

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Excelsior PREP Charter School Of Miami Gardens



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	18

Excelsior PREP Charter School Of Miami Gardens

18200 NW 22ND AVE, Miami Gardens, FL 33056

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Lalelei Kelly

Start Date for this Principal: 7/23/2012

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	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: D (38%) 2014-15: F (27%)
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	TS&I
* 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	18

Excelsior PREP Charter School Of Miami Gardens

18200 NW 22ND AVE, Miami Gardens, FL 33056

[no web address on file]

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	Yes	89%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	100%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	C	D

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.

Excelsior Charter Academy is committed to providing an education of excellence that meets each student's interests, abilities and needs within a common curricular framework that reflects and promotes an understanding of, and appreciation for, diversity in our community as an integral part of school life. Excelsior challenges each student to develop intellectual independence, creativity and curiosity and a sense of responsibility toward others both within the School and in the community at large. Guided by the Excelsior Motto, "where moments of learning are monumental."

Provide the school's vision statement.

Excelsior Charter Academy will challenge children of all abilities to achieve excellence in a wide range of academic, cultural and extra-curricular activities. It will equip children for the demands and opportunities of the twenty-first century by offering a differentiated, effective and rigorous curriculum as an entitlement to all.

A professional and highly motivated staff, in partnership with parents, will encourage each child to achieve their full potential. In a disciplined and caring environment, based on mutual respect, each child will be valued as an individual in his/her own right and his/her moral development encouraged.

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
Wyartt, Janell	Principal	Serves as the instructional leader of the school, monitor classroom instruction and student learning via data from bi-weekly and tri-weekly assessments.
Harris, Anthony	Dean	Monitor and correct student behavior; implement school's discipline plan, motivate and reward students with positive behavior. Assist the principal in monitoring and correcting any safety facility and operational issues that the school may incur.
Kelly, Lalelei	Instructional Coach	Assist the principal in monitoring classroom instruction, analyzing student data, conducting student/teacher data chats, model instructional lessons for teachers, provide professional development.

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	39	49	53	62	40	41	61	53	51	0	0	0	0	449
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	2	1	6	3	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide assessment	1	12	22	5	17	26	36	38	38	0	0	0	0	195

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	1	2	17	6	9	16	23	27	29	0	0	0	0	130

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		1	1	2	8	0	3	8	9	8	0	0	0	40
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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

29

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/10/2019

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	8	4	4	3	5	1	5	5	4	0	0	0	0	39
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	4	12	0	2	18	1	30	18	0	0	0	0	85

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	36%	63%	61%	32%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	61%	59%	52%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	57%	54%	55%	55%	51%
Math Achievement	42%	67%	62%	45%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains	43%	63%	59%	62%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	29%	56%	52%	60%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	22%	56%	56%	31%	53%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	79%	80%	78%	85%	75%	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	39 (0)	49 (0)	53 (0)	62 (0)	40 (0)	41 (0)	61 (0)	53 (0)	51 (0)	449 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	1 ()	2 (0)	1 (0)	6 (0)	3 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	20 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	1 ()	12 (0)	22 (0)	5 (0)	17 (0)	26 (0)	36 (0)	38 (0)	38 (0)	195 (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	37%	60%	-23%	58%	-21%
	2018	29%	61%	-32%	57%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	21%	64%	-43%	58%	-37%
	2018	48%	60%	-12%	56%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-27%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	38%	60%	-22%	56%	-18%
	2018	29%	59%	-30%	55%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
06	2019	37%	58%	-21%	54%	-17%
	2018	37%	53%	-16%	52%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
07	2019	33%	56%	-23%	52%	-19%
	2018	44%	54%	-10%	51%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
08	2019	53%	60%	-7%	56%	-3%
	2018	28%	59%	-31%	58%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		25%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	59%	67%	-8%	62%	-3%
	2018	58%	67%	-9%	62%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	69%	-15%	64%	-10%
	2018	40%	68%	-28%	62%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	66%	65%	1%	60%	6%
	2018	50%	66%	-16%	61%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		26%				
06	2019	21%	58%	-37%	55%	-34%
	2018	35%	56%	-21%	52%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-29%				
07	2019	23%	53%	-30%	54%	-31%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	45%	52%	-7%	54%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-22%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
08	2019	6%	40%	-34%	46%	-40%
	2018	36%	38%	-2%	45%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-30%				
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	17%	53%	-36%	53%	-36%
	2018	31%	56%	-25%	55%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	6%	43%	-37%	48%	-42%
	2018	28%	44%	-16%	50%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		-22%				
Cohort Comparison		-25%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	50%	68%	-18%	67%	-17%
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	76%	73%	3%	71%	5%
2018	88%	72%	16%	71%	17%
Compare		-12%			
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	61%	63%	-2%	61%	0%
2018	0%	59%	-59%	62%	-62%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		61%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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		9		6	9						
BLK	36	48	52	43	43	29	22	79	64		
HSP	29	27		29	33						
FRL	33	47	55	41	43	28	20	80	67		
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
BLK	36	48	49	45	55	46	29	88			
HSP	47	69		33	67						
FRL	40	51	49	46	58	51	36	90			
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
ELL	30			40							
BLK	31	50	51	45	61	58	30	86			
HSP	29	69		43	80						
FRL	30	50	50	44	61	58	29	82			

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	414
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	6
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	30
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	

Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	46
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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance for the 2019-2020 school year would be a significant decrease in the number of students attaining learning gains. The data reflects a 16% decrease in overall school learning gains and a 19% decrease in learning gains for students that reside in the lowest quartile. Contributing factors to last year's low performance was an influx of brand new teachers new to education, coupled with lack of consistent tutoring attendance of participants, coupled with low attendance to before school intervention programs.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year, would be Science. Data shows that 31% of students attained proficiency in the 2018 school year where 22% met the proficiency mark in the 2019 school year. A contributing factor was the implementation of a brand new state adopted text book. In addition, students who took the NGSSS Science Assessment also struggled in the area of ELA and Mathematics, thus incurring difficulty in dissecting and comprehending the question being asked.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state's average is Science. In 2019 the state's average for Science was 56% and the school's average for Science was 22% . Factors that contributed to this trend was the implementation of a new state adopted Science textbook, coupled with the students in grade 8 having significant low proficiency in the area of reading. As a result of the Science test being mostly comprised of word problems, many students incurred great difficulty in decoding the question and comprehending what the question asked.

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 would be English Language Arts. As a result of having many students in the accountability grades possess low proficient scores in ELA, we implemented a mandatory implementation plan for the ELA component of I-Ready, an online Technological platform in which students had to complete 2-3 lessons weekly. The assignments were based on the students current reading level, meeting the students where they were, while still exposing them to the tested FSA standards. In addition, growth monitoring assessments were given to students to determine if growth in ELA had been made.

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

In reflecting on the EWS data, one potential area of concern is the number of students that scored a level one on statewide assessments. There will be a direct focus on moving students from a level 1 to a level 2 in the areas of ELA and Mathematics.

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

1. Increase the number of students attaining proficiency in all tested areas.
2. Increase the number of students making learning gains in ELA and Mathematics.
3. Increase the number of students in the lowest quartile making learning gains in ELA and Mathematics.
4. Decrease the number of students who attain a level one on statewide assessments.
5. Decrease the number of students who possess two or more EWS indicators.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	All Core Instructional Areas
Rationale	If a direct focus is placed on core instruction in all areas will improve and there will be an overall increase in student achievement.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is is a minimum of 5 percentage point increase in all tested areas of the Florida Standards Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Janell Wyartt (944066@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students will be provided intensive instruction via interventions, push in/pull out models. In addition, parent conferences will be conducted to render suggestions and strategies that can be utilized at home. Students will also be provided research-based intervention strategies that meet the individual needs of struggling students , actively address the social needs and provide social support as well as academic assistance for struggling students, develop rigorous, specific, grade-by-grade standards that provide direction for curriculum development and help teachers assess individual learning needs , and involve parents as team members in improving student performance.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The reason that this strategy is being utilized is because it has been proven as a successful strategy that aided ECA i improving their school grade, In addition, having many conversations with parents has yielded results of students working harder, thus displaying a team of individuals who are in support of students receiving a quality education.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop an intensive support plan for students identified through data requiring intervention based upon social and academic needs. 2. Monitor student growth via bi-weekly/tri-weekly data 3. Monitor differentiated instruction groups 4. Conduct Data Chats with students, teachers, and parents 5. Remediate or Enrich students accordingly.
Person Responsible	Janell Wyartt (944066@dadeschools.net)

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).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

ECA has a parent liaison group that assists the Principal in attaining business partnerships that aids the school in securing and utilizing resources for student achievement. Typically, we visit various businesses within the community and introduce ourselves and ask if we could host a fundraiser at their location in which a portion of the proceeds go back to the school. ECA also participates in local businesses educational programs. From participation, we acquire funds or resources that are donated to the school. In addition, to their funds being donated, our business partners always speak to our students about the importance of education and how good study habits are necessary even as adults.

PFEP Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

ECA's students social-emotional needs are being met through various styles. We have counseling services provided to students who are in need of speaking to someone and express their concerns and fears.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Through articulation, ECA provides elementary students an opportunity to experience a day in middle school prior to entering middle school. Through these services, students are able to transition to more than one class. Additionally, during the 1st nine weeks, special attention is provided to 6th grade students in which administration meets with middle school cohorts and orientate them on their new grade level, and their expectations.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

After reviewing the school's data, the school's leadership team meets to discuss research based materials, strategies that worked well with our students and yielded the best results. We then ensure that all resources and materials used or purchased are aligned to the Florida Standards by consistently utilizing the recommended state adopted materials Test Item Specifications, and District Pacing Guides.

Persons Responsible: Janell W. Ferguson, Principal
Lalelei Kelly, Administrative Support

Frequency: Weekly

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

ECA will promote academic and career planning by:

1. Examining the policies and practices that govern entrance into rigorous classes. Work with the school's master scheduler to ensure there are sufficient sections of rigorous classes so all students have an opportunity to participate.
2. Collaborate with teachers, including those who are certified to teach high advanced courses, and other rigorous courses to develop strategies to help more students succeed (e.g. using technology and experiential learning, tutoring, extra study time, and special skill sessions).
3. Collaborate with teachers and students to build peer mentoring program for students that support networks that traditionally assist underserved students, first-generation students, and others who may need extra help with rigorous courses.

The focus on each level:

Elementary school will create early awareness, knowledge and skills that lay the foundation for the academic rigor and social development necessary for college and career readiness.

Middle school will create opportunities to explore and deepen college and career knowledge and skills necessary for academic planning and goal setting.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: All Core Instructional Areas				\$57,508.97
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			5032 - Excelsior PREP Charter School Of Miami Garden	General Fund	448.0	\$57,508.97
			<i>Notes: Purchase additional ancillary materials to assist in improvement and overall increase in student achievement.</i>			
Total:						\$57,508.97