

Appendix 11



School Improvement Plan

This document will lay out the areas in the Institute for the Creative Arts school academic report that show low levels of academic performance. It will then address those areas of concern by providing the standard for which students should achieve, a timeline of implementation for the plan, success indicators for the plan, responsible personnel for the plan, and a way to document the monitoring of the process.

Academic Areas of Concern:

Institute for the Creative Arts High School in Fort Smith, AR received an F letter grade for the 2024-2025 school year. This is based on the fact that students had low scores in Mathematics, Mathematics growth scores, and English growth scores.

Timeline of Implementation:

ICA has determined the students who are at the greatest risk of not passing the Atlas assessment and have implemented the following methods to ensure students are meeting the standards and growth metrics.

- Students will spend time weekly working on Atlas skills that directly relate to the assessment. This includes taking assessments built in the Atlas portal.
- Students that are showing deficiencies are placed into targeted intervention groups.
- Students who received a level 1 or 2 score on the Math and/or the English portion have been placed in tutoring for a minimum of 30 minutes weekly.
- The administration will receive biweekly reports to see if students are growing.
- Two weeks prior to the Atlas summative assessment all students will be reviewing essential skills.

Success Indicators:

The standards set by the state of Arkansas based on the Atlas assessment data are the standards ICA will use. Using our current data, we have determined the following goals to help us improve our school letter grade.

- Increase Mathematics passing from 13% to 25 %
- Increase Mathematics growth scores from 37% to 50%
- Increase English growth scores from 47% to 53 %

In addition, ICA will have data for science this school year. This data was missing from last years results due to low enrollment.

Appendix 11



School Improvement Plan

Responsible Personnel:

- Mr. Michael Johnson, Dean: Oversee the staff in the implementation of the SIP.
- Mr. Justin Blanton, Assessment Coordinator: Assimilating, analyzing, organizing, and distributing the data in a workable format for all teachers
- Mr. Matthew Forester, ELA Instructor and Ms. Kelly Lucero, Mathematics Instructor: Development of assessments and practices used in class.
- Tutors: Provide a minimum of 30 minutes weekly of targeted instruction outside of class time

Documented Monitoring Processes:

Our school Assessment coordinator, Academic coordinator, and Dean have worked to develop a documentation process. This has included collaborative input for the core teachers on who will need tutoring or targeted RTI time. From there we created a form that all teachers will have access to in order to determine what strategies to use for future tier 1 and tier 2 interventions.

This form will show students current Atlas data on the latest Atlas interim assessment. The students will be put into tutoring sessions. These students that are determined to need tutoring will be students that received a 1 or a 2 on the Atlas interim. This is based on the idea that a 1 on the Atlas is below grade level, 2 is near mastery, 3 is on grade level, and 4 is exceeding. The tutoring sessions will be based on this Atlas data and beginning assessments. Then every 2 weeks the form will be updated with student progress on the skills the student is working on. It will then be determined if the students' tutoring should move to a new topic or be continued. It will also be determined whether the student should continue with tutoring or if they have progressed enough to be removed from the tutoring program.

Students who are not determined to need tutoring but are not meeting their growth metric in some other way will be put into our RTI program to receive specific lessons too. Reasons for these students to be pulled in will be, they are close to their growth scores, they were level 3 on the interim assessment but did not grow, or they were level 2 on the interim assessment, showed growth, and were close to level 3.