

Broward County Public Schools

# Excelsior Charter Of Broward



**2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement  
Plan**

---

## **Table of Contents**

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>24</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>24</b> |

# Excelsior Charter Of Broward

2099 W. PROSPECT RD, Tamarac, FL 33309

excelsiorcharter.com

## Demographics

**Principal: Alicia Brown**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/16/2020

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>KG-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2018-19 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 73%  |
| <b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) |  |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: D (34%)<br>2017-18: D (33%)<br>2016-17: C (42%)<br>2015-16: B (57%) |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Diane Leinenbach</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   |  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  | NOT IN DA  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   |  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .                       |  |

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward County School Board.

## **SIP Authority**

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

## **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 Florida Department of Education 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.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement

The mission of Excelsior Charter of Broward is to support the improvement of student achievement by implementing best practices, innovative systematic initiatives and disseminating resources that enhance curriculum and Instruction. Additionally, the mission of Excelsior is to foster pride in academic achievements while developing our students' artistic abilities. The school will promote and demonstrate the essential role of the arts in enabling that every student is successful.

#### Provide the school's vision statement

Idealistically talking, we would like to empower and enlighten the teachers to become resource facilitators, capable of leading learners to enjoy the ecstasy of discovery In order to conquer educational possibilities and achieve level of understanding above imagination

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name              | Title                  | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|-------------------|------------------------|--|
| Baez, Raul        | Administrative Support | Provide leadership support, guidance and help the school organize a realistic, effective and data driven plan in order to achieve the school vision.   |
| Phillis, Amanda   | Instructional Coach    | The instructional coach will work as a colleague with classroom teachers to support student learning. The instructional coach will focus on individual and group professional development that will expand the understanding about research based effective instruction. The coach will provide personalized support that is based on the goals and identified needs of individual teachers. |
| Brown, Alicia     | Principal              | The role of the principal is to provide strategic direction in the school system. Principals develop standardized curricula, assess teaching methods, monitor student achievement, encourage parent involvement, revise policies and procedures, administer the budget, hire and evaluate staff and oversee facilities.  |
| Smith-Eyma, Karen | Teacher, ESE           | The main role of the special education teacher is to provide instruction and support which facilitates the participation of students with disabilities in the regular classroom.   |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Pending, Alicia Brown

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

10

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

13

**Demographic Data**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>KG-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2018-19 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 73%  |
| <b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | Black/African American Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students<br>English Language Learners<br>Hispanic Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: D (34%)<br>2017-18: D (33%)<br>2016-17: C (42%)<br>2015-16: B (57%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Diane Leinenbach</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   |  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>Support Tier</b>  | NOT IN DA |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   |           |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> . |           |

**Early Warning Systems**

**Current Year**

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

| Indicator                                 | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|   | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled               | 32          | 31 | 36 | 34 | 19 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 186   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 9           | 7  | 8  | 3  | 2  | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 35    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0  | 1  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 1  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 1  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Saturday 6/13/2020

**Prior Year - As Reported**

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

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                 | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled     | 28          | 42 | 41 | 27 | 35 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 188   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 8           | 16 | 6  | 7  | 8  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 47    |
| One or more suspensions         | 1           | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0  | 4  | 3  | 2  | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 10 | 13 | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 29    |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |

**Prior Year - Updated**

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

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                 | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled     | 28          | 42 | 41 | 27 | 35 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 188   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 8           | 16 | 6  | 7  | 8  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 47    |
| One or more suspensions         | 1           | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0  | 4  | 3  | 2  | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 10 | 13 | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 29    |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |



## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component      | 2019   |          |       | 2018   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 61%    | 59%      | 57%   | 60%    | 56%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 41%    | 60%      | 58%   | 29%    | 57%      | 55%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 9%     | 54%      | 53%   | 0%     | 51%      | 48%   |
| Math Achievement            | 50%    | 65%      | 63%   | 69%    | 62%      | 62%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 26%    | 66%      | 62%   | 37%    | 60%      | 59%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 0%     | 53%      | 51%   | 0%     | 47%      | 47%   |
| Science Achievement         | 54%    | 46%      | 53%   | 0%     | 49%      | 55%   |

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) |     |     |     |     |     | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
|           | K                                 | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   |       |
|           | (0)                               | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (0) |

### Grade Level Data

**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**

| ELA                   |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 68%    | 60%      | 8%                         | 58%   | 10%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 79%    | 59%      | 20%                        | 57%   | 22%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -11%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 60%    | 62%      | -2%                        | 58%   | 2%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 41%    | 58%      | -17%                       | 56%   | -15%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 19%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -19%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 54%    | 59%      | -5%                        | 56%   | -2%                     |
|                       | 2018 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 13%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03    | 2019 | 48%    | 65%      | -17%                       | 62%   | -14%                    |
|       | 2018 | 91%    | 63%      | 28%                        | 62%   | 29%                     |

| <b>MATH</b>           |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Grade</b>          | <b>Year</b> | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School-District Comparison</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School-State Comparison</b> |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | -43%          |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 04                    | 2019        | 44%           | 67%             | -23%                              | 64%          | -20%                           |
|                       | 2018        | 48%           | 63%             | -15%                              | 62%          | -14%                           |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | -4%           |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             | -47%          |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 05                    | 2019        | 62%           | 64%             | -2%                               | 60%          | 2%                             |
|                       | 2018        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             | 14%           |                 |                                   |              |                                |

| <b>SCIENCE</b>    |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Grade</b>      | <b>Year</b> | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School-District Comparison</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School-State Comparison</b> |
| 05                | 2019        | 54%           | 49%             | 5%                                | 53%          | 1%                             |
|                   | 2018        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |

**Subgroup Data**

| <b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
|--|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                 | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b> |
| ELL  | 44              |               |                    | 38               |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| BLK  | 50              | 33            |                    | 39               | 21             |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| HSP  | 74              | 59            |                    | 67               | 41             |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| FRL  | 57              | 36            | 10                 | 44               | 21             |                     | 40              |                |                  |                          |                                |

| <b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
|--|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                 | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2015-16</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2015-16</b> |
| ELL  | 57              | 40            |                    | 57               | 20             |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| BLK  | 56              | 25            |                    | 58               | 25             |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| HSP  | 66              | 33            |                    | 75               | 43             |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| FRL  | 54              | 20            |                    | 65               | 40             |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |

**ESSA Data**

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| <b>ESSA Federal Index</b>                    |      |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)                 | CS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index - All Students         | 36   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES  |

| <b>ESSA Federal Index</b>   |      |
|---|------|
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 2    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 50   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 291  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |
| <b>Subgroup Data</b>  |      |
| <b>Students With Disabilities</b>   |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      |      |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | N/A  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 0    |
| <b>English Language Learners</b>  |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 44   |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%        | 0    |
| <b>Asian Students</b>   |      |
| Federal Index - Asian Students  |      |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | N/A  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                   | 0    |
| <b>Black/African American Students</b>  |      |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                 | 36   |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?         | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%  | 0    |
| <b>Hispanic Students</b>  |      |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students   | 60   |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                       | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%                | 0    |
| <b>Multiracial Students</b>   |      |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students  |      |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                    | N/A  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%             | 0    |

| Native American Students   |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Native American Students   |     |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%            | 0   |
| Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                  | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%           | 0   |
| White Students   |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   |     |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      | 0   |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 32  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

### Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year’s low performance and discuss any trends

When comparing the AP1 2019-2020 and AP2 2019-2020 data taken from iReady Math Diagnostic Results Standard View, the data reflected that the lowest area of performance was 27% in the area of Math based on the iReady Diagnostic Results Standard View.

For grade 3, the Florida Math Standard, MAFS.3.OA.2.5-2: Apply properties of operations as strategies to multiply by splitting numbers, had an average skill score of 31% (from the iReady Standards Mastery Results Year-to-Date Report).

For grade 4, the Florida Math Standard, MAFS.4.MD.1.3: Apply the area and perimeter formulas for rectangles in real world and mathematical problems, had an average skill score of 38% (from the iReady Standards Mastery Results Year-to-Date Report).

For Grade 5, the Florida Math Standard, MAFS.5.NF.2.4.a: Interpret the product  $(a/b) \times q$  as a parts of a partition of  $q$  into  $b$  equal parts; equivalently, as the result of a sequence of operations  $a \times q \div b$ , had an average skill score of 37% (from iReady Standards

Mastery Results Year-to-Date Report).

The contributing factors to last year's low performance was due to staffing changes in the intermediate grades, 3 and 4. The fourth grade class experienced a change in teachers five times, due to high-teacher turn-over; therefore, the instructional coach, took over the class towards the beginning of quarter two to fill in and provide standards-based instruction with consistency. The fourth grade class experienced a change in teachers two times; therefore, qualified instructional candidates were hired on close to quarter two, to provide standards-based instruction.

**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 lowest performance was in the area of Math, based on iReady Diagnostic Results Standard View report from the 2018-2019 school year at 57% on or above level to 27% on the same iReady Diagnostic Results Standard View report from the 2019-2020 school year.

For grade 3, the Florida Math Standard, MAFS.3.OA.2.5-2: Apply properties of operations as strategies to multiply by splitting numbers, had an average skill score of 31% (from the iReady Standards Mastery Results Year-to-Date Report).

For grade 4, the Florida Math Standard, MAFS.4.MD.1.3: Apply the area and perimeter formulas for rectangles in real world and mathematical problems, had an average skill score of 38% (from the iReady Standards Mastery Results Year-to-Date Report).

For Grade 5, the Florida Math Standard, MAFS.5.NF.2.4.a: Interpret the product  $(a/b) \times q$  as a parts of a partition of  $q$  into  $b$  equal parts; equivalently, as the result of a sequence of operations  $a \times q \div b$ , had an average skill score of 37% (from iReady Standards Mastery Results Year-to-Date Report).

The contributing factors to last year's low performance was due to several staffing changes in the intermediate grades, 3 and 4. The fourth grade class experienced a change in teachers five times; therefore, the instructional coach, took over the fourth grade class towards the beginning of quarter two to fill in and provide standards-based instruction with consistency. The two third grade classes also had change of teachers towards the end of quarter one and into two.

**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**

Due to COVID-19 pandemic, state tests were waived for the Spring 2020; however, based on the data we had from our 2019-2020 plan, we see the following: The data component which had the greatest gap when compared with state average is in the lowest 25th percentile of the FSA tested grades 3, 4, and 5 in mathematics. With the lowest 25th percentile of the FSA tested grades 3, 4, and 5, there was a 0% gain. Factors contributing to this gap, were the following:(a) Lack of sufficient data analysis, need for more small group instructions, differentiated instructions, more hands-on learning experiences, more practice on Florida State Standards, more support facilitation for the English Language Learners and our Exceptional Student Education students, and need for more small group instruction in general education classrooms. With identification of ELL learners and ESE students, support facilitation can be addressed.(b) Differentiated Instruction was a instructional strategy that was lacking in planning, preparation, and delivery in the general education classrooms. According to research-based practices, "addressing

student differences and interest appears to enhance their motivation to learn while encouraging them to remain committed and stay positive (Stronge,2004;Tomlinson,2004b). Ignoring these fundamental differences may result in some students falling behind, losing motivation and failing to succeed (TomlinsonKalbfleisch, 1998). Students who may be advanced and motivated may become lost as the teacher strives to finish as much of the curriculum as possible . It would further appear that students learn effectively when tasks are moderately challenging, neither too simple nor too complex.(TomlinsonKalbfleisch,1998)

### **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 the area of mathematics at the Kindergarten grade level from the 2018-2019 school year (AP 3) data point to the 2019-2020 school year (AP 2) data point. This data was obtained from our progress monitoring system, iReady for reading and math on Florida Standards in grades Kindergarten to fifth grade.

There was no iReady Math Kindergarten Needs Analysis by Domain data in the 2018-2019 school year (AP 3) to compare with our recent iReady Math Kindergarten Needs Analysis by Domain data in the 2019-2020 school year (AP1 and AP 2) data which reflected 40% of all Kindergarten students performing on or above grade level on the Florida Math Standards. The domain in which these Kindergarten students did best was in the Number and Operations domain, with an 80% student performance rating.

Additionally, according to the iReady's Diagnostic Growth Report from 2018-2019 (AP 3), looking specifically at the Typical Growth Report, which identifies the average annual growth for a student at this grade and initial placement level, and comparing it to the same iReady's Diagnostic Growth Report from the 2019-2020 (AP 1 & 2), the Kindergarten students had a median percentage of progress in annual typical growth in mathematics from 31% (AP 3, 2019) to 56% (AP 2, 2020).

The new action our school took this past school year 2019-2020 was to obtain a curriculum and instructional coach on staff to support teachers in grades K-5 , in all content areas.

### **Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?**

After reflecting on the Early Warning Systems Data from Part 1 (D), the potential area of concern is "Student Attendance Below 90 Percent" in the 2019-2020 school year, from August 2019, to the early weeks of March 2020. The school day started at 8:00 am; however, there was a high percentage of the student population (about 65 students) who were bus riders and even after notices were sent to parents about the importance of bringing their students to the bus pick-up area on time, the bus would be delayed in arriving to campus by 8:00 am. There was also a 20 percent rate of late-student drop-off from parents who would bring their students on campus as car riders. Parents were also met with Administration to discuss the issues a parent maybe experiencing which would contribute to late arrival and early dismissal before the end of school day at 2:30 pm.

According to the National Center for Education Statistics, NCES 2009-804, February 2009, Every school day counts in a student's life. While research substantiates the importance of teacher effectiveness on student academic success, even the best teacher cannot be effective unless students are present in class. Regular attendance is essential

to providing students with opportunities to learn, and these opportunities are limited when students do not attend school. Moreover, access to accurate, timely data about whether individual students and groups of students regularly attend school is critical to making instructional and programmatic choices targeting student attendance behaviors. (Source of Research Citation:<https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2009/attendancedata/index.asp>).

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

1. Focus on providing ELA instruction online and or in-person with students through iReady progress monitoring, which is aligned to the Florida Standards and provides teachers with direct instructional materials for intervention and or enrichment to students in grades K-5, as appropriate, per student diagnostic data. Teachers will be able to track their students' progress in reading.

The data reflected from our school showed the following:

When comparing the AP1 2019-2020 and AP2 2019-2020 data taken from iReadyReading Diagnostic Assessments, the Needs Analysis By Domain showed increases from Diagnostic 1 to Diagnostic 2 of students scoring on or above level in reading, with the exception of fourth grade, which made a decrease of 11% and in fifth grade, which stayed the same.

The areas where Reading instruction will need to take a priority, based on this school wide K-5 iReadyReading Needs Analysis of Domains, are as follows:

#### Grade Band Levels K-2

There was an average of 22% at risk in the Comprehension: Informational Text Domain school wide in grades K-5, but in the K-2 band, on average 71% of the students were assessed as being below grade level.

#### Grade Band Levels 3-5

There was an average of 22% at risk in the Comprehension: Informational Text Domain school wide in grades K-5, but in the 3-5 band, on average 70% of students were assessed as being below grade level.

According to research report by Beth Maloch and Randy Bomer, "From these studies and many others, it is clear that one important (perhaps the most important) step in growing young children's knowledge, understanding, and use of informational texts is making these texts available and accessible to them. Recommendations vary in terms of just how many texts to provide and how to balance these with other genres, and no research has definitively settled the question. For example, Moss and her colleagues (Moss, Leone, & Dipillo, 1997) suggest that 25%- 50% of the texts in a classroom should be informational. The CCSS recommend that fully half of the texts made available to children be informational in nature." (Source: [https://archive.nwp.org/cs/public/download/nwp\\_file/21311/LATeachingAboutInformationalTexts.pdf?x-r=pcfile\\_d](https://archive.nwp.org/cs/public/download/nwp_file/21311/LATeachingAboutInformationalTexts.pdf?x-r=pcfile_d))

2. Focus on providing Math instruction online and or in-person with students via a system such as iReady, which is aligned to the Florida Standards and provides teachers with direct instructional materials for intervention and or enrichment to students in grades K-5, as appropriate, per student diagnostic data.

The data reflected from our school showed the following:

When comparing the AP1 2019-2020 and AP2 2019-2020 data taken from iReadyMath Diagnostic Assessments, the Needs Analysis By Domain showed increases from Diagnostic 1 to Diagnostic 2 overall of students scoring on or above level in math, with the exception of first and second grade. First grade made a decrease of 3% and in second grade, there was a decrease of 6%.

The areas where Math instruction will need to take a priority, based on this school wide K-5 iReadyMath Needs Analysis of Domains, are as follows:

#### Grade Band Levels K-2

There was an average of 20% at risk in the areas of Measurement and Data, as well as Geometry school wide in grades K-5, but in the K-2 band, on average 71% of the students were assessed as being below grade level.

#### Grade Band Levels 3-5

There was an average of 20% at risk in the areas of Measurement and Data, as well as Geometry school wide in grades K-5, but in the 3-5 band, on average of 66% students were assessed as being below grade level in Measurement and Data and on average 79% of students were assessed as being below grade level in Geometry.

When comparing the AP1 2019-2020 and AP2 2019-2020 data taken from iReadyMath Diagnostic Results Standard View, the data reflected that the lowest area of performance was 27% in the area of Math based on the iReady Diagnostic Results Standard View.

For grade 3, the Florida Math Standard, MAFS.3.OA.2.5-2 had an average skill score of 31% (from the iReady Standards Mastery Results Year-to-Date Report).

For grade 4, the Florida Math Standard, MAFS.4.MD.1.3 had an average skill score of 38% (from the iReady Standards Mastery Results Year-to-Date Report).

For Grade 5, the Florida Math Standard, MAFS.5.NF.2.4 had an average skill score of 37% (from iReady Standards Mastery Results Year-to-Date Report).

According to a research article by Browning, Alden, Edson, Kimani, and Aslan-Tutak, The authors defined measurement as “assigning a number to continuous quantities” (p. 301) and stressed that as children keep learning about numbers and counting, they get more into measurement. Source: <https://scholarworks.umt.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1306&context=tme>

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:



**#1. Other specifically relating to Math Achievement**

This Area of Focus was identified as a critical need from the 2018-2019 FSA data reviewed and the data showed that our school made 0% Math learning gains over the last 2 years. By targeting the bottom 25% percentile we will decrease our number of students performing at a level 1 in Math. In addition to the FSA data, the i-Ready diagnostic results reported 43% of the student population were identified as being Tier 2 and Tier 3. Students in grade 3 showed 10% of the population were two years or more below their grade level. Grade 4 showed 6% of the population, and grade 5 showed 20%.

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

In contrast, the ELL student population has shown considerable Math learning gains throughout the 2019-2020 school year. Report cards from beginning of the year to end of the year show that about 70% of the ELL student population have achieved at least a letter grade higher than their previous semester grades. Although some ELL students still struggle with language proficiency, a contributing factor to their Math learning gains was the use of more interactive/hands-on instruction support given to those students that do still struggle with the English language. In contrast to the report card grades, i-ReadyMath diagnostic results show that 90% of ELL students are performing at either grade level or 1 grade level below.

K-2

An average of 20% at risk in the areas of Measurement/Data, as well as Geometry school wide in K-5, but an average 71% of the students were assessed as being below grade level in Geometry.

3-5

An average of 20% at risk in the areas of Measurement/Data, as well as Geometry school wide in K-5, but 3-5 band, an average of 66% students were assessed as being below grade level in Measurement/Data and average 79% of students were assessed as being below grade level in Geometry.

**Measureable Outcome:**

By June 2021, the average percentage of students in grades K-5 who scored at risk in Measurement and Data or Geometry (20% in AP2 in 2019-2020), will decrease by 10% when assessed on the AP 2 or AP 3 iReady Math Diagnostic.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Amanda Phillis (aphillips@excelsiorcharter.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus in Measurement and Data, and or Geometry in grades K to 5, will be utilized from the Florida Standards Based iReady Math system. Wherein, teachers will be able to provide differentiated lessons in Measurement and Data and or Geometry in grades Kindergarten through fifth grades, using "Tools for Instruction" with strategies aligned to Florida Standards and appropriate to mathematical concepts - Measurement and Data and or Geometry.

**Rationale for Evidence-**

When comparing the AP1 2019-2020 and AP2 2019-2020 data taken from iReadyMath Diagnostic Assessments, the Needs Analysis By Domain showed increases from Diagnostic 1 to Diagnostic 2 overall of students scoring on or

above level in math, with the exception of first and second grade. First grade made a decrease of 3% and in second grade, there was a decrease of 6%.

For grade 3, the FloridaMathStandard, MAFS.3.OA.2.5-2 had an average skill score of 31% (from the iReady StandardsMasteryResults Year-to-Date Report). For grade 4, the FloridaMathStandard, MAFS.4.MD.1.3 had an average skill score of 38% (from the iReady Standards Mastery Results Year-to-Date Report). For Grade 5, the FloridaMathStandard, MAFS.5.NF.2.4 had an average skill score of 37% (from iReadyStandardsMastery Results Year-to-Date Report).

**based  
Strategy:**

According to a research article by Browning, Alden, Edson, Kimani, and Aslan-Tutak, The authors defined measurement as “assigning a number to continuous quantities” (p. 301) and stressed that as children keep learning about numbers and counting, they get more into measurement. Source: <https://scholarworks.umt.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1306&context=tme>

### Action Steps to Implement

Our Math instruction priority school-wide for grades K-5, based on iReady Math Needs Analysis of Domains are in the areas of Measurement and Data and Geometry, with the school-wide average of 30%+ at risk in these domains and scored in the below grade level range.

Preliminary step in August - Identify ESOL, ESE, Tier 2, and Tier 3 identified students in BASIS/TERMS (Curriculum/Instructional Coach, ESOL Contact, ESE Specialist and Administration) that carried over in our registration system from 2019-2020 school year. Teachers will be provided with Florida MAFS Standards.

Teachers will assess students in grades K-5 using Math Diagnostic 1 in the Diagnostic 1 period (2020-2021), and use that data to compare with the AP 2 19-20 iReady Math Diagnostic 2 data. The ESE Specialist, ESOL Contact, and Curriculum Coordinator will provide teachers with copies of Individualized Plans for students (as appropriate for ESE/ESOL) and accommodations list for lesson planning.

**Person Responsible** Amanda Phillis (aphillips@excelsiorcharter.com)

Continuation of Math Achievement Action Steps:

After teachers assess students, they will pull Diagnostic 1 results for Math and pull the instructional grouping report to identify students who mastered or still need instructional support to gain proficiency in Measurement/Geometry.

Then, teachers will implement instruction using iReady Instructional Materials from the Tools of Instruction, as needed to tailor instructional strategies for Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.

When teachers are implementing instructional strategies, they will make the necessary accommodations for students who are identified as ESE and have an Individualized Educational Plan. Likewise, for teachers who have students in their class who are identified

as ESOL, their teachers will be provided their accommodations and use appropriate strategies when taught reading comprehension lessons.

Lastly, after teachers have informed parents of their student's performance and will decide to move the student on to Tier 2/3 interventions in the area of mathematics.

**Person Responsible** Amanda Phillis (aphillips@excelsiorcharter.com)

**#2. Other specifically relating to Reading Achievement**

When comparing the AP1 2019-2020 and AP2 2019-2020 data taken from iReadyReading Diagnostic Assessments, the Needs Analysis By Domain showed increases from Diagnostic 1 to Diagnostic 2 of students scoring on or above level in reading, with the exception of fourth grade, which made a decrease of 11% and in fifth grade, which stayed the same.

The areas where Reading instruction will need to take a priority, based on this school wide K-5 iReadyReading NeedsAnalysis of Domains, are as follows:

**GRADE Levels K-2**

There was an average of 22% at risk in the Comprehension: Informational Text Domain school wide in grades K-5, but in the K-2 band, on average 71% of the students were assessed as being below grade level.

**GRADE Levels 3-5**

There was an average of 22% at risk in the Comprehension: Informational Text Domain school wide in grades K-5, but in the 3-5 band, on average 70% of students were assessed as being below grade level.

According to research report by Beth Maloch and Randy Bomer, "From these studies and many others, it is clear that one important (perhaps the most important) step in growing young children's knowledge, understanding, and use of informational texts is making these texts available and accessible to them. (Source: [https://archive.nwp.org/cs/public/download/nwp\\_file/21311/LATeachingAboutInformationalTexts.pdf?x-r=pcfile\\_d](https://archive.nwp.org/cs/public/download/nwp_file/21311/LATeachingAboutInformationalTexts.pdf?x-r=pcfile_d))

(ESOL)ELA/Math - Students in grades K to 5 who are identified as LY/LF will receive accommodations per each subject area and instructional support as per their individualized plans.

(ESE)ELA/Math - Students in grades K to 5 who are identified as ESE will receive accommodations per each subject area and instructional support as per their individualized plans.

(MTSS/EWS) ELA/Math - Students in grades K to 5 who are identified by their teachers, as having difficulties in reading or math, will provide Tier 2 and Tier 2 support to the student and document student performance.

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

**Measureable Outcome:**

By June 2021, the average percentage of students in grades K-5 who scored at risk in Comprehension (22% in AP2 in 2019-2020), will decrease by 10% when assessed on the AP 2 or AP 3 iReady Reading Diagnostic.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Amanda Phillis (aphillips@excelsiorcharter.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus in Reading Comprehension for grades K to 5, will be utilized from the Florida Standards Based iReady Reading system. Wherein, teachers will be able to provide differentiated lessons in Reading Comprehension in grades Kindergarten through fifth grades, using "Tools for Instruction" with strategies

aligned to Florida Standards and appropriate to reading comprehension concepts in both informational and non-informational text.

When comparing the AP1 2019-2020 and AP2 2019-2020 data taken from iReady Reading Diagnostic Assessments, the Needs Analysis By Domain showed increases from Diagnostic 1 to Diagnostic 2 of students scoring on or above level in reading, with the exception of fourth grade, which made a decrease of 11% and in fifth grade, which stayed the same.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Reading instruction priorities, based school-wide K-5 iReady Reading Needs Analysis of Domains:

Grade Band Levels K-2

There was an average of 22% at risk in the Comprehension: Informational Text Domain school wide in grades K-5, but in the K-2 band, on average 71% of the students were assessed as being below grade level.

Grade Band Levels 3-5

There was an average of 22% at risk in the Comprehension: Informational Text Domain school wide in grades K-5, but in the 3-5 band, on average 70% of students were assessed as being below grade level.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Our Reading instruction priority school-wide for grades K-5, based on iReady Reading Needs Analysis of Domains is in the area of Reading Comprehension, with the school-wide average of 22% at risk in this domain, and on average 70% of the students assessed in grades K-5 scored in the below grade level range.

Preliminary step in August - Identify ESOL, ESE, Tier 2, and Tier 3 identified students in BASIS/TERMS (Curriculum/Instructional Coach, ESOL Contact, ESE Specialist and Administration) that carried over in our registration system from 2019-2020 school year.

Teachers will assess students in grades K-5 using iReady Reading Diagnostic 1 in the Diagnostic 1 period (2020-2021), and use that data to compare with the AP 2 19-20 iReady Reading Diagnostic 2 data. The ESE Specialist, ESOL Contact, and Curriculum Coordinator will provide teachers with copies of Individualized Plans for students (as appropriate for ESE/ESOL) and accommodations list for lesson planning.

**Person Responsible** Amanda Phillis (aphillips@excelsiorcharter.com)

**Continuation of Reading Achievement Action Steps:**

After teachers assess students, they will pull Diagnostic 1 results for Reading and pull the instructional grouping report to identify which students have mastered or are still needing instructional support in order to gain proficiency in reading comprehension.

Then, teachers will implement instruction using iReady Instructional Materials from the Tools of Instruction, as needed to tailor instructional strategies for Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.

When teachers are implementing instructional strategies, they will make the necessary accommodations for students who are identified as ESE and have an Individualized Educational Plan. Likewise, for teachers who have students in their class who are identified as ESOL, their teachers will be provided their accommodations and use appropriate strategies when taught reading comprehension lessons.

Lastly, after teachers have informed parents of their student's performance and will decide to move the student on to Tier 2/3 interventions.

**Person Responsible** Amanda Phillis (aphillips@excelsiorcharter.com)

### **Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**According to our school's Spring FSA 2019 data only 9% of our students who fell into the lower 25% percentile made gains. Also, I-Ready end of year ELA diagnostic data showed that 27% of the student population was performing at one grade level below. 10% of the student population was performing two or more grade levels below. Focusing on this group of students will decrease the number of students performing at level one in ELA. Included in this group are students identified as ESOL and ESE. These students will receive additional strategies and support that will be documented weekly in the lesson plan. Increasing the number of English Language Proficiency will improve the schools' overall scores on FSA ELA. By targeting the number of SWD, will increase the proficiency of SWD will improve the school's overall scores on FSA/ELA/Math. With respect to reflection of the AP1 and AP2 data and the end of the 2019-2020 school year, our school's focus on providing ELA instruction online and or in-person with students through iReady progress monitoring, which is aligned to the Florida Standards and provides teachers with direct instructional materials for intervention and or enrichment to students in grades K-5, as appropriate, per student diagnostic data. Teachers will be able to track their students' progress in reading.**

**The data reflected from our school showed the following:**

**When comparing the AP1 2019-2020 and AP2 2019-2020 data taken from iReady Reading Diagnostic Assessments, the Needs Analysis By Domain showed increases from Diagnostic 1 to Diagnostic 2 of students scoring on or above level in reading, with the exception of fourth grade, which made a decrease of 11% and in fifth grade, which stayed the same.**

**The areas where Reading instruction will need to take a priority, based on this school wide K-5 iReady Reading Needs Analysis of Domains, are as follows:**

#### **Grade Band Levels K-2**

**There was an average of 22% at risk in the Comprehension: Informational Text Domain school wide in grades K-5, but in the K-2 band, on average 71% of the students were assessed as being below grade level.**

#### **Grade Band Levels 3-5**

**There was an average of 22% at risk in the Comprehension: Informational Text Domain school wide in grades K-5, but in the 3-5 band, on average 70% of students were assessed as being below grade level.**

**According to research report by Beth Maloch and Randy Bomer, "From these studies and many others, it is clear that one important (perhaps the most important) step in growing young children's knowledge, understanding, and use of informational texts is making these texts available and accessible to them. Recommendations vary in terms of just how many texts to provide and how to balance these with other genres, and no research has definitively settled the question. For example, Moss and her colleagues (Moss, Leone, & Dipillo, 1997) suggest that 25%- 50% of the texts in a classroom should be informational. The CCSS recommend that fully half of the texts made available to children be informational in nature." (Source: [https://archive.nwp.org/cs/public/download/nwp\\_file/21311/LATeachingAboutInformationalTexts.pdf?x-r=pcfile\\_d](https://archive.nwp.org/cs/public/download/nwp_file/21311/LATeachingAboutInformationalTexts.pdf?x-r=pcfile_d))**

**ESOL for ELA and Math - Students in grades K to 5 who are identified as LY will receive accommodations per each subject area and instructional support as per their individualized plans. The use of Imagine Learning will also be implemented by the ESOL teacher. Monitoring as well our identified LE students with their**

## Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The school plans to build positive and strong relationships with the students, parents, and the community by promoting effective communication which is essential to building a school partnership, and to support the students. The school will promote a positive growth mindset to improve students' attitudes towards learning as stated in Dr. Carol Dweck's research. Students will learn to accept challenging as a way to grow and improve. They will be encouraged to show effort so as to progress in daily tasks. Parent Advisory Committee (PAC) will have biannual meeting to address school progress, community involvement and student growth. We will continue to develop volunteering efforts among parents by opening opportunities for them to attend activities such as Reading Day. Parents can read to their child's class or offer additional services in the classroom or school-wide activities such as the Story Book Character Parade. The school will promote, encourage, and provide volunteer opportunities for student involvement, parents input and ideas, parent/teacher conferences, and school events throughout the year. Ample notice and incentives will be provided to achieve high attendance. We look forward to building strong and effective relationships within our school community. School-wide attendance monitoring and school-wide incentives to promote attendance: (a) School will pull reports from Pinnacle and or teacher record book on a bi-weekly basis to determine attendance trends and make attempts to contact parent(s) or guardian(s) by phone, electronic communication, and or letter, to ensure families are notified of the school's awareness of the absence or tardiness of their child. (b) Administration will educate and conference with parents on the importance of consistent school attendance through means of print, phone call, and or meetings. Parent and Community Engagement: (a) Increase student attendance rate; (b) Increase parent awareness of Florida State Standards and the impact of the Florida Standards Assessment on their student's academic career; and (c) Increase parent participation through the mandatory twenty volunteer hours, required by the Charter.

**Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

## Part V: Budget

|          |               |  |                    |
|----------|---------------|--|--------------------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Other: Math Achievement</b> | <b>\$44,920.00</b> |
|----------|---------------|--|--------------------|



|          | Function      | Object  | Budget Focus  | Funding Source  | FTE           | 2020-21            |
|----------|---------------|---|---|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|
|          | 5100          | 390-Other Purchased Services                      | 5393 - Excelsior Charter Of Broward   | Title, I Part A |               | \$10,000.00        |
|          |               |   | <i>Notes: iReady Math K-5</i>   |                 |               |                    |
|          | 5100          | 390-Other Purchased Services                      | 5393 - Excelsior Charter Of Broward   | UniSIG          | 1.0           | \$34,920.00        |
|          |               |   | <i>Notes: STEM coach to work with all levels K-5 and focus on Math and Science Literacy</i> |                 |               |                    |
| <b>2</b> | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Other: Reading Achievement</b> |   |                 |               | <b>\$51,013.00</b> |
|          | Function      | Object  | Budget Focus  | Funding Source  | FTE           | 2020-21            |
|          | 5100          | 390-Other Purchased Services                      | 5393 - Excelsior Charter Of Broward   | Title, I Part A |               | \$10,000.00        |
|          |               |   | <i>Notes: iReady Reading K-5</i>  |                 |               |                    |
|          | 5100          | 100-Salaries                                      | 5393 - Excelsior Charter Of Broward   | Title, I Part A | 1.0           | \$41,013.00        |
|          |               |   | <i>Notes: Resource Teacher for all grades K-5</i>   |                 |               |                    |
|          |               |   |   |                 | <b>Total:</b> | <b>\$95,933.00</b> |