

Broward County Public Schools

Innovation Charter School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	32
Budget to Support Goals	32

Innovation Charter School

600 SW 3RD ST, Pompano Beach, FL 33060

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Susan Alexander

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: D (34%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: F (25%)
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	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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.

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	12
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	32

Innovation Charter School

600 SW 3RD ST, Pompano Beach, FL 33060

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	94%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	95%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	D	D	C	C

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 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.

The mission of Innovation Charter School (ICS) is to develop and nurture a collaborative community of learners with successful education models to impact tomorrow's world today. Equipping and nurturing children from lower socioeconomic strata with technology, literacy, and numeracy skills prepares them for fulfilling their future roles in a workforce that is increasingly global in its perspective, as well as in its connectedness and reach, is critical to their success in that environment and, ultimately, to the advancement of our community and culture within that technology-rich and knowledge-driven context. The focus of the charter school is to serve the children and families in our culturally diverse community with an emphasis on reading, math, and technology. The theme of the charter school helps facilitate learning through a dynamic, interactive, teamwork environment to prepare students for the global workplace. ICS serves all eligible Broward County students in grades K-5. The Board of ICS cast this mission and vision during the development of the original application, and they reflect their passions, dreams, and desires to serve the community of Pompano Beach, Florida. This mission has been rephrased for ease of communication via publication to our school's website as "Innovation Charter School empowers young ones for success as world changers through highly talented teachers using innovative and leading methods in a very loving environment." An emphasis on Caring and Excellence as the two pillars of our community have evolved out of daily practice and interaction amongst our administrators, teachers, staff, students, parents and surrounding community members.

Provide the school's vision statement.

ICS CREED Today is going to be a great day. I came to school to listen and learn. I will ask questions if I don't understand. My teachers and my classmates love me and are cheering me on. I will be diligent and do my best daily. I will respect my teachers and my classmates. I will walk in confidence knowing that I am destined for great things.

ICS is constantly working towards achieving significant progress towards achieving the school/mission-specific goals as defined in our charter agreement. We understand that each child is unique and learns differently, developing at his/her own rate, and reinforces this in the classroom with professionals who believe that all children can succeed. To support this learning environment, professionals have the tools to facilitate student learning to the Application Notes for Innovation Charter School Page 41 level of mastery and life application. In addition, our teachers use data to accurately shape differentiation. The role of the teacher is interactive, facilitating academic student activities. Children learn by building on what they already know. The KWL reading strategy – what they Know, what they Want to know, and what they will Learn – applies as our children begin building a foundation of knowledge in the early years and then learning how to take this educational framework to assist them in developing the constructs upon which their viewpoints will be based. For our demographics, this knowledge base begins at school age and is nurtured in the classroom by the school academic program and safe environment. As this educational foundation is cultivated, students have been empowered to look to the future with hopes and dreams of becoming productive members of society. ICS facilitates the building of this educational framework to encourage students to become the "best they can be" to impact the future and be "world changers. ICS's mission is "to develop and nurture a collaborative community of learners with successful education models to impact tomorrow's world today." The foundation – a framework of concepts not yet built – begins as our children experience the world of knowledge in our classrooms, immersed with the lessons from our core curriculum and actively engaged with these new concepts in a visual and tactile way. Then, our children begin constructing from what they have yet to experience within a lower economic background and language interference environment and progress in our "collaborative community of learners." This mission is working towards progressing by: effectively executing Standards-

Based classroom instruction aligned Florida State Standards (FSS) integrated research-based core curricula Broward County approved K-12 Literacy Plan individualized online instructional support using i-Ready in a safe environment for students The ultimate outcome: Students are growing as individuals to “impact tomorrow’s world today.”

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
Alexander, Susan	Principal	Responsible for student academic achievement, staff & faculty professional development and oversight, overall operational organization of the school, community relations, and supervision of the budget.
Anderson, Marisa	Instructional Coach	Curriculum Facilitator, Instructional Coaching, IReady data collection, Training, Accountability, Budget, Purchasing, Report card grade accuracy and credibility, Teacher Certification
Yates, Janet	Assistant Principal	Proxy for the principal, Teacher care, accountability, development, and observations, Operations & Events, CCA/CCFL & JKV Liaison, CCLC Support, Grade accountability/Report Cards, Lesson Plans, Scheduling, School Improvement, Academics, Teacher Evaluations & Prof. Dev. Plans, Progress Monitoring, Title 2
Martinez, Andres	Administrative Support	ELL support testing etc. Buses, Facilities (Cleaning Co. & FORUM liaison), Emergency Management Procedures (fire drills, lockdowns, reunification etc.) Discipline Support, CCLC support, Spanish Translation Team Member support: Students at Risk, MTSS/RTI, and Retentions
Ott, Michael	Administrative Support	All things ESE: student & teacher support, I.E.P.s, 504s, oversees Chrysalis, Speech Pathologist, and psychologist when on campus, Supervises E.A. interventions, Substitute placement, Team member support: Students at Risk, MTSS/RTI, and retention, Mental Health Liaison
Evans, Jackie	Administrative Support	MTSS student support, State Testing K-5th, Attendance (Tardiness and Truancy, At Risk Students) Oversees PLC HEART, Homeless

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Susan Alexander

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.*

12

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

28

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: D (34%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: F (25%)
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	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	79	93	88	83	74	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	464
Attendance below 90 percent	12	21	14	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	5	11	13	3	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in Math	7	9	10	4	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	8	12	7	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	8	12	6	12	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	4	7	8	5	15	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	3	2	6	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/16/2020

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	94	96	99	79	55	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	466
Attendance below 90 percent	22	15	15	12	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	30	29	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86

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	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	2	7	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	94	96	99	79	55	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	466
Attendance below 90 percent	22	15	15	12	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	30	29	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86

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	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	2	7	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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%	59%	57%	28%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	60%	58%	49%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	54%	53%	73%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	40%	65%	63%	30%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	40%	66%	62%	35%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	23%	53%	51%	38%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	9%	46%	53%	0%	45%	51%

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	45%	60%	-15%	58%	-13%
	2018	31%	59%	-28%	57%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	40%	62%	-22%	58%	-18%
	2018	18%	58%	-40%	56%	-38%
Same Grade Comparison		22%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	10%	59%	-49%	56%	-46%
	2018	39%	56%	-17%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-29%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	46%	65%	-19%	62%	-16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	48%	63%	-15%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	42%	67%	-25%	64%	-22%
	2018	21%	63%	-42%	62%	-41%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	23%	64%	-41%	60%	-37%
	2018	37%	62%	-25%	61%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	8%	49%	-41%	53%	-45%
	2018	37%	51%	-14%	55%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-29%				
Cohort Comparison						

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		10			20						
ELL	24	41	38	33	32	25					
BLK	37	52		39	40						
HSP	33	41	36	37	35	21	5				
WHT	50			57							
FRL	34	49	47	38	31	7	9				
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	8	45		8	50						
ELL	14	55	67	27	62	70	10				
BLK	39	42		41	60		50				
HSP	21	53	69	36	57	64	23				
WHT	62			46							
FRL	27	49	65	36	55	67	32				

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	20			20							
ELL		33		17	32						
BLK	30	53		19	24						
HSP	17	40		30	35						
WHT	60			60							
FRL	24	48	70	28	33	33					

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	293
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	15
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	31
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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

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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	34
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	33
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
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
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	54
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	33
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.

Although Math and Reading/ELA were close in improvement from AP#1 to AP#2, the ELA/Reading showed the lowest performance. Our 2020 i-Ready Diagnostic #1 assessment showed 24% proficiency (-30% from AP 3), 55% Tier 2, (+23) and 21% Tier 3 (+8).

For Diagnostic #2, Reading/ELA scores showed 44% proficiency (Tier 1) increase of 20% from Diagnostic #1, 45% Tier 2 with -10% difference and 11% Tier 3 with a decrease of 10% (56% below grade level) for whole school. While Kindergarten scores increased by 28%, the other grade levels had minimal increases: Grade 5 – 26% (the least), 3rd Grade – 56%, and Kindergarten – 66% (the most). For K-2, 46% students are proficient and 51% in Tier 2 with 3% in Tier 3. For Grades 3-5, students scored 39% proficient, 40% Tier 2 and 20% Tier 3 (60% below grade level). Per our subgroups for Diagnostic #2, ELA gains for ELL – 29%, BLK – 36%, HSP – 45%, FRL – 43% is -7% from the 2019 FSA scores and -15% from 2018 scores. The SWD was +50% difference 2018 and +15% for 2019.

ICS is 43% ELL, and summer away from school impacts ESOL students which is reflective in the difference between AP 3 and AP1 scores. With A1 and Level 1 students working on Imagine Learning, the Reading/ELA proficiency should have had a larger increase. Teachers had to adjust to a new Literacy Coach and Standard based lessons while Reading Intervention showed some inconsistencies – impacting student growth.

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

Math

For the last 2 years our data shows students score low on the AP1 i-Ready assessment - (2018 Math – AP 1 – 8% and 2019 - 13%). For this year, our i-Ready Diagnostic #1 assessment showed 13% proficiency (-43% from AP 3), 65% Tier 2, (+26) and 22% Tier 3 (+16).

For Diagnostic #2, Math scores showed 33% proficiency (Tier 1) increase of 20% from Diagnostic #1, 58% Tier 2 with -7% difference and 9% Tier 3 with a decrease of 13% (67% below grade level) whole school. While Kindergarten scores increased by 40%, the other grade levels only had minimal increases: Grade 1 – 11% (the least) and 3rd Grade – 19% (the most). For K-2, 26% students are proficient and 63% in Tier 2 with only 3% in Tier 3. For Grades 3-5, students scored 39% proficient, 48% Tier 2 and 13% Tier 3 (61% below grade level). Per our subgroups for Diagnostic #2, Math gains for Grades 3 are 48%, Grade 4 - 34% and for Grade 5 - 31%.

Data shows subgroup i-Ready AP #2 Math gains were 7% higher than the FSA 2019 Math Gains, but again, 22% lower than the 2018 percentage.

Pacing concerns and curricular differences per Diagnostic #2 along with the need for consistent daily small groups and remediation were factors. Addressing the needs of our Math Lowest 25% subgroups and using i-Ready and GoMath resources will impact intervention. Time for small groups and implementing manipulatives was slow to embrace.

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 with the greatest gap when compared to the state average for the 2019 FSA was Science Achievement. The statewide Science percentage was 53%, and ICS scored 9% for 2019. Science achievement for our 5th grade subgroups showed no achievement for SWD, and 10% ELL, 50% BLK, 18% HSP, 23% FRL decrease from 2018-2019. Reading is a factor. With the Reading/ELA Diagnostic #1 at 24% proficiency, understanding vocabulary (27%) and informational text comprehension (26%) were the lowest scored skills. Students scored a 39% proficiency on the teacher made Pre-Test and 32% on the Coach publishing Mid-Year (-7%), 27% Tier 2 and 41% Tier 3 - 68% below grade level. The drop in the Mid-Year test and the 41% in Tier 3 were concerns in looking at the FSA in May. Plans for the Science Camp in the spring were in place and this will be scheduled for this year. Even though there is a consistent K-4 focus with teaching Science, addressing standards that were not mastered before 5th grade is a concern which affects pacing and student performance along with the reading deficiencies. Having the time to do hands-on activities and continue moving forward is a constant challenge. We will have a new teacher again this year. With STEMscopes, GIZZMOS and Brain Pop, our scores should increase as teachers implement the new resources.

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

The statewide Science Achievement percentage was 53%, and ICS scored 9% for 2019. Science achievement for our 5th grade subgroups showed no achievement for SWD, and 10% ELL, 50% BLK, 18% HSP, 23% FRL decrease from 2018-2019. For Science assessments for proficiency and remediation, the 5th grade students scored a 39% proficiency on the Pre-Test, 35% Tier 2 and 26% Tier 3. For the Mid-Year assessment, students scored 32% on (-7%), 27% Tier 2 (-8) and 41% Tier 3 (-15). Although the drop in the Mid-Year test and the 41% in Tier 3 were concerns in looking at the FSA in May, the AP 1 showed a 30% increase and the Mid – year showed a 23% increase from the 9% FSA score. This confirmed that students were learning science. We hired a highly effective teacher who embraced the 5th graders and work diligently to teach the standards along with a new Curriculum Coach. Also, new teacher resources such as STEMscopes, GIZZMOS and Brain Pop were ordered to give the students hands-on and visual connect to the standards. The Science Team consistently met monthly to discuss action steps and best practices. The 5 E's were established as part of science academic vocabulary and steps to the process of inquiry. Science Camp was planned and students were applying for Saturday Science Camp. What will take a two year plan to compete began this year in ICS science classes.

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

Attendance was one of our Action Steps for this year and will be an action item again for next year. Last year, we had 15% of our students with attendance below 90%. Kindergarten was the highest with 23% and 4th grade was the lowest with 5%. Grades K-2 averaged 18% of the students to have attendance below 90% and Grades 3-5 averaged 10%. For this year, our average students below 90% attendance is 13% (-2%) and the highest average is first grade (kindergarten last year) with the same 23%. The lowest average was 5th Grade with 0%. The K-2 average was the same with 18% and Grades 3-5 was 5% (-5%). We sent letters, made calls, and hired a Social Worker who also made calls. The Attendance Team worked individually instead of meeting once a month to collaborate. Tracking students with attendance issues from this year to next year with the EWS data will help with scheduling parent conference with administration in the process. We had a picture wall for those students with perfect attendance and awards were give quarterly. The CPS team did discuss attendance when meeting with parents, and parent communication took place in our Bee's Buzz letter, Coffee and Conversation with the Principal and at Title I Parent events such as Back to School Night. Tracking Action Steps monthly will help us manage the student list by grade and make contacts as needed as well as have incentives consistently.

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

1. Reading/ELA Focus

Reading permeates all disciplines. Proficiency scores for AP 1 of 24% began in the “teens’ except for Kindergarten at 38% and 3rd Grade with 36%. With 20% increase in our 2019-2020 data for the i-Ready Reading/ELA Diagnostic #1 to Diagnostic #2, scores showed 44% proficiency and 56% below grade level. We must continually support teachers and track data to purposefully implement a reading program that will produce student gains and teach children how to read.

Primary grades met their goals for phonics achievement last year, but in K-2, we must continue to build the foundation for reading by teaching phonics and phonemic awareness and build vocabulary consistently. The i-Ready Diagnostic #2 Assessment shows our students are most deficient in Vocabulary and Informative Text Comprehension skills. Building student comprehension and vocabulary skills will effectively expand students’ word bank and connect words to content knowledge and then comprehension. Then, as students reach Intermediate grades, they will be able to meet the expectations in all disciplines as expectations broaden through comprehension and writing.

With a 43% ELL population along with 5 other subgroups, teaching students the English language and teaching students how to read and comprehend reading are at the forefront of how we develop the overall learning experience. We must continue to track i-Ready data, identify instructional groupings with specific skill deficits, and implement a working format for small groups and reading intervention that will address the reading skills needs of all of our students including our ELL, BLK, HSP, FRL, SWD and Lowest 25% subgroups.

2. Math Focus

For the past 2 years, our students have scored low on the AP1 i-Ready assessment - (2018 Math – AP 1 – 8% and 2019 Math 13%). For this year, our i-Ready Diagnostic #1 assessment showed 13% proficiency (-43% from AP 3), 65% Tier 2, (+26) and 22% Tier 3 (+16). Whole school proficiency was 33% for Diagnostic #2.

Instructional review, assessment data to drive instruction and remediation will reflect increased math learning gains. Teacher support will facilitate discussions of math pacing and planning along with best practices discussions for whole group math instruction to effectively address each standard. Communicating expectations in faculty meetings, providing professional development as needed, and observing classes with teacher accountability will impact our K-5 Math program and student achievement. From the GOMath review and reinforcement curriculum to the i-Ready Math Supplemental lessons and instructional groupings, teachers have the tools to use with DI to meet the needs of all of our students including our ELL, BLK, HSP, FRL, SWD and Lowest 25% subgroups. Implementing small group instruction to complement the whole group instructional lesson effectively will be a focus as the Math Team meets and continual program evaluation takes place.

3. Science Focus

Because of the 28% difference in performance on our 5th Graders Science Achievement scores with a 9% in 2018-2019 and no final state assessment, we must continue to re-evaluate our K-5 Science program with a focus on 5th grade. With increased enrollment, we will again be working with new teachers. By re-evaluating pacing and specific standard-based units in K-5, we will continue to refine the instructional approach. With new resources, teacher support and training is a priority.

Communicating expectations K-5 with continual evaluation and implementation of hands-on activities, academic vocabulary word banks, and specific instructional focuses per grade level standards. Coordinating teacher accountability through Science Team meetings will continue to initiate best practice conversations for hands-on activities and connect curricular standards with the scope and

sequence.

We will use Coach Practice Tests to accurately track student achievement and make instructional changes and create a plan for remediation. Most importantly, small group reinforcement and remediation of standards taught per these assessments will be monitored, and students re-assessed as learning gains increase for our ELL, BLK, HSP, FRL, SWD and Lowest 25% subgroups.

4. Attendance Focus

To meet our goal, we will re-evaluate our program for Primary Grades. Although we sent 91 letters and made 77 calls for 1st Grade, there was no change in the 23% for Kindergarten 2018-2019 to First Grade. Continuing to communicating attendance expectations to parents throughout the year with letters and parent meetings, and parent conferences individually through the Administrative office will continue to take place. We must track student in our Early Warning Signs data and have specific conversations in teacher-parent conferences and administrative conferences to identify specific areas of need with our ICS families and plan individualized attendance plans to see our children consistently come to school.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Although there was a 20% increase in our 2019-2020 data for the i-Ready ELA Diagnostic #1 to Diagnostic #2, our scores showed 44% proficiency. (Tier 1), 45% Tier 2 (or one grade level below) and 11% Tier 3 (2 or more grade levels below) for whole school in December. Reading levels are still below 50%, and reading impacts student achievement in all disciplines. For K-2, 46% students are proficient and 51% in Tier 2 with only 7% in Tier 3. For Grades 3-5, students scored 39% proficient, 41% Tier 2 and 20% Tier 3 (61% below grade level). Vocabulary (K-5) and Informative Text Comprehension are the skills that show the greatest need for focus (Grades 1-5). With an ELL subgroup of 43% of our school community, reading scores between AP 3 and AP 1 have been considerably low for the last 2 years. First Grade has the highest percent of ELL students with 63% (53 of 84 students) and 71% (38 students) of these are A1 and Level 1 working on Imagine Learning. Also, with Grade 2 at 56% and Grade 3 at 50% ELL students, focusing on the ELL learner will benefit with reading as Focus Area. Grades K-2 average 47% Annual Typical Growth and Grades 3-5 with 58% Annual Typical Growth. The correlation between student assessment improvement and student typical growth reflects the need for a continued Reading/ELA Action Plan. Per our subgroups for Diagnostic #2 ELA gains, student show: SWD 60%, ELL 29%, BLK 36%, HSP 45%, FL 43% and Lowest 25% with 21%. Percentages close to the 2018-2019 FSA. In comparison to 2018-2019 FSA scores, there is need to focus instructional groupings on specific skill needs and continue to refine small group rotations by using data to drive instruction for small group.

Measurable Outcome:

Although there was a 20% increase in our 2019-2020 data for the i-Ready Reading/ELA Diagnostic #1 to Diagnostic #2, our scores showed 44%(21%) proficiency (Tier 1), 45%(68%) Tier 2 (or one grade level below) and 11%(11%) Tier 3 (2 or more grade levels below) for whole school in December. The i-Ready Diagnostic #2 Assessment shows our students are most deficient in Vocabulary and Informative Text Comprehension skills. Also, our community is 43% ELL and building comprehension and vocabulary skills will effectively expand students' word bank and connect words to content knowledge and then comprehension.

The school will increase our schoolwide Reading/ELA score from 44% to 50%. Also, the school will increase our Vocabulary score from 42%(20%) to 47%(25%) and our Informative Test Comprehension from 43% (23%) to 48% (28%) in the 2021 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Janet Yates (janetyates@innovationcharter.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

The Explicit Direct Instructional approach will complement the Gradual Release process as teachers connect past and present knowledge, provide step-by-step guided questions and model (I DO), provide guided practice in groups (We DO), and incorporate independent reading texts and assignments (You DO). This strategy will focus students and create a safe learning environment for students to interact with the lesson.

Again, the Explicit Direct Instructional approach will direct vocabulary instruction across all disciplines as teachers provide an easy-to-understand definition with examples and non-examples and multiple practice opportunities for using vocabulary words. Semantic Mapping will enhance academic word walls as students and teachers build classroom word walls connecting new words with varied related words and associate how multiple words and concepts "fit together." Visuals will also connect the definitions along with the multiple connects.

These will ensure vocabulary and informative text comprehension concept and skill development, guided practice and closure.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Although there was a 20% increase in our 2019-2020 data for the i-Ready Reading/ELA Diagnostic #1 to Diagnostic #2, our scores showed 44%(21%) proficiency (Tier 1), 45%(68%) Tier 2 (or one grade level below) and 11%(11%) Tier 3 (2 or more grade levels below) for whole school in December. Reading levels are still below 50%, and reading impacts student achievement in all disciplines. The Explicit Direct Instruction will fortify standard-based lessons and the Gradual Release will create a safe environment for students to work through concepts taught.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teacher Support

An ELA Team, one teacher per grade level, will meet monthly to address the key instructional components such as Small Group Rotations, Gradual Release, and Best Practices. A Curriculum Coach will guide grade level teams and assist in data dissemination, unpacking the standards, pacing, and scope and sequence. Lastly, each Grade Level will have a Team Leader to be immediate support level for guidance with standards, lessons, and lesson plan discussions. Data, Grade Level, and Team Leader meetings will focus on dissemination of data as BAS, i-Ready and Imagine Learning performance is tracked and used to drive instruction. Walk-throughs, and observations will be conducted to ensure teachers are implementing the strategic plan and key strategies to meet the needs of all students. Faculty meetings are another layer of support to create a caring community of communication, addressing important informational topics, expectations, and key professional development topics.

Person Responsible Janet Yates (janetyates@innovationcharter.net)

2. Professional Development:

Professional Development will focus on Implementation of SIP Action Steps, HMH Think Central, TECHNOLOGY at School and at Home, Reading Rotations for Differentiating Instruction, BAS, Building Academic Vocabulary, Best Practices for ESE/ELL Strategies, Basis – MTSS/RTI Strategies, i-Ready, and Assessment Evaluation and Implementation to Drive Instruction. Other Primary (K-2) and Intermediate (Grades 3-5) as well as Grade Level Professional Development will provide direction on Unpacking the Florida Best Standards, FUNdations, New Lesson Plan Template, and Review of Gradual Release will be provided to support teachers as they differentiate for our subgroups: ELL, SWD, HSP, BLK, FRL, and Lowest 25%. Teacher professional development in Science will be a major focus including district based and WIDA trainings to ensure teachers meet the diversified needs of our ELL students.

Person Responsible Susan Alexander (susanalexander@innovationcharter.net)

3. Curricular Components:

Journeys will be used to teach key reading/ELA standards in whole group with the Journeys Teacher Toolkit and i-Ready Toolbox to guide vocabulary and informative text comprehension skills and review, reinforce and remediate all students including the ELL, SWD, HSP, BLK, FRL, and Lowest 25%. i-Ready Reading will be used to reinforce the standards taught and both Journeys (Grades K-3) and Top Score (Grades 4-5) will be used to guide ELA/Writing standard expectations, ELA teaching tools, and student needs. Instructional Groupings and Focus skills will be determined by BAS and i-Ready Diagnostic data and i-Ready Typical Growth tracking with an emphasis on vocabulary and informative text comprehension. RTI student focus skills will be discussed in CPST meetings. FUNdations will be used for the second year with Kindergarten – 2nd Grade during Reading Intervention with whole group and small group phonics, phonemic awareness and writing reinforcement.

Person Responsible Marisa Anderson (marisaanderson@innovationcharter.net)

4. Teaching Reading/ELA:

During the standards-based Whole Group instruction, the student will engage in power point presentations, essential questioning, using graphic organizers, and writing/note-taking to guide all students including ELL, SWD, HSP, BLK, FRL, and Lowest 25%. Teachers will follow the Gradual Release strategy as teachers model, students work together for practice, and then students work individually for mastery. During small group instruction, students will utilize core Journeys curriculum to continue Gradual Release process and transition to Journeys leveled readers, teaching the same standard. Students will rotate from independent work for comprehension to the Teacher Led Center. Key focus skills are academic vocabulary and informative text comprehension. Students will have differentiated tasks with modifications and accommodations and RTI needs including our subgroups ELL, SWD, HSP, BLK, FRL, and Lowest 25%. Teachers will evaluate with formative and summative assessments along with the i-Ready and BAS data to drive instructional changes.

Person Responsible Marisa Anderson (marisaanderson@innovationcharter.net)

5. Test Prep:

Teachers will use Journeys Cold Reads and i-Ready Toolbox assessments for comprehension/FSA student practice and standard based assessment checks per standard. Remediation will be a part of the assessment process for those students who perform below grade level. The USA Test Prep assessment will be given quarterly to provide FSA practice. Also, Morning Meeting will address student anxiety and nervousness, and test taking strategy mini lessons will be provided for implementation and practice before the USA Test Prep and FSA practice test. This “student experience” will allow practice for SEL components, data to evaluate ELA standards that need remediation, and review of test taking strategies for all students including our subgroups ELL, SWD, HSP, BLK, FRL, and Lowest 25%. Quarterly data chats will help students to set goals and address concerns as formative and summative assessments are given.

Person Responsible Janet Yates (janetyates@innovationcharter.net)

6. Reading Intervention (Power Hour):

Students in Grades 3-5, who scored a Level 1 and 2 on the FSA or part of the RTI Tier 3 including all subgroups will receive intensive instruction with a focus on phonics and vocabulary. Student in i-Ready instructional groupings 2 and 3 will focus on skill deficits, vocabulary and informative text comprehension instruction. Students who are in the 4, and 5 i-Ready Instructional groupings or have scored high 3 – 5 on the FSA will focus on vocabulary and literary/informative text comprehension with writing as part of Reading Intervention. Intensive pull-outs and push-ins will be held for our ESE and ELL students and those in Tier 3 i-Ready for remediation. Instructional groupings are aligned per FSA scores and Diagnostic #2 data for all students including the Lowest 25% FRL, BLK, SED, HSP, ELL and Bubble students. A Reading Coach will be assigned to K-2.

Person Responsible Janet Yates (janetyates@innovationcharter.net)

7. Progress Monitoring:

The student individual i-Ready goal is 50 minutes weekly and scoring an 80% average or higher. Quarterly data chats will include all assessment performance. Class and student goals will be set quarterly.

i-Ready Reading Instruction books, i-Ready Toolbox and i-Ready Supplemental lessons will be used for review and reinforcement, whole class instruction and small group intervention.

ELL students who are A1 and Level 1 will receive their individual plan from Imagine Learning. The ELL coordinator and teacher will track student performance and have data chats. Pull-out and push-in will

review phonics and phonemic awareness using FUNdations. Also, vocabulary and informational text comprehension with i-Ready Supplemental lesson. K-2 teachers will have FUNdations small groups during Reading Intervention to reinforce phonics concepts.

BAS will track fluency data to drive instruction for the August review and throughout the year as one more layer of assessment to identify student needs.

Person Responsible Janet Yates (janetyates@innovationcharter.net)

8. Parent Involvement

Parent Involvement transfers information and updates from the school to the home. Literacy Night emphasizes the importance of reading and ways parents can encourage reading at home. During Parent Conferences and Coffee and Conversation, there will be communication regarding FSA Reading and Writing testing and Parent Resources and District wide parent workshops.

Person Responsible Janet Yates (janetyates@innovationcharter.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>MATH:</p> <p>Math scores showed 33% proficiency (Tier 1), 58% Tier 2 (or one grade level below) and 9% Tier 3 (2 or more grade levels below) for whole school in December. While Kindergarten scores increased by 40%, the other grade levels only had minimal increases: Grade 1 – 11% (the least) and 3rd Grade – 19% (the most). For K-2, 26% students are proficient and 63% in Tier 2 with only 3% in Tier 3. For Grades 3-5, students scored 39% proficient, 48% Tier 2 and 13% Tier 3 (61% below grade level). Per our subgroups for Diagnostic #2, Math gains for Grades 3 are 48%, Grade 4 - 34% and for Grade 5 - 31%. Grades K-2 average 59% Annual Typical Growth and Grades 3-5 with 51% Annual Typical Growth. Pacing and curricular differences per Diagnostic #2 along with time to complete the Standard Assessment remediation were factors in the lower math scores. Sampling for Diagnostic #3 showed 3rd Grade at a 60% and 4th Grade at 42%.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>By the end of the 2021 Math FSA, our students including our SWD, FRL, HSP, BLK, and ELL subgroups will show a 5% increase in Math learning gains by increasing from 40% to 45% learning gains for grades 3-5. For Grades K-2 and looking to Diagnostic #3 2021 for final percentages, each grade level will increase from the 2019 Diagnostic #2 proficiency level by 10% with Kindergarten 47% to 57%, 1st Grade 15% to 25%, and 2nd Grade 28% to 38%. This will be accomplished by identifying students in the lowest 25% (Grades 3-5) and i-Ready instructional groupings (K-2) according to skill deficits, and implementing plans that will meet students' needs. From the GOMath review and reinforcement curriculum to the i-Ready Math Supplemental lessons and instructional groupings, teachers have the tools to use for DI and to meet the needs of all learners. Teacher support will facilitate discussions of math pacing and planning along with discussions of best practices for whole group math instruction to effectively address each standard. Instructional review, assessment to drive instruction and remediation will help increase our math learning gains.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Marisa Anderson (marisaanderson@innovationcharter.net)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Explicit, systematic instruction involves teaching a specific concept or procedure in a highly structured and carefully sequenced manner. This evidenced-based strategy can significantly improve students' abilities to perform mathematical operations such as adding and multiplying as well as to solve word problems. Teachers will connect the new concept to prior learning, explain important details, give precise instructions and model concepts step-by-step by thinking aloud and talking through the process. Lessons will build from simple to complex with student engagement, verbalization, and practice. Through teacher directed instruction for specific steps and explanation from student practice with verbalization of "why," explicit instruction meets the needs for diverse groups of students, including FEL, BLK, HSP, SWD, and ELL students. From the simplistic calculations to the more complex word problems, students will be able to follow steps in a process and make calculations according to student engagement and skill reinforcement.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>According to the i-Ready Diagnostic #2 data, Grades 3-5 averaged 41% math gains and our Grades 3-5 subgroups averaged 38% Math gains. For our subgroups, SWD 33%, ELL 38%, BLK 36%, HSP 40% FRL 41% and Lowest 25% - 31%. Although this is 7% above Math gains for the 2019 FSA Math gains, these scores are 22% below the 2018 Math gains. Kindergarten – 2nd grade averaged 30% proficiency. Overall, our students should be showing greater gains. Student achievement will improve as a result of identifying student instructional groupings and addressing these skill deficits in small group settings. Implementing i-Ready data to drive instruction in small groups, monitoring students as they</p>

take the i-Ready minutes and passing each week, tracking growth monitoring for Annual Stretch Goals will produce positive math learning gains for next year.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teacher Support

A Math Team, one teacher per grade level, will meet monthly to address the key instructional components such as Small Group Rotations, Gradual Release, and Best Practices. A Curriculum Coach guide grade level teams and assist in unpacking the standards, pacing, and scope and sequence. Lastly, each Grade Level will have a Team Leader to be the immediate support level for guidance with standards, lessons, and lesson plan discussions. Data, Grade Level, and Team Leader meetings will focus on dissemination of data as formative and summative assessments, i-Ready performance is tracked and used to drive instruction. Walk-throughs, and observations will be conducted to ensure teachers are implementing the strategic plan and key strategies to meet the needs of all students. Faculty meetings are another layer of support to create a caring community of communication that will address important informational topics, expectations, and key professional development topics.

Person Responsible Janet Yates (janetyates@innovationcharter.net)

2. Professional Development

Professional Development will focus on Implementation of SIP Action Steps, Teaching Word Problems, GOMath/Think Central, TECHNOLOGY – at School and at Home, Small Groups-Differentiating Instruction in Math, Building Academic Vocabulary, Best Practices for Teaching Math ESE/ELL Strategies, i-Ready, and Assessment Evaluation and Implementation to Drive Instruction. Other Primary (K-2) and Intermediate (Grades 3-5) as well as Grade Level Professional Development will provide direction on Unpacking the Florida Best Standards, CUBES, Teaching Math in STEPS, New Lesson Plan Template, and Review of Gradual Release will be provided to support teachers as they differentiate for our subgroups: ELL, SWD, HSP, BLK, FRL, and Lowest 25%.

Person Responsible Susan Alexander (susanalexander@innovationcharter.net)

3. Teaching Math:

Teachers will continue implementing the Gradual Release Model for math instruction. The teacher will give precise instructions and model step by step Explicit, Systematic instructional procedures by thinking aloud with explanation of reasoning and working examples for “I Do.” The teacher will elicit questions for next steps to ensure understanding of the skill process during “We DO” and students will work in collaborative groups and small groups with the teacher to practice standard based skills. Formative assessments such as assigned problems, vocabulary identification, and Daily Exit Tickets will provide data for student mastery and progress monitoring for “You DO.”

From reading steps in a process to reading directions, students will practice reading comprehension skills by working word problems, identifying definitions to key skill vocabulary, using CUBES to identify the process requested and follow steps in a process to practice working through informational text comprehension skills in math.

Person Responsible Marisa Anderson (marisaanderson@innovationcharter.net)

4. Academic Vocabulary:

Teachers will introduce new concepts, skills, and strategies to elicit prior knowledge for student association and engagement. This will strategically correlate similar words and skill associations for all students including subgroups (SWD, ELL, BLK, HSP, FRL) while practicing informative text comprehension. Students including our SWD, ELL, BLK, HSP, FRL will create vocabulary work banks connecting new vocabulary with pictures and varied related words and associating how words and concepts “fit together,” as well as referenced for review and reinforcement.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

5. Curricular Components:

i-Ready Math Instruction will be added as reinforcement along with the GO/Math Think Central teaching tools and I-Ready Supplemental Resources for remediation and skill practice for specific standards. I-Ready Individual student plans and lesson references are available for whole group and small group teacher instruction and individual student practice. Again, GOMath Think Central, i-Ready Math Toolbox, manipulatives, and technology apps such as Flocabulary, GIZMOS, and Quizlet will layer varied approaches to review and supplement DI and intervention.

Person Responsible Marisa Anderson (marisaanderson@innovationcharter.net)

6. Test Prep:

FSA test taking strategies will be practiced with FSA Coach Success Books and i-Ready Toolbox assessments to allow for FSA student practice per standard. FSA style test questions will be incorporated into daily assignments and standard – based unit tests. Remediation will be a part of the assessment process for those students who perform below grade level. The USA Test Prep assessment will be given quarterly to provide FSA practice. Also, Morning Meeting will address student anxiety, and test taking strategy lessons will be provided for teachers before practice test. This “student experience” will allow practice for SEL components, data to evaluate Math standards that need remediation, and review of test taking strategies for all students including our subgroups ELL, SWD, HSP, BLK, FRL, and Lowest 25%. Quarterly data chats will help students to set goals and address concerns as formative and summative assessments are given.

Person Responsible Janet Yates (janetyates@innovationcharter.net)

7. Parent Involvement

Parent Involvement transfers information and updates from the school to the home. Math Night emphasizes standard-based activities/games and math facts review. On-line Math Practice sites will be distributed along with ways parents can help with math at home. During Parent Conferences and Coffee and Conversation, there will be communication regarding FSA Math testing and Parent Resources and District wide parent workshops.

Person Responsible Janet Yates (janetyates@innovationcharter.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>SCIENCE:</p> <p>There were many areas of concern for ICS to evaluate and implement with science, and we are still working to complete the science program with fidelity. This will take more than a year. According to our Mid-Year Data, we achieved the goal: 25% of students will make a “3.” But, we must focus on a higher percentage as we did see (-7%) percentage drop from 39% to 32% on the Pre-Test to the Mid-Year test for proficiency, and 26% to 41% (+15%) for 2 years or lower – Red level. The Pre-Test was teacher-made and the mid-year assessment was the Coach Practice Test. Using Coach Practice Tests for next year will be a more consistent measurement of student performance and gage to drive instructional changes. With hiring a new teacher for next year, continued support by the Science Team Leader will create for accountability with the intended outcome. We will continue to address subgroup academic needs and restructure the science instruction with more hands-on activities to give students the opportunity to learn about world of science and show assessment improvement. Also, we will continue have K-4th Grade teachers who are mindful of the expectation implement the interactive student notebooks, hands-on activities, and tech resources. Also, when students have reading and science skill deficits such as ours, teaching science standards can take more time than is planned in the pacing guide. Also, students take more time in taking the test, and we have seen that time limits need practice to help students “forget” about the time, begin working more efficiently with test taking strategies, and work as quickly as possible to complete assessment. The hands-on activities are the “visual” to the content/skill lessons which will complement the science lessons and help all students “experience” the content and understand the concepts.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>Measurable Outcome</p> <p>For the 2020-21 school year, 25% of our 5th Grade science students will score Level 3 or above on the NGSSS assessment. By continuing to teach standard-based lessons and determining reliable science practice tests to drive instruction and address remediation for all students including our SWD, ELL, BLK, HSP, FRL students, students will make science learning gains. By providing support for our teachers, collaborating with lesson plans, implementing small group intervention for our subgroups, our students will engage in hands-on activities from a variety of resources encouraging student engagement and growth. Progress monitoring with consistent data collection and pull-outs/push-ins for our sub-groups, intervention will provide for collaborative discussions for reworking standards, assessing student performance and adjusting as needed. Supplemental curriculum will be utilized in the class science lab weekly.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Andres Martinez (andresmartinez@innovationcharter.net)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Inquiry based instruction will be introduced in each K-5th grade science class. The 4 phases of Inquiry based instruction are: ask questions, investigate, experiment, and discuss, reflect and share ideas. These hands-on activities associated with the standard based focus identifies student roles as active learners engaging in the scientific process including our SWD, ELL, BLK, HSP, FRL students. Teachers will provide students’ the opportunity to compare, contrast, interpret, analyze and explain science concepts and learn new academic vocabulary during hands-on lab activities and classroom discussions to reinforce higher-order thinking skills and deeper meaning. Inquiry learning helps students draw connections between prior knowledge and new concepts while walking though the steps and taking risks. Students will use interactive journals including graphic organizers,</p>

illustrations and graphs. The students will be motivated to advance their problem solving and critical thinking skills.

**Rationale
for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

With our continued drive to refine our approach to teaching the NGSSS science standards, the Inquiry method connects to all levels of learners and allows instruction to relate to collective multiple intelligences. We have purchased new teacher resources to complement science exploration and evaluation. To supplement our curriculum and the science instructional strategies, STEMscopes, GIZMOS and Super Science for Scholastics will be purchased as teacher resources. These supplemental resources will deepen the students' knowledge by complementing hands-on investigations, student engagement and note taking skills. In addition, these resources will help students develop a deeper understanding of concepts through inquiry, exploration and reflection that will result in higher student achievement for all of our students including our SWD, ELL, BLK, HSP, FRL subgroups.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teacher Support

The Science Team Leader will guide grade level teams and assist in unpacking the standards, pacing, and scope and sequence. Also, a Science Team, one teacher per grade level, will meet monthly to address key instructional components such as Inquiry Method of Teaching, STEMscopes, GIZMOS, and Best Practices for our ELL/ESE Students. Lastly, each Grade Level will have a Team Leader for immediate support and guidance with standards, and lesson plan discussions. Data, Grade Level, and Team Leader meetings will focus on dissemination of data as formative, summative assessments, and i-Ready performance is tracked and used to drive instruction. Walk-throughs, and observations will be conducted to ensure teachers are implementing the strategic plan and key strategies, meeting needs of all students. Faculty meetings are another layer of support to create a caring community of communication that will address important informational topics, expectations, and key professional development topics.

Person Responsible Janet Yates (janetyates@innovationcharter.net)

2. Professional Development

Professional Development will focus on Implementation of SIP Action Steps, Science Fusion/Think Central, TECHNOLOGY – at School and at Home, Small Groups-Differentiating Instruction in Science, Building Academic Vocabulary, Best Practices for Teaching Science ESE/ELL Strategies, i-Ready for vocabulary and informative text comprehension improvement, and Assessment Evaluation and Implementation to Drive Instruction. Grades 4-5 will have training for STEMscopes and GIZMOS as new resources for teachers to better implement the Inquiry method of teaching, DI and hands-on learning activities. Other Primary (K-2) and Intermediate (Grades 3-5) as well as Grade Level Professional Development will provide direction on Unpacking the Florida Best Standards, Interactive Journals, Best Practices for Teaching the Inquiry Method in segments, New Lesson Plan Template, and Review of Gradual Release will be provided to support teachers as they differentiate for our subgroups: ELL, SWD, HSP, BLK, FRL, and Lowest 25%.

Person Responsible Susan Alexander (susanalexander@innovationcharter.net)

3. Teaching Science

Using the Inquiry Method continues to structure science lessons, and this whole group instruction will guide students to: Engage, Explore, Explain, Evaluate, and extend science to associate with step-by-step connections. Using teacher guided questions along with authentic student questions generated from the “experience” of learning, the science classroom will become a hands-on learning experience to connect standards-based lessons to academic vocabulary and student engagement for all students including ELL, SWD, HSP, BLK, FRL, and Lowest 25%. Teachers will use a variety of visuals, charts, and graphs, and students will record findings in interactive journals. Grades 3-5 will read from a variety of informational texts and respond through a variety of activities such as summaries for comprehension and explanation of

meaning by identification of text features and text structures to enforce standards-based learning. Scholastic leveled informative texts and Super-Science Scholastic Magazines will be used for comprehension practice.

Person Responsible Marisa Anderson (marisaanderson@innovationcharter.net)

4. Academic Vocabulary

Teachers will introduce new concepts, skills, and strategies to elicit prior knowledge for student association and engagement with the 5 E approach. This will strategically correlate similar academic vocabulary and skill associations for all students including subgroups (SWD, ELL, BLK, HSP, FRL) while practicing informative text comprehension. Students including our SWD, ELL, BLK, HSP, FRL will create vocabulary work banks connecting new vocabulary with pictures and varied related words and associating how words and concepts “fit together,” as well as referenced for review and reinforcement.

Person Responsible Janet Yates (janetyates@innovationcharter.net)

Curricular Components

Science Fusion/ Think Central teaching tools and I-Ready Supplemental Resources for informational text comprehension remediation and academic vocabulary review are the core curricular components. STEMscopes for Grades 5 will be purchased along with GIZMOS (Grades 4-5) for varied approaches to review, supplement DI and intervention. New teacher resources will add another layer of choices to differentiate lessons and address the needs of our subgroups including our SWD, ELL, BLK, HSP, FRL students.

Person Responsible Marisa Anderson (marisaanderson@innovationcharter.net)

6. Test Prep

Coach Practice Tests will be among the assessments teachers will use for data to drive instruction and remediate for student achievement. FSA test taking strategies will be practiced with Coach Science Books. FSA style test questions will be incorporated into daily assignments and unit tests. Remediation in small groups will address needs of those students who perform below grade level. The USA Test Prep assessment will be given quarterly to provide FSA practice. Morning Meeting will address student anxiety and nervousness, and test taking strategy mini lessons will be provided for implementation and practice before the USA Test Prep and FSA practice test. This “student experience” will allow practice for SEL components, data to evaluate Science standards that need remediation, and review of test taking strategies for all students including ELL, SWD, HSP, BLK, FRL, and Lowest 25%. Quarterly data chats will help students to set goals.

Person Responsible Janet Yates (janetyates@innovationcharter.net)

7. Science Camp

A science camp for grades 3-5 will be organized to take place 7 Saturdays in March and April for FSA Science review and reinforcement. Lessons will reflect standards needing review from Mid-year data and overall standards review. Schedules, teachers, curriculum, lesson plans, and student incentives will be organized by the Science Camp Director and Science Team.

Person Responsible Susan Alexander (susanalexander@innovationcharter.net)

8. Science Focus for ELL Students

For science test practice, 5th grade ELL students will engage in lessons taught by Standard in ability grouped ELL clusters and the ELL teacher, in the new ELL Learning Center. Students will receive remediation using the Coach Science Workbook to reinforce testing format and strategies, reading of test style questions and charts, completing all steps in a process, practicing test taking strategies and learning

how to better use ELL resource tools. The ELL Coordinator will work with ELL students to help them understand the testing process. Student skill deficits will be addressed in small group pull-outs. Teacher professional development will be a major focus including district based and WIDA trainings to ensure teachers meet the diversified needs of our ELL students.

Person Responsible Andres Martinez (andresmartinez@innovationcharter.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Attendance

According to the 2018-2019 attendance data 15% of our student body is below 90% attendance with kindergarten having the highest percentage at 23% below 90% attendance. By the end of 3rd Quarter 2020, our attendance average for students below 90% attendance was 13% with no change in our K-2 attendance average at 18%. By the end of the 2021 school year, our school year's attendance rate of below 90% will decrease from 13% to 10%.

By communicating the Innovation Charter School Attendance Policy that complies with the Broward County Schools Policy to parents and students, creating a framework for training parents and rewarding children for perfect attendance, this focus area will reinforce the importance of attending school as we build an awareness for being on time and regularly attending school to provide the maximum time in a learning environment.

Attendance Policy

1. The system for marking absences/tardies and early ick-up to track chronic offenders will continue to be communicated in parent communications and parent meetings.
2. Systematically enforcing the ICS Truancy Policy will support children who need guidance for attending school. ICS has developed the following attendance policy to comply with the School Board of Broward County Florida and stated this policy in our Parent/Student Handbook. We encourage all students to attend school on a regular basis. Each day that a student attends school, he/she has opportunities to develop personal, social, and academic skills. We encourage the commitment of all stakeholders to work together on this endeavor.
3. The School Office will contact parents of students who are absent on a daily basis (if not notified). Sending a parent link to these families as notification will take place for the daily contact. Here are the guidelines for cumulative absences (absences, early leaves, tardies):
 - 3 absences – teacher contact
 - 5 absences – warning letter
 - 7 absences – administration call with parents
 - 10 absences – administration conference with parents (attendance contract is signed)
 - 15 absences – Administrative Team decision to report for Truancy

(A child will be considered tardy if he comes to school after 8:00A.M.)
4. A weekly attendance report will chart student and grade level for those with attendance concerns and intervention accordingly. A weekly chart will be given to the Principal and the Assistant Principal.
5. The Attendance Review Team lead by the MTSS/Rtl Coordinator and including the Registrar for tracking, and Student Services Coordinator will track attendance records, create intervention plans, and communicate with Administration of a regular basis.
6. The Attendance Review Team will assess attendance report and implement strategic steps aligning with our attendance policy for intervention such as : contact the parent, conference with the parent, create a preventative plan with remediation options, determine excused and unexcused documentation, conference with student and support team accountability.

Parental Training and Communication:

- 1.Elementary student attendance issues are parent issues. We encourage the commitment of ICS staff and students' parents to work together on this endeavor. The School Office staff is available to assist with parent questions, needs and concerns as well as welcome volunteer opportunities. To engage parents in attendance focus, ICS must clearly communicate the attendance Policy and

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.

To increase parent involvement in the upcoming school year, we will solicit parents during all activities and ask involved parents to motivate other parents to take on an active role in making their child's learning-community a place of "academic excellence" and a "caring environment." Parent activities will be scheduled at different times to ensure working parents are available. We will also ask each teacher to motivate active parental participation and involvement that is authentic and value-added.

An annual Parent Meeting will be held and parents will be encouraged to attend. They will be notified by flyer, newsletter, Parent Link, or teacher initiated contact (i.e., conference, email, or phone call). Other activities will be held that will help build effective parental involvement, including a monthly Coffee with the Principal meeting, SAC meetings, Literacy/Math Family Night, a Family Celebration, and testing meetings and conferences. Information for parents of SWD regarding District sponsored workshops and classes which are free and open to all will be provided at meetings and through parent communication (i.e., communication folder, flyer, news letter).

Teachers will also hold parent conferences in their classrooms at least twice a year. Parents will be given quarterly interim reports and report cards for continual updates of students progress. Parents will be encouraged to provide suggestions/evaluations of the school's performance on a quarterly basis.

Innovation Charter School embraces the opportunity to partner with community-based organizations and businesses in parent involvement activities. These various community-based organizations will be scheduled to share information with our parent community during parent meetings, and information will be made available for parents as a resource in helping them in the education of their children. A reasonable support system will be available for parental guidance as we encourage involved parental participation as they successfully engage in the education of their children.

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

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
---	--------	---	--------

2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00