

Broward County Public Schools

Central Charter School



2021-22 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	20
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Central Charter School

4515 STATE ROAD 7, Lauderdale Lakes, FL 33319

www.centralcharterschool.org

Demographics

Principal: John Billingsley

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2008

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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: C (53%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: I (%)
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	
* 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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	20
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Central Charter School

4515 STATE ROAD 7, Lauderdale Lakes, FL 33319

www.centralcharterschool.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	99%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	B

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.

To achieve our vision, we will prepare our students to become independent learners with the desires, the skills, and the abilities necessary for lifelong learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Inspiring, challenging, and preparing our students for tomorrow's global opportunities.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Billingsley, John	Principal	Ensuring that academic policies and curriculum are followed Developing and tracking benchmarks for measuring institutional success Helping teachers maximize their teaching potential Observes and evaluates teacher performance
Alexander, Janell	Assistant Principal	Supervises and monitors curriculum implementation Observes and assists instructional staff with curriculum and instruction Observes teachers to ensure effective instructional facilitation
Cephas, Carissa	Reading Coach	Monitors the RTI process Observes and Coaches ELA/Reading teachers in effective instructional facilitation

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/1/2008, John Billingsley

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.*

0

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

65

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,196

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

7

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

5

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22****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	120	111	142	161	153	134	142	128	105	0	0	0	0	1196
Attendance below 90 percent	25	27	25	27	23	24	7	8	6	0	0	0	0	172
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	22	2	18	36	26	29	6	22	2	0	0	0	0	163
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	43	28	43	21	25	17	0	0	0	0	177
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	9	45	60	45	45	59	61	47	0	0	0	0	371

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	22	9	18	36	26	32	43	25	17	0	0	0	0	228

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/21/2021

2020-21 - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Number of students enrolled		
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

2020-21 - 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				47%	58%	61%	47%	57%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	58%	59%	56%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	52%	54%	51%	49%	52%
Math Achievement				39%	58%	62%	43%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains				51%	58%	59%	59%	56%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	51%	52%	53%	49%	52%
Science Achievement				30%	51%	56%	36%	52%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				77%	74%	78%	78%	75%	77%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	39%	60%	-21%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	62%	-11%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
05	2021					
	2019	39%	59%	-20%	56%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
06	2021					
	2019	39%	57%	-18%	54%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
07	2021					
	2019	55%	55%	0%	52%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
08	2021					
	2019	47%	59%	-12%	56%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	28%	65%	-37%	62%	-34%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	42%	67%	-25%	64%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				
05	2021					
	2019	46%	64%	-18%	60%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
06	2021					
	2019	43%	58%	-15%	55%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
07	2021					
	2019	35%	53%	-18%	54%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
08	2021					
	2019	12%	45%	-33%	46%	-34%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	32%	49%	-17%	53%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	24%	43%	-19%	48%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	75%	71%	4%	71%	4%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	84%	61%	23%	61%	23%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

iReady

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	54%	42%	49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	54%	42%	49%
	Students With Disabilities	69%		
	English Language Learners	21%		
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	40%	47%	47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	40%	47%	47%
	Students With Disabilities	16%		
	English Language Learners	25%		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34%	42%	54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	34%	42%	54%
	Students With Disabilities	24%		
	English Language Learners	20%		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	29%	32%	33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29%	32%	33%
	Students With Disabilities	52%		
	English Language Learners	8%		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	28%	31%	32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	28%	31%	32%
	Students With Disabilities	53%		
	English Language Learners	27%		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	28%	33%	34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	28%	33%	34%
	Students With Disabilities	10%		
	English Language Learners	15%		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	25%	38%	36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25%	38%	36%
	Students With Disabilities	10%		
	English Language Learners	8%		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	31%	39%	37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31%	39%	37%
	Students With Disabilities	10%		
	English Language Learners	0%		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	12	32	32	10	29	32	10	9			
ELL	25	41	46	16	31	38	10	40			
BLK	31	38	39	20	26	32	20	39			
HSP	33			13	10						
FRL	31	38	39	20	26	30	19	40			
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	21	44	43	13	33	31	13				
ELL	41	50	45	31	48	48	24	70			
BLK	46	53	52	39	51	45	30	76	83		
HSP	55			18							
FRL	47	53	51	39	51	45	30	77	84		

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	16	44	43	13	46	52	18				
ELL	34	55	51	32	52	46	24	81			
BLK	47	55	50	43	59	53	36	79	76		
HSP	15	73		23	64						
FRL	47	55	51	43	57	52	36	79	71		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	28
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	41
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	284
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	32
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	29
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	19
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	28
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

According to IReady The trends that emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas is the number of students that are two or more grade levels below in comprehension informational text and literature. Eighth grade has 46% of students two or more grade levels in comprehension. Seventh grade has 63% of students two or more grade levels in Reading Comprehension. Sixth grade has 47% of students two or more grade levels in comprehension. Fifth grade has 43% of students at risk in the area of comprehension. Fourth grade has 45% of students two or more grade levels in comprehension. Third grade has 48% of students at risk in the area of comprehension. Second grade has 36% of students performing below grade level according to iReady diagnostic results. First grade and Kindergarten has the lowest number of at risk students with 11% and 0% respectively.

The 2020-2021 FSA Reading results, showed that students in grades 3 - 8 scored lowest in Comprehension Informational text. 60 ELL students in grades three through eight scored a level 1 or 2. In the subgroup of ESE 53 students scored a level 1 or 2. Eleven Hispanics scored a level 1 or 2 on the FSA Reading.

The data revealed that ELL and SWD student performed significantly lower than their peers and were not proficient in any of the tested areas (Key Ideas, Craft and Structure, Integration of Knowledge and Language and Editing).

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Central Charter School's subgroup performance data for students who scored at level 3 and above on the Spring ELA Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) for the 2018-2019 school year are 19.3% SWD students, 19.2% ELL students, 44.6% of Economically Disadvantaged students, 43.9% Black or African American students, and 50% Hispanic students.

Based on the 2019 Florida Standards Assessment 80.8% ELL and 80.7% SWD scored at levels 1 and 2. Students in grades 3 - 8 performed below grade-level in Main Idea and Details and Reading Informational text.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The contributing factors to this improvement were not enough on campus learning. Many teachers were unfamiliar with using technology to improve student achievement using research-based strategies. In order to realize improved academic achievement, teachers need to be trained in using proven research-based strategies to provide instruction. Teachers will be sent to specified trainings held at the district, through PLC's, as well as through trainers contracted by the school on Teacher Planning and Early Release days. The Literacy coach will work with individual as well as teacher teams to assist to train teachers in instructional facilitation using research-based strategies.

In addition, teachers will be provided training by the ESE Specialist and ELL Coordinator and provided resources to be used to provide effective instruction to Students With Disabilities and English Language Learners.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Central Charter School's performance data for students who scored at level 3 and above on the Spring ELA Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) for grades 3 through 7 for the 2018-2019 school year are 39% of students in grade 3, 50.8% of the students in grade 4, 39.2% of students in grade 5, 39.1% of students in grade 6, 54.6% students in grade 7, and 47% students in grade 8.

The data component that showed the most improvement was vocabulary according to iReady AP3 was 22% in comparison to AP1 from this year the results were 34%. That is a 12% increase from last year.

The data component that showed the most improvement in the 2019 Florida Standards Assessment was Craft and Structure for grade 3 (34%), 4 (13%), grade 5 (31%), grade 7 (27%), and grade 8 (41%) of students in each group scored proficient or higher. a grade was the only grade-level that showed the greatest improvement in Main Idea and Details.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The contributing factors to this improvement was a school-wide focus on vocabulary with monthly trainings that showed teacher research-based strategies for improving vocabulary. The new actions included using graphic organizers with the Frayer Model to introduce new vocabulary words.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

In an effort to develop teachers and build capacity within the organization, we recognize that teachers need to be trained on how to effectively accommodate students, design and facilitate instruction to ensure that students experience academic success. Teachers participate in Professional Learning Communities (PLC's) in order to learn proven research-based strategies that increase students' learning. Therefore, teachers are able to identify best practices and learn how to implement them in the classroom to enhance learning. Within the PLC's, teachers evaluate and discuss students' data. Additionally, District and on-site professional development is provided in an attempt to build the capacity of teachers so that they will be able to provide effective instruction to the students.

There are several strategies that will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning in comprehension. Students' comprehension skills will improve by building knowledge and vocabulary and specifically content vocabulary learned through Science and Social Studies. Teachers of ELA/ Reading will collaborate with Science and Social Studies teachers during their PLC's to identify strategies content area teachers can use to teach vocabulary in the classroom. In addition, teachers will make connections between concepts and words with photographs, recordings, and infographics.

We will also provide:

1. After- school tutoring starts in November
3. Measuring Up Science (Grades 5 - 8) and Math (grades 6 – 8) will be used to provide supplemental academic instruction
4. Differentiated instruction will be utilized to instruct the various subgroups.
5. in-class support needs of SWD and ELL students

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

We work hard to ensure that professional development is based on the unique needs of our students and staff. Classroom data are analyzed on an ongoing basis and at the end of the year to determine root causes for gaps in achievement. For example, a root cause of a reading weakness was determined to be a lack of instructional time spent on reading across the curriculum. For that reason, we are focusing professional development efforts on literacy across the curriculum this year to raise our students' achievement in our areas of need.

Opportunities for professional learning will be determined by student performance data discussed during weekly Professional Learning Communities (PLC's). Teachers will identify their levels of proficiency in various research-based instructional strategies. On-site training will be given through our Curriculum department, and teachers can also select learning opportunities that will enhance the areas of need. In addition, all staff members will participate in professional development offered by Broward County.

We will devote sufficient resources to carry out effective professional development activities that are primarily job embedded and address the root causes of academic problems. For example, we will devote resources to improve academic achievement for our students to increase teacher efficacy. This is done through planned, consistent and pervasive professional development through and with the support of our instructional coaches during the school day, on teacher planning days and after school hours. To that end, we have dedicated a large portion of our Title I funds to professional development.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

All stakeholders must be knowledgeable about the content taught to the students in order to support classroom instruction and continuity. Research has shown that Parental Involvement is key to student success. Central Charter School therefore holds parent-training workshops, open houses, academic fairs, and parent-teacher conferences to educate parents on the tools and resources available to them to assist their student/students at home. Also, they are given hands-on training in Mathematics, Reading, Science and Social Studies as well as resources for reference as they work with their students at home

A focus on teacher development, data analysis and PLCs will give the teachers the skills, strategies and increase in competence that will create a positive impact on student achievement. Having the teachers complete Reading Endorsement courses will assist the teachers in learning about the developmental levels in reading and strategies to increase reading proficiency. The school has opted into the Broward Schools District plan by using Learning Across Broward, New Teacher Academy, Alternate Certification program (ACE), FTCE testing support, virtual coach for ALT Certification for first year teachers.

The leadership team will assist with developing trainings for the teachers to implementing the new state standards, teacher development, data analysis, and PLCs. The teachers will be required to attend district trainings and come back to campus and share what they learned including completing the follow up for the class. Teachers will receive additional training in monitoring student progress using the online instruction action plan provided in the iReady Teacher Success guide.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus	Central Charter has had an increase in the number teachers who are new to the profession, and tend to teach the way they were taught. Classroom observations reveal that teachers are more comfortable providing whole group instruction.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of June 2022, all teachers will be trained in ways to effectively differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students including SWD's and ELL's.
Monitoring:	<p>This will be monitored through lesson plans, classroom observation and walkthroughs by administration and coaches. Teachers will conference with coaches on a weekly/biweekly basis and provide each teacher with strategies, support to monitor desired outcomes, and professional learning communities to reflect on progress and track goal achievement.</p> <p>The ELL and ESE support teams will push into classrooms during instruction to assist with providing quality instruction to these students. They will also plan with the teacher to ensure that they proper accommodations are included.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carissa Cephas (ccephas@centralcharterschool.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on data and instructional needs, differentiation will be the research-based strategy used to improve this area of focus. Differentiation focuses on learning and academic growth. Every lesson and unit of study has a clearly identified standard, learning intentions are clearly defined, success criteria is clearly defined, and evidence from formative assessments is regularly used to inform instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Upon reviewing the data, we need to improve the percentage of students scoring proficiently or higher. Differentiation, is the selected strategy teachers will use because it focuses on growth, offers empathy by tailoring instruction to readiness level while exposing students to grade-level content and skills.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will conduct data chats, student conferences, parent conferences and attend PLCs and professional development to address the Area of Focus. Coaches will conduct classroom walkthroughs, observations, real time coaching, and one on one planning/instruction support to teachers.

Person Responsible Janell Alexander (jalexander@centralcharterschool.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities**Area of Focus
Description and Rationale:**

PLC's are designed to provide a time and place for teachers to collaborate in order to improve instructional practice resulting in improved students academic performance.

Measurable Outcome:

By the end of May 2022, all teachers will be able to effectively implement research-based instructional strategies in their classroom evidenced by students increased academic performance on iReady AP3.

Monitoring:

PLC's are scheduled every Wednesday during their planning times for elementary teachers and after school for middle school teachers. The Inservice Facilitator monitors to make sure the meetings are held, and reviews minutes submissions.

The ELL Liaison and ESE Specialist will provide assistance with implementation of best practices to support each learner based on the need.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Janell Alexander (jalexander@centralcharterschool.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Research has shown that when teachers collaborate they are able to learn from each other and solve problems together. Here student weekly performance data is analyzed and teachers identify interventions and enrichment strategies to be implemented in the classroom to address the specific standard/skill. Instruction continues until at least 70% of the students show mastery.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Research shows that students and teachers benefit from collaborative teams. Teachers are provided weekly time spaces to collaborate, analyze common assessments, establish and monitor data goals, and review grade level expectations.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Every teacher will be assigned to a PLC based on their academic area of focus.
2. Teacher teams will meet on Wednesdays during their planning. Since middle school teachers do not have common planning they will meet after school.
3. Teachers collaborate to address an area of focus/learning domain and identify best practices and implement those best practices in the classroom.
4. Common Formative Assessments are administered to determine mastery
5. Based on student performance, students are either enriched or provided remediation until at least 70% of the students have met mastery.

Person Responsible

Janell Alexander (jalexander@centralcharterschool.com)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>The Spring 2021 FSA and iReady AP1 data revealed that the greatest area of deficiency form Kindergarten through grade 8 is Comprehension Informational Text. In addition, Kindergarten students are performing below level in Phonics.</p> <p>In addition, classroom walkthroughs and teacher observation data indicated that teachers lack the capacity to provide instruction effectively to students in the classroom. Most of our ELA teachers are not reading endorsed and some are new to teaching. As a result we have to provide extensive onsite professional development to address the specific needs of our teachers. Specific targeted trainings offered by the district are identified and teachers are mandated to sign up for those trainings as well.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>By the end of May 2022, student proficiency in Comprehension Informational Text will increase by 20% for each grade level as measured by iReady AP3.</p> <p>Each teacher's lesson plans will be reviewed to ensure they contain the essential components such as . Frequent walkthroughs will be done by the Literacy coach and administration in order to ensure lesson implementation and facilitation are done with fidelity. Mini-Benchmarks will be administered to determine academic progress.</p>
Monitoring:	<p>A thorough analysis of the data will be conducted to identify students and teachers in need of additional support. The Literacy Coach will conference with the individual teacher to provide assistance and assist with tools and resources needed to facilitate instruction effectively in his or her classroom. In addition, the ESE Specialist/Teacher will meet with each teacher or teacher team to provide training and or resources to assist with understanding the content taught.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Carissa Cephas (ccephas@centralcharterschool.com)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Teachers will collaborate in their PLC's to identify research-based strategies for use in providing instruction in Comprehension Informational text. They will focus on content vocabulary in collaboration with the Social Studies teachers and identify a strategy that will be used to facilitate instruction. Teachers will learn the strategy and take it back to their classrooms. The ESE specialist/teacher will attend PLC's as requested to provide assistance with implementation of research-based strategies related to ELL and ESE students.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Student performance on comprehension informational text on the FSA and iReady AP1 were below satisfactory standards. FSA is the Spring assessment administered to students in grades 3 - 10. Students performance determines the school's grade. iReady is a progress monitoring tool used to measure student progress during the year. Students complete three Diagnostics and is a good indicator of student academic performance.</p> <p>An analysis of the I-Ready and FSA data reveal that I-Ready directly correlates. I-Ready is also a research-based supplemental academic instructional resource that is approved by the state.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

1. Scheduled frequent classroom walkthroughs and observations will be conducted by the administrators and coaches.
2. An inventory of the strengths and weaknesses of the lesson will be identified.
3. The administrator and coach will meet with the teacher to review the to results.

4. A plan is devised to address the needs and the teacher is coached through the process until the teacher achieves proficiency and is able to provide effective instruction to his or her students.
5. The teacher is given the opportunity to attend offsite professional development in order to enable him or her to build his or her capacity to provide effective instruction using a variety of research-based strategies.

Person Responsible Carissa Cephas (ccephas@centralcharterschool.com)

No description entered

Person Responsible Carissa Cephas (ccephas@centralcharterschool.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Central Charter's suspension rate is 4.6 per 100 students as compared to 1.6 per 100 for the state. The school has implemented a school wide discipline expectations intended to build a positive culture among students and staff as shown below:

Use the objective/purpose section to describe to students the reason for the expectation (i.e. tracking the speaker so I can tell your engaged and focused on what is being said)

*** When modeling always be specific, tell students exactly what they should be doing and how it should look, giving examples and non examples are a great way to accomplish this**

***. Use the guided practice section to describe how you will practice and implement with your students.**

*** The independent practice/mastery section can be used to describe how you will support students and practice with those who are struggling with mastering the expectation. Remember the goal is 100%.**

Any students identified as exhibiting at-risk indicators will be monitored by the school counselor and provided resources and interventions as needed to meet the needs of both students and their families.