Brevard Public Schools

Sculptor Charter School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sculptor Charter School

1301 ARMSTRONG DR, Titusville, FL 32780

http://www.sculptorcharter.org

Demographics

Principal: Renee Bernhard

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2017

2019-20 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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	27%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Asian Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (63%) 2014-15: A (70%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

N/A

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.

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.

Table of Contents

Sculptor Charter School

1301 ARMSTRONG DR, Titusville, FL 32780

http://www.sculptorcharter.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	No	28%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	20%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://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.

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

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bernhard, Renee	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.
Quam, Christine	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
Hoogerwerf, Michelle	School Counselor	*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 through the IPST/ MTSS process.

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	54	53	58	58	66	65	70	63	62	0	0	0	0	549
Attendance below 90 percent	11	9	13	10	7	7	13	10	18	0	0	0	0	98
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	5	0	2	5	2	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	10	4	11	8	6	1	0	0	0	0	40

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	1	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	6

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	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

38

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 10/1/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	15	13	17	5	9	11	14	19	5	0	0	0	0	108
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	2	3	3	2	4	5	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	9	13	7	6	6	0	0	0	0	42

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	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	4

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	74%	65%	61%	74%	67%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	58%	59%	63%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	54%	54%	53%	53%	51%
Math Achievement	70%	67%	62%	61%	63%	58%
Math Learning Gains	66%	62%	59%	57%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	59%	52%	53%	55%	50%
Science Achievement	70%	62%	56%	64%	62%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	82%	80%	78%	90%	82%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	54 (0)	53 (0)	58 (0)	58 (0)	66 (0)	65 (0)	70 (0)	63 (0)	62 (0)	549 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	11 ()	9 ()	13 ()	10 ()	7 ()	7 ()	13 ()	10 ()	18 ()	98 (0)
One or more suspensions	1 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	5 (0)	2 (0)	15 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	10 (0)	4 (0)	11 (0)	8 (0)	6 (0)	1 (0)	40 (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.

NOTE: 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**
03	2019	76%	64%	12%	58%	18%
	2018	82%	63%	19%	57%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	80%	61%	19%	58%	22%
	2018	76%	57%	19%	56%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	76%	60%	16%	56%	20%
	2018	62%	54%	8%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	58%	60%	-2%	54%	4%
	2018	72%	63%	9%	52%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
07	2019	75%	58%	17%	52%	23%
	2018	70%	56%	14%	51%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	79%	63%	16%	56%	23%
	2018	67%	65%	2%	58%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	47%	61%	-14%	62%	-15%
	2018	75%	62%	13%	62%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-28%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	79%	64%	15%	64%	15%
	2018	67%	59%	8%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	64%	60%	4%	60%	4%
	2018	53%	58%	-5%	61%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
06	2019	60%	67%	-7%	55%	5%
	2018	75%	68%	7%	52%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
07	2019	76%	62%	14%	54%	22%

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2018	72%	62%	10%	54%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
08	2019	81%	43%	38%	46%	35%
	2018	56%	41%	15%	45%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		25%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	76%	56%	20%	53%	23%
	2018	49%	57%	-8%	55%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		27%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	64%	53%	11%	48%	16%
	2018	51%	55%	-4%	50%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	83%	74%	9%	71%	12%
2018	92%	73%	19%	71%	21%
Compare		-9%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	97%	61%	36%	61%	36%
2018	65%	62%	3%	62%	3%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		32%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	95%	60%	35%	57%	38%
2018	93%	60%	33%	56%	37%
Compare		2%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	55	55	56	57	66	69	43				
HSP	84	77		77	69		92				
MUL	68	57		68	53		42	80			
WHT	74	65	60	70	67	59	71	85	72		
FRL	72	65	64	72	67	62	68	86	55		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	62	56	65	46	52	53	36				
HSP	78	59		69	74		45				
MUL	74	65		68	73						
WHT	71	57	53	68	64	58	51	94	69		
FRL	63	53	47	63	66	59	19	91	55		

2017 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	55	50	48	39	45	48	47				
HSP	73	56		69	46		45				
MUL	70	63		59	54		75				
WHT	75	64	57	61	58	58	66	93	78		
FRL	61	59	63	60	56	60	53	93	75		

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	620
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	57
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	80
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	61
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	69
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	68
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

3rd grade math - it was a different group of students. The teachers and curriculum were the same as in the prior years.

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

3rd grade math (decline of 28%) - same as above. Both the teachers and the curriculum were the same. This group of students did not perform well in Math.
6th grade ELA had a significant decline as well (down 14%). But, the cohort comparison showed their performance to be exactly the same as the year prior. In Math, 6th grade showed a decline of 15%, but the cohort showed an increase of 7%. It is possible because we focused so heavily on Math that less focus was on ELA.
Our lowest 25% students in Math showed a decline over last year (62% made gains in 2018 over 57% in 2019)
Civics EOC showed a decline of 9%.
SWD decreased in performance in ELA over 2018 (decrease of 7%)

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.

Algebra EOC - 36% higher than state average; 8th grade Math - 35% higher than state average. All grades, except 3rd grade, performed higher than the state average in Math. Geometry-38% higher than state average.
in ELA - All grades performed higher than the state average.
In Science - both grades scored higher than the state average (5th-23% higher; 8th-16% higher).
In Civics - our average was still 12% higher than the state average.
We had an increased focus on Math and Science, including professional development for teachers in these subjects. In Science, we realigned our curriculum to the Standards to ensure all standards were being taught appropriately. In addition, we had an Administrative Intern from NASA who was instrumental in providing feedback to the Science teachers regarding tested standards.

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

Algebra EOC- increase of 32% over 2018
5th grade Science - increase of 27% over 2018
8th grade Science - increase of 13% over 2018; cohort increased 51%.
Among subgroups:
SWD increased performance over 2018 in Math (11%) and Science (7%).
Hispanic students increased performance in ELA (6%), Math (8%), and Science (47%).
FRL students also increased performance in ELA (9%), Math (9%), and Science (49%).
White students increased performance in ELA (4%), Math (2%), and Science (20%).

We continued our focus on Math, but added a focus on Science. We ensured curriculum and instruction were aligned with the standards, particularly with Science. We had an Administrative Intern from NASA who was instrumental in providing feedback to the Science teachers regarding tested standards.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Overall, we decreased the number of student absences (from 108 to 98), decreased the number of suspensions (from 21 to 15), and decreased the number of students scoring Level 1 (from 42 to 40). But, the number of students with 2 or more EWS indicators increased from 4 to 6. Therefore 2 areas of concern: the number of students with 2 or more indicators and the number of students scoring Level 1 in Reading or Math (since this only improved by a small margin).

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

1. Continue strong emphasis on Math and Science.
2 Work with the lowest 25%, especially in Math.
3. Continue to reduce suspensions and students with attendance problems.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Standards based instruction for math
Rationale	In order to maintain and continue our growth in Math, we need to ensure standards based instruction and continued professional development in math is a priority. All grades showed growth in Math, except 3rd grade (which had a 28% decline) and 6th grade (which had a 15% decline in the grade level, but a 7% gain in the cohort). 8th grade made showed gains of 25%; Algebra EOC had gains of 32%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	95% of the instructional staff responsible for teaching math will demonstrate effective implementation of the Eureka Math/Engage NY curriculum. Per our charter goals, we will continue to meet or exceed the MSS of the District and/or State in Math. All grade levels or cohorts will show at least 2% growth in Math as measured by the Math FSA .
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Renee Bernhard (bernhard.renee@sculptorcharter.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will ensure students are: * Actively engaged in doing mathematics * Solving challenging problems *Making inter-disciplinary connections *Sharing mathematical ideas *Using multiple representations to communicate mathematical ideas *Using manipulatives and other tools
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Research has shown that the above strategies should be seen in an effective math classroom (Protheroe, 2007). We have utilized these strategies over the last 2 years that our focus has been on Math. Since we have seen continued improvements in student achievement, we are going to continue the use of these strategies.
Action Step	
Description	1. Provide new teachers with initial Professional development in Eureka Math/Engage NY. 2. Provide veteran teachers with support and follow-up professional development in Math (both for Eureka Math/Engage NY and in Algebra Nation) 3. Continue to support the teachers in providing resources and showing them how to find additional resources. 4. Meet with teachers monthly to discuss student achievement in Math. 5.Progress monitoring of the lowest 25% in Math will be conducted by teachers weekly.
Person Responsible	Christine Quam (quam.chris@sculptorcharter.org)

#2	
Title	Standards based instruction for Science
Rationale	With a huge focus on Science last year, we saw tremendous growth in student achievement over prior years. This focus on standards based instruction, while still adhering to the Core Knowledge curriculum, helped us realized these gains. 5th grade Science had gains of 25%; 8th grade Science had gains of 13% and cohort gains of 15%. In looking at subgroups, Students with Disabilities increased performance by 7%, Hispanic students increased by 47%, and students with free and reduced lunch increased by 49%
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	50% of the teachers responsible for teaching Science will continue to participate in the Science cadre. This cadre will continue to ensure proper alignment of science curriculum to the standards. In addition, the cadre will work with the Administrative intern to ensure science assessments are grade level appropriate and standards based. Per our charter goals, we will meet or exceed the MSS of that of the District and/or State on the FCAT Science assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Christine Quam (quam.chris@sculptorcharter.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	*Teachers will set clear lesson goals and objectives for Science instruction (goals will clearly state what students will know and understand and what they will be able to do) *Teachers will consistently track student progress using standards based questioning and assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	When teachers set clear goals, they can intentionally plan their instruction and their activities. Marzano's research is clear that students need to know what learning targets they are intended to master. In regards to tracking student progress, while teachers have always provided students with assessments, sometimes the assessments were not aligned to the true meaning of the grade level standards.
Action Step	
Description	1. Lesson plans will be reviewed to ensure goals and objectives for Science are clear. 2. Monthly meetings will be held with the Science cadre to ensure instruction continues to be aligned to the standards. 3. Monthly meetings will be held with all teachers in order to provide support, as needed. 4. Administer standards based assessments as a progress monitoring tool. Such assessments will be developed within the science cadre.
Person Responsible	Christine Quam (quam.chris@sculptorcharter.org)

#3	
Title	Implement Core Knowledge curriculum with fidelity
Rationale	Implementing this research based, content rich curriculum will assist in increasing student achievement in Social studies/Civics, Science, and ELA. All grades showed growth in ELA, except for 3rd grade (6% decline) and 6th grade (14% decline). Civics showed a 9% decline over the previous year, but average was still well above the average of the District and State.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	100% of teachers will demonstrate effective implementation of the Core Knowledge curriculum, including the CKLA (Core Knowledge Language Arts) program, as applicable. Per our charter goals, we will meet or exceed the MSS of the District and/or the State in Reading, Science, and Civics, as measured by FSA or FCAT. All grade levels or cohorts will show at least 2% growth in Reading, Science, and Civics, as measured by FSA or FCAT.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Renee Bernhard (bernhard.renee@sculptorcharter.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	*High level questioning will be utilized throughout lessons in order to determine students' level of understanding and to encourage students to think critically. *Vocabulary instruction will be intentional with the focus being to develop fluency and reading comprehension. An emphasis will be on providing students with rich background knowledge, which will assist with reading comprehension.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	While our main focus for the last couple of years has been on Math, we have noticed our ELA scores were not as strong in some grade levels. Reading comprehension is key to successful achievement across all academic areas. According to E.D. Hirsch, developer/ founder of Core Knowledge, in order for students to understand what they are reading (in any content area), they must first have the background knowledge to understand the content. Implementing Core Knowledge with fidelity will assist in providing students with the background knowledge necessary for successful reading comprehension.
Action Step	
Description	1. Lesson plans will be reviewed. Vocabulary instruction and high level questions will be notated. 2. Classroom walk-throughs, observations, and monthly meetings with teachers will be implemented by both the Assistant Principal and Principal 3. Provide online support for ELA program: NewsELA. 4. Progress monitor through online programs: NewsELA (5th-8th), SRI (4th), and iStation (1-3)
Person Responsible	Renee Bernhard (bernhard.renee@sculptorcharter.org)

#4	
Title	Continue relationship building activities
Rationale	In order for students to be successful, they need to believe that we truly care about them. If students believe we care, attendance and discipline rates should improve. We began implementing Restorative Practices, at a very basic level. in 2019. In 2019, students with absences greater than 90% were reduced by 10 (from 108 to 98). Suspensions also decreased by 6 (from 21 to 15).
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Student absences will be reduced by 2%; Student suspensions will be reduced by 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Renee Bernhard (bernhard.renee@sculptorcharter.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Restorative Practices will be implemented.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The purpose of implementing Restorative Practices is for students to reflect on behavior, restore relationships, and make restitution as needed. This will also assist with relationship building as teachers learn to implement restorative circles in their classroom.
Action Step	
Description	1. Provide training to teacher leader(s) and Assistant principal in Restorative Practices. 2. Teacher leaders, Assistant Principal, Principal, and Guidance counselor will provide professional development to instructional staff on restorative practice techniques. 3. Teachers will begin to implement Circles in their classrooms. This will be verified by classroom observations and/or walk-throughs.
Person Responsible	Renee Bernhard (bernhard.renee@sculptorcharter.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).