

Broward County Public Schools

# Championship Academy Of Distinction Of West Broward



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Championship Academy Of Distinction Of West Broward

7100 W OAKLAND PARK BLVD, Sunrise, FL 33313

[www.championshipacademy.org](http://www.championshipacademy.org)

## Demographics

**Principal: Richard Newell**

Start Date for this Principal: 9/13/2021

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Closed: 2023-06-30
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: D (39%) 2016-17: No Grade
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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](http://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

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Championship Academy Of Distinction Of West Broward

7100 W OAKLAND PARK BLVD, Sunrise, FL 33313

[www.championshipacademy.org](http://www.championshipacademy.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	98%

## School Grades History

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

## 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 Championship Academy of Distinction at West Broward (CADWB) is to provide students with a comprehensive education with a focus on character education, facilitated by a high quality staff, promoting academic excellence, leadership skills, and college and career ready skills.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of CADWB is that each student will develop a strong set of values and the leadership skills necessary to become successful, productive, and contributing members of society.

### 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
		Serves as the Chief instructional Leader. Provides strategic direction for the staff, students and parents of Championship Academy of Distinction/West Broward. Performs responsible administrative and supervisory work in the area of instruction, personnel, curriculum, safety, budget, purchasing, public relations, plant operations, food service, and transportation. Position is responsible for the total operational management of the school.
Newell, Richard	Principal	<p>All school leadership team roles and responsibilities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Monitoring student progress with on going assessments and data analysis to adjust groups for students achievement and close achievement gaps.</li> <li>*Mentor new teachers for growth and retention.</li> <li>*Planning, leading, and supporting professional learning.</li> <li>*Monitoring conditions for learning in classroom.</li> <li>*Collaborating with grade level teams and vertical teams on standards based instruction.</li> <li>*Ensuring quality core instruction to the depth of standards.</li> <li>*Alignment of strategies and activities with appropriate target tasks alignment.</li> <li>*Communication with stakeholders and community members.</li> <li>*Monitoring the implementation of the SIP.</li> <li>*Maintaining focus on student achievement.</li> <li>*Making decisions based on needs with appropriate resources and budget alignment.</li> <li>*Building relationships through communication, mentoring and the shared ownership of student achievement.</li> <li>*Using the adult coaching model to build capacity of teachers and monitor growth.</li> </ul>

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Monday 9/13/2021, Richard Newell

**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**

22

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

270

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

1

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

6

**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	17	33	45	26	47	29	55	47	41	0	0	0	0	340	
Attendance below 90 percent	10	18	23	12	25	18	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	27	13	0	0	0	0	73	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	23	9	0	0	0	0	59	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	4	12	21	12	0	0	0	0	52	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	6	13	24	13	0	0	0	0	58	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	17	33	45	24	45	13	55	47	41	0	0	0	0	320	

**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	10	18	23	11	24	11	40	36	23	0	0	0	0	196

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	7

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 9/28/2021

**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	
Students with two or more indicators	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	12		
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				34%	58%	61%	28%	57%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				48%	58%	59%	50%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	52%	54%	39%	49%	52%
Math Achievement				27%	58%	62%	21%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains				46%	58%	59%	52%	56%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	51%	52%	56%	49%	52%
Science Achievement				29%	51%	56%	14%	52%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				50%	74%	78%	50%	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	26%	60%	-34%	58%	-32%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	62%	62%	0%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-26%				
05	2021					
	2019	11%	59%	-48%	56%	-45%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
06	2021					
	2019	33%	57%	-24%	54%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
07	2021					
	2019	24%	55%	-31%	52%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
08	2021					
	2019	53%	59%	-6%	56%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-24%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	15%	65%	-50%	62%	-47%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	57%	67%	-10%	64%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-15%				
05	2021					
	2019	18%	64%	-46%	60%	-42%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
06	2021					
	2019	33%	58%	-25%	55%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-18%				
07	2021					
	2019	14%	53%	-39%	54%	-40%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
08	2021					
	2019	37%	45%	-8%	46%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-14%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	4%	49%	-45%	53%	-49%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	58%	43%	15%	48%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

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	46%	71%	-25%	71%	-25%
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					
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.

I-Ready Reading (K-8)

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18	45	53
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10	25	41
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32	23	32
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	3	9	15
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5	17	21
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5	2	13
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	14	11
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11	14	24
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13	19	25
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	3	8	19
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6	4	18
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7	0	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	7	7	0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8	0	
	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	15			7	10						
ELL	8	17		8	16						
BLK	23	33	27	19	14	12	13	21			
HSP	37	25		15	29						
FRL	25	33	33	17	15	14	14	19			
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	5	33		5	43						
ELL	30	59	80	25	55						
BLK	31	43	52	24	43	55	26	47			
HSP	42	79		47	64						
FRL	33	46	50	25	42	59	26	55			



2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD											
ELL	13			13							
BLK	29	51	29	21	55	56	14	47			
FRL	28	51	47	19	51	53	16	47			

### 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	23
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	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	228
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	87%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	11
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	22
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	
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	22
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	27
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	25
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?**

The percentage of students who performed at Level 3 or above on the 2019 ELA-FSA was less than the district and state averages. In addition, students in grades, 3, 5, and 8 demonstrated a decrease in performance between AP1 and AP3 2021.

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

Based on the 2021 AP3 and the 2022 AP1 of the I-Ready Reading administration, 11% and 13% respectively of students are performing on or above grade level compared to 34% performing at Level 3 or above on the 2019 FSA-ELA assessment. Therefore, Reading is the area in greatest need of improvement.

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

One contributing factor for this extremely low performance is that students missed out on structured instruction

earlier on in the pandemic between April – June 2020. Our teachers were not well trained to teach virtually and majority of our teachers struggle to adopt and implement targeted instruction. Another contributing factor was that students were periodically attending virtual classes for direct instruction. Now that we're all in-person learning, we should begin to see noticeable improvement in performance.

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

Based on the comparison of data points from AP3 for 2019-2020 SY and AP1 for 2020- 2021 SY our students (K-8) grew exponentially in the area of phonics.

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

For this area to improve, we implemented analytic phonics and synthetic phonics within the reading block across grade levels and send our teachers to professional developments on various reading/ language acquisition

workshops and seminars. Furthermore, we implemented 20 -30 minutes of “drop everything and read” within the instructional schedule and followed up with these new procedures with fidelity.

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

All students will participate in 90 minutes of daily reading instruction. The students will obtain specific skills.

Teachers will facilitate data chats and implement standards mastery tools from i-Ready. The skills will consist of: Written Language, Technical and academic Vocabulary, Guided Reading, and standards-based instruction and small group instruction as needed. Students will be grouped according to data from the following assessments. I-Ready, Reading Plus, USA Test Prep, WIDA, FSA and additional data. Data from the assessments will be analyzed to monitor student progress towards proficiency and plan next steps. When appropriate for those students obtaining skills through resource push-ins, Social Studies and Science text will be integrated into the resource push-in groups.

**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.**

Differentiated Instruction  
CRISS Strategies  
Reading in the Content Area  
Kagan Cooperative Learning

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

Teachers will integrate Social/Emotional learning skills in their learning environments, with the mindset that all students are at risk. Targeted intervention groups will be designed and implemented to assist with the increase in SWD proficiency and ELL proficiency.

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	<p>This area of focus is specific to ELA and Reading. Students must have the reading skills and knowledge necessary to use reading as a tool to learn and understand content across instructional areas. It is also imperative for students to be able to use reading to learn critical academic content.</p> <p>As evidenced by the 2019 ELA - FSA data, 34 % of students were proficient, 48% made learning gains and 53% of L25 made learning gains. Although our school did not opt-in for school grade scoring in 2021, 25 % of students were proficient, 31% made learning gains and 26% of L25 made learning gains on the ELA - FSA. The learning loss experienced during distanced learning from Spring 2020 to Spring 2021 was significant as evidenced by Spring 2019 ELA and Spring 2021 ELA data.</p> <p>By implementing school-wide literacy with a focus on rigorous, differentiated instruction in reading, writing, and speaking, we will improve the proficiency level of all students. Teachers will focus on instructional practices that identify critical content and engage students in complex tasks in order to improve student learning and increase the overall level of proficiency in ELA/Reading across all grade levels.</p>
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	<p>1) The percent of all students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 34% to 43%, as measured by ELA-FSA 2) The percent of student making learning gain in ELA will increase from 48% to 65%, as measured by ELA-FSA. 3) The percent of students in the bottom quartile making learning gains in ELA will increase from 53% to 80%, as measured by the ELA-FSA.</p> <p>Each action step will be monitored by the Administrative Team at least once per month. Classroom observations, lesson plan review, and assessment data will support evidence of completion.</p>
<b>Monitoring:</b>	<p>We will use I-Ready Reading, which is a predictive diagnostic tool correlated to the FSA, to assess students in grades K-8 three times per year. In addition, we will develop benchmark reading assessments using USA Test Prep to assess student progress at least every 4.5 weeks. We will also create and administer mock writing assessment every 4.5 weeks. We will assess and collect additional data from Reading Plus and WIDA.</p>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	<p>Richard Newell (charter5234@browardschools.com)</p>
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>ELA strategy 1- Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks          ELA strategy 2- Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiate/scaffold instruction to meet the needs of each student.          ELA strategy 3 - Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the Standards in alignment with curriculum resources.</p> <p>All students will participate in 90 minutes of daily reading instruction. This environment will assist students in becoming Assessment Capable Learners. Teachers will facilitate data chats and implement standards mastery tools from i-Ready. The skills will consist of: Written Language, Technical academic Vocabulary, Guided Reading, and standards-based instruction and small group instruction as needed. Data from the assessments will be analyzed to monitor student progress towards proficiency and plan next steps. When appropriate, Social Studies and Science text will be integrated into the resource push-in groups.</p>

<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>The rationale for implementing these strategies is that they directly correlate to improved academic achievement in reading. Overall, ELA proficiency decreased by 9% proficient from 2019 to 2021. The percentage of students making learning gains in ELA decreased from 48% in 2019 to 31% in 2021. Learning gains among our L25 students also decreased from 53% in 2019 to 26% in 2021.</p> <p>These strategies will be implemented in 2021-2022 to increase learning gains and to increase overall proficiency by Spring 2022 FSA. In addition, the following target groups will be monitored for improvement in ELA Achievement: SWD currently 15 percent proficiency and ELL currently 20 percent proficiency on Diagnostic 1 of I-Ready Reading.</p>
---	--

### Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will Develop Highly Effective PLC's to Encourage Co-Planning and Data Informed Instruction.

**Person Responsible** Richard Newell (charter5234@browardschools.com)

Teachers will Facilitate Small Group Instruction Based on Student Needs.

**Person Responsible** Richard Newell (charter5234@browardschools.com)

Teachers will Implement High Impact Transfer Literacy Strategies (Focus Strategies)

**Person Responsible** Richard Newell (charter5234@browardschools.com)

Writing Workshops and Thinking Maps will be Used to Support Instruction in the Learning Environment.

**Person Responsible** Richard Newell (charter5234@browardschools.com)

Staff will focus on Teacher Clarity and Effective Feedback to Students to Enhance the Quality of Feedback

Students Receive and the students' Ability to Mastery Grade Level Standards.

**Person Responsible** Richard Newell (charter5234@browardschools.com)

The Administrative Team will coordinate and build a consistent school wide literacy implementation plan specific to focused note taking, writing, reading, and speaking.

**Person Responsible** Richard Newell (charter5234@browardschools.com)

Meet weekly in PLC's with teachers to prioritize and align academic language/vocabulary in unit planning to ensure that academic language is being taught consistently and in the appropriate vertical progression.

**Person Responsible** Richard Newell (charter5234@browardschools.com)

All teachers will understand the components and utilize student data to determine effectiveness and when to adjust student levels.

**Person Responsible** Richard Newell (charter5234@browardschools.com)

Regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction, including utilizing the Assessment platform for collecting and assessing reading and writing, reviewing student data and guiding instruction.

**Person Responsible** Richard Newell (charter5234@browardschools.com)

All teachers will utilize an instructional focus calendar/planning roadmap with weekly high impact ELA/ Reading standards, strategies and resources for use as they plan, to ensure high engagement, rigor and progress monitoring. Planning PLC is aligned to equity protocol.

**Person Responsible** Richard Newell (charter5234@browardschools.com)

Determine the higher order thinking skills needed to understand and apply the standards. Teachers develop high-level questions for assessments as well as performance tasks that require critical thinking, application, etc. Teachers also ask high-level questions needed to assess students' understanding of concepts during instruction.

**Person Responsible** Richard Newell (charter5234@browardschools.com)

Place students who are not meeting standard(s) into groups according to assessment results and assign them to safety net instruction which occurs before, during, and after school. Programs such as, Saturday School or evening classes are also considered as a means for meeting additional instructional needs. All extended learning sessions are monitored for effectiveness by analyzing data from assessments on a regular basis. Use domain specific instruction with the use of Catch Up Coach Books.

**Person Responsible** Richard Newell (charter5234@browardschools.com)

Utilize tablets, laptops, and web-based learning sites to develop student responses to literature (graphic organizers, summaries, critical analyses, presentations, creative writing and standard based projects.

**Person Responsible** Richard Newell (charter5234@browardschools.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.

**N/A**