance in addition to attendance issues for several students.

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

ELA proficiency dropped from 61 percent proficient to 51 percent proficient from 21-22 school year to the 22-23 school year. We have experienced teacher turnover as well as a large increase in our ELL population and it continues to grow.

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.

Math proficiency in the 4th grade showed the greatest gap with a 12% difference between our percentage and the states. We have experienced teacher turnover as well as a large increase in our ELL population and it continues to grow.

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

Middle school acceleration showed the greatest growth between the 21-22 and 22-23 school year. We were able to make staffing changes and hired experienced teachers in this area. In addition, students' data was scrutinized before placement and tutoring and bootcamps were provided for those students who showed signs of struggling.

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

Achievement levels for core subjects of Language Arts, Math, and Science were low for the SWD subgroup. Specifically, the percentage of students meeting proficiency in grades 4-8 in Math is a potential area of concern.

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

Focus on core class support for SWD students through ESE to increase proficiency and learning gains. Focus on RTI strategies to greater impact student success.

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.

For the SWD subgroup the school achieved a points index of 35% with the cutoff being 41%. This was the only area where we are identified as ATSI.

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

We will increase our percentage of proficient students with disabilities from 35% to 45% this school year.

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

The area of focus will be monitored through quarterly data chats with the classroom teachers and ESE teachers. We will look at Star and fast data in addition to our NWEA data, progress monitoring and standards mastery tracking.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mike Hilliker (mhilliker@coastalcharter.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.)

Targeted small group instruction based on our FAST, Star and NWEA data to improve the outcomes for our ESE students using our SAAVAS curriculum.

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

The students need targeted instruction based on their needs and deficiencies in each academic area.

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.

Train teachers (PD) in best practices for small group instruction.
Monitor through walkthroughs and data chats with classroom teachers and ESE teachers based on formative assessments.

Person Responsible: Mike Hilliker (mhilliker@coastalcharter.org)

By When: By May 29th 2024

#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.

Increase the teacher and community involvement and awareness of opportunities to participate in local decision making.

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

We will see an increase on the percentage of staff and parents who strongly agree that there are opportunities to participate in school decisions on our school surveys.

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

Increase in the percentage of staff and parents that agree that there are opportunities to participate in school decisions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mike Hilliker (mhilliker@coastalcharter.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.)

Increase opportunities for teachers and parents to join committees and participate in decisions.

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

This is consistently a low indicator in or staff and parent surveys.

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.

Provide opportunities for staff and stakeholders to participate in local decision making.

Person Responsible: Mike Hilliker (mhilliker@coastalcharter.org)

By When: May 29th 2024

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).

After reviewing the data, we used grant funding to increase our support to these students. We were able to hire additional ESE teachers and ESOL support to reach as many of our ESE students many of whom are also ESOL students. Hired additional interventionists to assist our students in meeting their goals and becoming proficient.