

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Excelsior PREP Charter School Of Miami Gardens



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
2019-20 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%)
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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	Yes	87%
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	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/23/2012, Lalelei Kelly

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.*

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.*

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)	Combination School KG-8
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)	85%
2019-20 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%)
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 .	

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	41	38	52	48	59	42	41	53	49	0	0	0	0	423	
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	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in Math	0	0	4	0	6	0	5	4	3	0	0	0	0	22	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	4	0	5	14	25	8	27	0	0	0	0	83	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	13	0	5	8	16	17	30	0	0	0	0	89	

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	4	0	6	7	17	18	24	0	0	0	0	76	

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/9/2020

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

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

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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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	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						

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State 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%
	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%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
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%
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	
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%	1
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%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	1
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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.

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 the school's low performance in 2018-2019 was an influx of brand new teachers new to education, coupled with lack of consistent tutoring attendance of participants, and 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 would be Science. Data shows that 31% of students attained proficiency in the 2018 school year where 22% met with 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 questions 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 questions and comprehending what the questions 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 student in the accountability grades possess low proficient scores in ELA, we implemented a mandatory implementation Plan for the ELA component of I-Ready, and 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?

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. Other specifically relating to All core Instructional Areas

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	If direct instruction is placed on core instruction, then all areas will improve and there will be an overall increase student achievement.
---	---

Measurable Outcome: The measurable outcome Excelsior Charter Academy plans to achieve 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: The evidenced based strategy that will be implemented for this area of focus will be 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 achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The reason that this strategy is being utilized is because it has proven as a successful strategy that aided ECA in 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 Steps to Implement

1. Develop an intensive support plan for students identified through data requiring interventions 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

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

The school leadership team will also address the improvement priority of placing a direct focus on moving students from a level 1 to a level 2 in the areas of ELA and Mathematics. This will be done through intensive intervention. In addition, these students will be automatically enrolled in before school, after school, and Saturday school tutoring. Upon completion of their diagnostic assessments, students will possess a intensive instructional plan that will afford students the opportunity to receive instruction, have guided practice, independent practice, differentiated instruction, assessments, as well as opportunities for having the skill or standard retaught if proficiency isn't met or enrichment if the standard is mastered.

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.

At ECA, administration knows that having a positive school culture has an impact on the entire learning experience at schools. To ensure that a positive school culture and environment is cultivated and all stakeholders are involved, The first step that ECA will take is to possess an open line of communication with all stakeholders. Constantly affirming the school's vision, mission, and school improvement strategies. Secondly, ECA staff and students will build norms that build values to help students learn what they should and should not do, but also why they should or should not do something. As we all know when school norms are established, discipline is also established. To that end, ECA will set consistent discipline measures, (i.e. providing a child with a task to correct behavior oppose to a detention. Next we will encourage creativity in the classrooms, encouraging teachers to try new methods of teaching. Also encouraging meaningful staff and parental professional development. In incorporating meaningful professional development for parents, it is important that they have a platform where they can express their hopes or concerns for their child's education. ECA will take it a step further and organize parent workshops where teachers and parents can discuss homework, study skills, assessments, and strategies that parents can use for assisting their children while at home.

Excelsior Charter Academy recognizes that it is very important to celebrate personal and academic achievement for both staff and students. This will be done by publicly applauding and complimenting staff and students on achievements great or small and encouraging all to keep up the good work. Along with the aforementioned strategies, ensuring the physical environment of the school is well kept also plays a major role in building a positive school culture. To that end, the administrative team will ensure a clean, safe, and sanitized environment at all times. In implementing strategies, it is important to always take the time to reflect and identify room for improvement. ECA's administrative team will reflect weekly during administrative team meetings on the school's culture and make adjustments when necessary.

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: Other: All core Instructional Areas				\$58,195.52
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			5032 - Excelsior PREP Charter School Of Miami Garden	Title, I Part A	421.0	\$58,195.52
			<i>Notes: Purchase additional ancillary materials to assist in improvement and overall increase in student achievement.</i>			
Total:						\$58,195.52