Sculptor Charter School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Sculptor Charter School

1301 ARMSTRONG DR, Titusville, FL 32780

http://www.sculptorcharter.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.

Sculpting Young Minds to Shape the Future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Sculptor Charter School will develop culturally literate citizens who are successful in the real world by delivering a world class education in a collaborative environment with a passion for learning.

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
Quam, Christine	Principal	* Instructional leader focused on student achievement * Collaborates with others to develop strategies to improve student achievement * Encourages others to collaborate * Uses data to improve learning * Provides support to all staff, particularly instructional staff * Provides feedback to instructional staff * Assists in aligning curriculum, assessment, and instruction * Provides and allocates resources * Uses data to determine staff professional development activities to strengthen instructional skills * Writes plans for funding and monitors progress of same * Ensures school safety needs are met * Serves on the Threat Assessment team * Handles school discipline
	Assistant Principal	* Instructional leader focused on student achievement * Collaborates with others to develop strategies to improve student achievement * Encourages others to collaborate * Uses data to improve learning * Provides support to all staff, particularly instructional staff * Provides feedback to instructional staff * Assists in aligning curriculum, assessment, and instruction * Provides and allocates resources * Uses data to determine staff professional development activities to strengthen instructional skills * Testing Coordinator * Ensures school safety needs are met * Serves on the Treat Assessment Team * Handles school discipline
Hoogerwerf, Michelle	Other	* Provides counseling services to students to ensure their mental health needs are being met * Assists in developing and implementing behavior plans, as needed * Instrumental in the MTSS process * Collaborates with others to develop strategies to improve student achievement * Encourages others to collaborate * Uses data to improve learning * Provides support to instructional staff as they work throught the IPST/MTSS process

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.

Sculptor has a School Advisory Council which includes the Principal (myself), two teachers, three parents, and a board/community member. The purpose of the SAC is to assist in the preparation and evaluation (developing and evaluating) of the results of the school improvement plan. The SAC reviews relevant data (which is much more than test scores), identifies problem areas, develops improvement strategies, monitors their implementation, and then starts the whole process over when the next round of data is available. The input is used to identify problem areas and develop the strategies in the SIP to address those student needs.

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

The SIP will be monitored throughout the year by utilizing the state's progress monitoring assessments (FAST PM1, 2, & 3) as well as other diagnostic and instructional supports including IReady (Reading and Math), Dibels (Reading), Zearn (math K-5), IXL (math 6-8) and Penda (science). The data will be used to determine if these monitoring programs and supplemental instructional resources are effective in increasing student achievement. The data will be analyzed and discussed in weekly/monthly meetings with grade level teams and administration, the teacher leadership team, the ESE team and interventionist, and with the SAC.

Demographic Data	
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	20%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	27%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	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)	
School Grades History	2021-22: A 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	0	5	5	4	3	1	3	2	3	26
One or more suspensions	1	3	1	2	3	5	4	11	9	39
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	9	6	5	4	31
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	14	14	5	2	45
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	11	8	36

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	1	0	4	6	3	4	18

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

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	2	3	4	2	3	3	5	2	0	24
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	5	0	8
Course failure in ELA	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	8	6	5	4	6	36
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	13	13	5	2	5	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	1	0	7	8	6	5	4	6	40

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	2	3	4	2	3	3	5	2	0	24
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	5	0	8
Course failure in ELA	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	8	6	5	4	6	36
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	13	13	5	2	5	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	1	0	7	8	6	5	4	6	40

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
				Grade Level						
Retained Students: Current Year	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	68	64	57	74	65	61
ELA Learning Gains	59	56	55	65	58	59
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44	49	46	59	54	54
Math Achievement*	68	66	55	70	67	62
Math Learning Gains	69	62	60	66	62	59
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	66	57	56	57	59	52
Science Achievement*	58	63	51	70	62	56
Social Studies Achievement*	90	77	72	82	80	78
Middle School Acceleration	71			77		
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress						

* 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	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	593
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

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	39	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	66			
MUL	71			
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	63			

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)

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	68	59	44	68	69	66	58	90	71			

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
SWD	32	48	46	41	42	33	30					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	73	58		67	65							
MUL	81	80		69	76		50					
PAC												
WHT	66	57	40	68	67	67	58	90	68			
FRL	64	62	40	64	75	61	52	80	69			

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	69	63	59	58	49	41	50	96	81			
SWD	21	37	45	32	26	30	17					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	71	62		58	52							
MUL	76	72		60	50							
PAC												
WHT	69	62	56	59	50	42	53	94	80			
FRL	66	62	60	51	52	63	55	100	71			

2018-19 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	74	65	59	70	66	57	70	82	77			
SWD	55	55	56	57	66	69	43					
ELL												
AMI												

| 2018-19 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	84	77		77	69		92					
MUL	68	57		68	53		42	80				
PAC												
WHT	74	65	60	70	67	59	71	85	72			
FRL	72	65	64	72	67	62	68	86	55			

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	48%	59%	-11%	54%	-6%
07	2023 - Spring	56%	53%	3%	47%	9%
08	2023 - Spring	56%	52%	4%	47%	9%
04	2023 - Spring	73%	61%	12%	58%	15%
06	2023 - Spring	49%	61%	-12%	47%	2%
03	2023 - Spring	58%	56%	2%	50%	8%

| MATH | | | | | | |
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	67%	67%	0%	54%	13%
07	2023 - Spring	57%	58%	-1%	48%	9%
03	2023 - Spring	63%	60%	3%	59%	4%
04	2023 - Spring	67%	61%	6%	61%	6%
08	2023 - Spring	47%	38%	9%	55%	-8%
05	2023 - Spring	55%	55%	0%	55%	0%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	60%	48%	12%	44%	16%
05	2023 - Spring	48%	57%	-9%	51%	-3%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	84%	51%	33%	50%	34%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	77%	50%	27%	48%	29%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	85%	69%	16%	66%	19%

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 data components that showed the lowest performance on the state assessments in 2022 were in ELA in grades 5 and 6. The percentage of students scoring at Level 3 or above in ELA for grade 5 was 48%. In grade 6, students at Level 3 or above was 49%. In math, the lowest performance was in grades 8 and 5. The percentage of Level 3 or above in Math for grade 8 was 47% and in grade 5 it was 55%. Some of the decline in these areas can still be attributed to learning loss that occurred during the pandemic, especially when students were in intermediate grades where new skills are taught and developed before moving on to middle school. Many students struggled to make learning gains while learning at home virtually. While the gaps are closing for some students in some areas, others continue to impact achievement. The other contributing factor is most likely an increase in teacher turnover which occurred in the middle of the school year in a couple of grades.

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 2022 to 2023 was Math in grade 7 that went from 85% at Level 3 and above to 57% at Level 3 and above. In ELA grade 8, the percentage of students at Level 3 and above went from 74% in 2022 to 56% in 2023. One contributing factor is an increased lack of student engagement and apathy in the classroom. In addition, there was an increase in off-task and negative behaviors that most likely had an impact on learning.

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 compared to the state average was Math in grade 8 where the percentage was 47% at Level 3 and higher compared to the state at 55%. The next biggest gap was in grade 5 ELA where the percentage was 48% at Level 3 and higher compared to the state at 54%. The factors that contributed were most likely student engagement and gaps created over the pandemic. Students in middle school were in key grade levels durrng the pandemic where new math skills were introduced while students were at home e-learning. The support was not there as it would have been in the classroom and some students have been struggling to catch up with more difficult abstract algebraic concepts which are taught in middle school grades and are built upon gradually in upper elementary grade levels.

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 in grade 4 Math where the percentage of students scoring at Level 3 and above increased by 7%. This grade changed their departmentalization structure to allow for one teacher to teach math to all three classes. This allowed for more consistency in instruction throughout and provided the opportunity for one teacher to focus in on math skills more. In addition, this grade level had a designated RtI time focused on math intervention. The school continued to utilize online software programs such as IReady and Zearn to diagnose and supplement instruction.

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

Potential areas of concern from the EWS data are the number of students scoring a level 1 on the statewide Math assessment (45) and the number of suspensions across grade levels (39).

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

1. Increase in Achievement in the subgroup SWD
2. Increase Science Achievement
3. Increase Math Achievement
4. Decrease negative behaviors & suspensions (Positive School Climate)
5. Increase ELA Achievement

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.

The school was identified in 2021 as ATSI due to the subgroup of SWD scoring 39% which is below the Federal Index of 41%.

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

The measureable outcome the school plans to achieve is for the subgroup of SWD to increase from 39% to 41% based on state assessment data.

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

Students with disabilities that are not performing at grade level (as determined by previous state assessment results, current FAST results, and/or curriculum based assessments) will participate in progress monitoring (Reading, Math, & Science) through IReady and Penda. This data will be used along with the curriculum based assessments in order to determine specific areas of learning and individualized focus points. The school's new interventionist will provide targeted instruction in small groups to support learning achievement in the classroom and through the IPST/MTSS process.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christine Quam (quam.chris@sculptorcharter.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.)

Direct /Explicit Instruction and Feedback: Through progress monitoring results, identify target skill, teach skill/concept in multiple ways, model, provide practice opportunities for students, provide feedback that is specific and timely, provide additional practice and support, post-test (progress monitoring), and reteach as needed.

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

John Hattie has identified direct instruction as a high yield strategy (.59 effect size). Both Robert Marzano and John Hattie agree that struggling learners need immediate feedback in order to improve their learning.

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 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.

Data was pulled through the Early Warning System and it showed that the school had 39 suspensions and at least one in every grade level in the 2022-2023 school year compared to 20 suspensions the previous school year (2021-2022).

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

The specific measureable outcome the school plans to achieve is to decrease suspension rate by 20% across all grade levels.

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored through the use of FOCUS and PBIS Rewards. These are both computer based programs where discipline data is documented and tracked. The school's administration and teacher leadership team will meet to discuss the data and determine possible solutions or interventions needed depending on the results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christine Quam (quam.chris@sculptorcharter.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.)

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

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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).

Federal funding that was received by the school was utilized to implement an after-school tutoring program as well as a summer tutoring program. Students were recommended based on assessment and progress monitoring data and this included students in the lowest 25% in addition to students with disabilities. The students were provided a diagnostic and progress monitoring was completed each week. A post-test was used to determine outcomes and if the interventions were successful in raising student achievement levels. Students were assessed for determine if mastery of the Florida standards was achieved. Funding will be utilized again this year to continue the tutoring programs. Other funds will be used to purchase online programs that progress monitor students and provide targeted instruction in all three Tiers.

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

N/A

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

The ELA FAST assessment for 2022-2023 indicates that one grade level (3rd to 5th) had more than 50% of its students score below a Level 3. Grade 5 had 51% of students score either a Level 1 or Level 2. The Area of Focus for these these students will be increasing reading comprehension skills, analyzing informational text, and progress monitoring and assessing using IReady. The schools ELA curriculum, CKLA, will be used to provide differentiated instruction along with both formative and summative assessments for on-going progress monitoring. Students identified as below grade level will receive additional support from the school's interventionist.

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

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The school plans to increase the number of students achieving Level 3 or higher on the FAST (ELA) in grades 5 and 6 from 49% to 55%.

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.

The school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes through FAST and IReady progress monitoring. Ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement by providing targeted skills for intervention and differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Young, Kristen, young.kristen@brevardschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

The school is utilizing the I Ready online system for progress monitoring, assessing students, and to provide targeted support and differentiation to address specific student needs. This program incorporates the use of a "Stretch Goal". Developed years before the pandemic to provide an aspirational or "stretch" growth goal for students at any level, Stretch Growth is a novel approach to measuring student progress to proficiency and beyond. There is a growing body of evidence that shares context on Stretch Growth goal setting and the impact on students and their learning over time. I Ready's assessment and instructional solutions are grounded in research to deliver rigorous instruction and comprehensive support to help students at all levels, from all backgrounds, achieve their greatest possible gains. I-Ready and Ready are backed by timely research conducted in diverse educational settings. This research meets the criteria for "evidence-based" as defined by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

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?

Across all grades and in both subjects, results provide evidence for the strong correlation between IReady Diagnostic and the FAST PM1 and PM2. Specifically, correlations between fall IReady scores and FAST PM1 scores ranged from .77 to .81 for ELA Reading and from .75 to .84 for Mathematics. Correlations between winter IReady scores and FAST PM2 scores ranged from .77 to .82 for ELA Reading and from .82 to .86 for Mathematics. These correlations, all surpassing the .70 standard generally considered to be strong in education research, provide evidence of a substantial relationship between IReady Diagnostic and the FAST Progress Monitoring assessments.

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
Use IReady diagnostic, FAST scores, and classroom based assessments (formative/summative) to determine specific skills that need to be addressed for each student. Students will receive targeted instruction through IReady and specified RtI time within the classroom (Assessment). In addition, the interventionist will work with students in small groups to support instruction in the classroom.	Quam, Christine, quam.chris@sculptorcharter.org

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.

N/A

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

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

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Mental health problems can affect a student's energy level, concentration, dependability, mental ability, and optimism, hindering performance. Research suggests that depression is associated with lower grade point averages, and that co-occurring depression and anxiety can increase this association. The school provides support and services for students who have mental health needs. The guidance counselor is available to meet with students, visits classrooms to conduct lessons, and works with small groups of students who need strategies to regulate their emotions and behaviors. The school utilizes funding through grants to provide mental health counseling from outside providers.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Students are made aware of postsecondary opportunities and career/ technical education programs through guest speakers, career research in middle school, and discussions with high school guidance counselors.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

The school has implemented Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) which is an evidence-based, tiered framework for supporting students' behavioral, academic, social, emotional, and mental health. When implemented with fidelity, PBIS improves social emotional competence, academic success, and school climate. It also improves teacher health and wellbeing. It is a way to create positive, predictable, equitable and safe learning environments where everyone thrives. When students are in a positive school climate, research proves that academic achievement increases along with student engagement in the classroom.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Professional development is offered through the district and provided on-site to support teachers in implementing PBIS, standards, and the school's curriculum with fidelity.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

The early childhood program (VPK) is governed by the school's board and operates within the same building, but is not under the school's charter. The students transition well into Kindergarten and the program director and VPK teachers align what they teach with what is happening in the school's Kindergarten classrooms.

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: Early Warning System	$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.

No