

Broward County Public Schools

Panacea PREP 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	18
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Panacea PREP Charter School

201 N UNIVERSITY DR, Coral Springs, FL 33071

panaceaprep.org

Demographics

Principal: Wayne Neunie

Start Date for this Principal: 2/16/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: D (34%) 2016-17: D (39%)
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	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Panacea PREP Charter School

201 N UNIVERSITY DR, Coral Springs, FL 33071

panaceaprep.org

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School KG-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>99%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	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 Panacea Prep Charter School is to grow a child's character and knowledge so they can achieve their dreams for the future. Their character and knowledge will determine their future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Panacea Prep Charter School is to engage and empower our students, families and community.

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
Hope, Belinda	Principal	Exercise proactive leadership in promoting the vision and mission of the District's Plan. Work collaboratively to develop, implement and monitor an instructional framework that aligns curriculum with state standards, effective instructional practices and student learning needs and assessments. Employ and monitor transparent decision-making processes that are based on a vision, mission, and improvement priorities using facts and data. Demonstrate personal and professional behaviors consistent with the Code of Ethics and the Principles of Professional Practice.
Iles, Evie	Other	Ensures that students with disabilities demonstrate increased participation and performance in the standard or Access curriculum, statewide assessments, and accountability systems.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 2/16/2018, Wayne Neunie

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

6

Total number of students enrolled at the school

85

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.

1

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	10	10	14	16	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
Attendance below 90 percent	7	1	4	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	1	1	3	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	0	0	2	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	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	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				52%	59%	57%	44%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				45%	60%	58%	49%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile					54%	53%		51%	48%
Math Achievement				66%	65%	63%	37%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				88%	66%	62%	22%	60%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile					53%	51%		47%	47%
Science Achievement				45%	46%	53%	19%	49%	55%

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	58%	60%	-2%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	44%	62%	-18%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2021					
	2019	50%	59%	-9%	56%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	65%	65%	0%	62%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	67%	67%	0%	64%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2021					
	2019	70%	64%	6%	60%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	45%	49%	-4%	53%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Following is the progress monitoring tools by grade level used to compile the below data:

- 1st Grade - iReady AP1, AP2 and AP3 from 20-21
- 2nd Grade - iReady AP1, AP2 and AP3 from 20-21
- 3rd Grade - iReady AP1, AP2 and AP3 from 20-21
- 4th Grade - iReady AP1, AP2 and AP3 from 20-21
- 5th Grade - iReady AP1, AP2 and AP3 from 20-21

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	14/79% AP1, 15/67% AP2, 15/73% AP3		
	Economically Disadvantaged	14/79% AP1, 15/67% AP2, 15/73% AP3		
	Students With Disabilities	2/50%AP1, 2/0% AP2, 1/0% AP3		
	English Language Learners	1/100%AP1, 1/0% AP2, 1/0% AP3		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	9/33% AP1, 10/50% AP2, 10/80% AP3		
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/33% AP1, 10/50% AP2, 10/80% AP3		
	Students With Disabilities	0/0% AP1, 0/0% AP2, 0/0% AP3		
	English Language Learners	0/0% AP1, 0/0% AP2, 0/0% AP3		
	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	9/22% AP1, 8/26% AP2, 10/50% AP3		
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/22% AP1, 8/26% AP2, 10/50% AP3		
	Students With Disabilities	1/0% AP1, 1/0% AP2, 1/0% AP3		
	English Language Learners	1/0% AP1, 1/0% AP2, 1/0% AP3		
	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	11/18% AP1, 12/50% AP2, 12/59% AP3		
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/18% AP1, 12/50% AP2, 12/59% AP3		
	Students With Disabilities	1/0% AP1, 1/0% AP2, 2/0% AP3		
	English Language Learners	0/0% AP1, 0/0% AP2, 0/0% AP3		
	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	15/27% AP1, 16/32% AP2, 16/44% AP3		
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/27% AP1, 16/32% AP2, 16/44% AP3		
	Students With Disabilities	1/0% AP1, 1/0% AP2, 1/0% AP3		
	English Language Learners	3/0% AP1, 3/0% AP2, 3/0% AP3		
	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
BLK	37	41		56	61		39				
FRL	35	35		58	67		33				
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
ELL	50			60	70						
BLK	50	44		68	91		38				
FRL	52	45		66	88		45				

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
ELL	38			25							
BLK	38	46		35	18		14				
FRL	43	49		38	22		19				

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	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	228
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students

Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students

Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

Last school year the ESE and SWD were deficient at each grade level for the AP1, AP2 and AP3 diagnostic test. All grade levels improved on Phonological Awareness and High Frequency Words from AP1 to AP3. Also, Vocabulary had the highest deficiencies in AP1, AP2 and AP3.

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

The data component that showed the greatest need for improvement is Vocabulary:

67% of kindergarten scored below grade level on the 21-22 iReady AP1 diagnostic and 27% were below on the 20-21 iReady AP3 diagnostic.

79% of 1st grade scored below grade level on the iReady AP1 diagnostic and 40% were below on the 20-21 iReady AP3 diagnostic.

46% of 2nd grade scored below grade level on the iReady AP1 diagnostic and 60% were below on the 20-21 iReady AP3 diagnostic.

64% of 3rd grade scored below grade level on the iReady AP1 diagnostic and 25% were below on the 20-21 iReady AP3 diagnostic.

86% of 4th grade scored below grade level on the iReady AP1 diagnostic and 56% were below on the 20-21 iReady AP3 diagnostic.

67% of 5th grade scored below grade level on the iReady AP1 diagnostic and 62% were below on the 20-21 iReady AP3 diagnostic.

As a result, compared to the other reading components, Vocabulary had the highest number of students scoring below grade level on the 20-21 AP3 and the 21-22 AP1 iReady Diagnostic.

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 for low performance in Vocabulary is that teachers were not providing students with explicit vocabulary instruction, and were not providing strategies to help students determine word meanings independently.

The following are six steps to teaching Vocabulary:

Step 1: Explain—Provide a student-friendly description, explanation, or example of the new term. (This is where the teacher explicitly states the definition that will make sense to her/his students.)

Step 2: Restate—Ask students to restate the description, explanation, or example in their own words. (Students could add the term to their notebooks or to a chart in the classroom, followed by the following step.)

Step 3: Show—Ask students to construct a picture, symbol, or graphic representation of the term. (If possible, ask students to come up with an antonym or synonym to the new word.)

Step 4: Discuss—Engage students periodically in structured vocabulary discussions that help them add to their knowledge of the terms in their vocabulary notebooks. (Have students use new words in oral sentences or use the new words in questions you ask your students.)

Step 5: Refine and reflect—Periodically, ask students to return to their notebooks to discuss and refine entries. (When another new word comes up, try to mention previously learned words as similar or different.)

Step 6: Apply in Learning Games—Involve students periodically in games that allow them to play with new terms.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement from the prior year's assessment is Phonological Awareness.

56% of kindergarten scored below grade level on the 21-22 iReady AP1 diagnostic and 27% were below on the 20-21 iReady AP3 diagnostic.

64% of 1st grade scored below grade level on the iReady AP1 diagnostic and 30% were below on the

20-21 iReady AP3 diagnostic.

29% of 2nd grade scored below grade level on the iReady AP1 diagnostic and 0% were below on the 20-21 iReady AP3 diagnostic.

0% of 3rd grade scored below grade level on the iReady AP1 diagnostic and 0% were below on the 20-21 iReady AP3 diagnostic.

0% of 4th grade scored below grade level on the iReady AP1 diagnostic and 0% were below on the 20-21 iReady AP3 diagnostic.

0% of 5th grade scored below grade level on the iReady AP1 diagnostic and 0% were below on the 20-21 iReady AP3 diagnostic.

As a result, compared to the other data components, Phonological Awareness had the lowest number of students scoring below grade level on the 20-21 AP3 and the 21-22 AP1 iReady Diagnostic.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement from the prior year's assessment is Phonological Awareness. One factor that contributed to the improvement is because teachers made Phonological Awareness a high priority for teaching in their class. Also, students were required to log-in to iReady every day to work on phonics. Finally, the school helped struggling readers achieve awareness by providing speech therapy classes for the students who have speech deficiencies.

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

Diagnosing students unfinished learning is one of the first steps in learning loss recovery, and every minute counts when addressing amplified learning loss. Knowing what grade level the student is currently performing at allows educators to review standards one grade level below and formulate a plan to address potentially missed content. In addition, having domain-level details (e.g., Phonics, Vocabulary and Comprehension in Reading) will enable teachers to fine-tune their acceleration plans. Teachers need to personalize instruction while maintaining grade-level focus. They can accomplish this by using precise data that tells them where students are in their learning progression, and use that data as a "scaffolding" approach to personalize instruction and help students master specific tasks. By combining data on students' precise needs with a platform for personalized instruction, teachers can augment their capacity and give students agency over their learning.

Finally, educators should rely on resources and tools that allow students to see themselves in the stories they read and the passages with which they engage. Recapturing the safe, engaging, and nurturing space at school will be paramount to a student's accelerated learning. This shift in mindset will propel the shift we seek in a student's skillset.

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.

Educators analyze their own i-Ready data to create instructional plans that help students access grade-level instruction. Using Data to Plan Instruction prepares educators to use effective data practices as they analyze their own students' data from the first Diagnostic.

Data-Driven Leadership Best Practices I helps leaders establish effective implementation strategies and foundations that unlock i-Ready's potential to drive student growth. Leaders who are new to i-Ready engage in hands-on exploration of the most important reports and features for administrators. This prepares leaders to use i-Ready for data-driven decision-making and instructional planning. As time permits, educators discuss the Top Leader Actions for successful assessment, instruction, and student engagement and develop communication plans that support a strong i-Ready rollout.

Delivering Differentiated Instruction, helps educators analyze their Diagnostic data to create small groups based on instructional priorities. Using corresponding i-Ready resources, they create actionable plans for either grade-level instruction, intervention, and/or enrichment. As time permits,

educators plan to provide additional teacher-led support if students struggle to achieve their Personalized Instruction goals and/or how to engage students in tracking their data. Social Emotional Learning Skills will assist our educators with mental models, and frameworks that fit into any school, classroom type, or subject area. Through regular application, these tools enable educators to transform abstract SEL principles into practical actions that they can use every day.

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

Strengthen the core academic program

Administration will conduct classroom walk-throughs to monitor the implementation of these strategies on a day-to-day basis. Teachers will also participate in Professional Learning Committees in which they will share best practices and review data on student achievement. This is done so that teachers are consistently assessing their teaching methods and revising as needed to consistently increase student participation and achievement.

Increase the amount of learning time;

Students at Panacea Prep Charter receive one hour more of instructional time daily due to the school's hours, which extend to 3:00 pm versus the traditional 2:00 pm dismissal. Teachers are expected to teach from bell to bell to maximize instructional time. Transitions between class and activities are kept to a minimum to ensure students are in class receiving instruction. Extended Learning Opportunities will also be provided to students. After-school Tutoring on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday will be implemented so that students have additional opportunities to receive academic support in all academic areas assessed by state assessments.

Include strategies for serving underserved populations.

In addition to implementing instructional strategies, teachers will also use differentiated instruction. Teachers will differentiate the curriculum through content, process, products, and learning environment. This will ensure that the academic needs of all students are being met.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Vocabulary was identified as a critical need based on the following data:
 67% of kindergarten scored below grade level on the 21-22 iReady AP1 diagnostic and 27% were below on the 20-21 iReady AP3 diagnostic.
 79% of 1st grade scored below grade level on the iReady AP1 diagnostic and 40% were below on the 20-21 iReady AP3 diagnostic.
 46% of 2nd grade scored below grade level on the iReady AP1 diagnostic and 60% were below on the 20-21 iReady AP3 diagnostic.
 64% of 3rd grade scored below grade level on the iReady AP1 diagnostic and 25% were below on the 20-21 iReady AP3 diagnostic.
 86% of 4th grade scored below grade level on the iReady AP1 diagnostic and 56% were below on the 20-21 iReady AP3 diagnostic.
 67% of 5th grade scored below grade level on the iReady AP1 diagnostic and 62% were below on the 20-21 iReady AP3 diagnostic.
 As a result, compared to the other reading components, Vocabulary had the highest number of students scoring below grade level on the 20-21 AP3 and the 21-22 AP1 iReady Diagnostic.

Measurable Outcome:

By December 2021, the percentage of students in kindergarten scoring below grade level (67%) as measured by the iReady Diagnostic will decrease by 5%.
 By December 2021, the percentage of students in 1st grade scoring below grade level (79%) as measured by the iReady Diagnostic will decrease by 5%.
 By December 2021, the percentage of students in 2nd grade scoring below grade level (67%) as measured by the iReady Diagnostic will decrease by 5%.
 By December 2021, the percentage of students in 3rd grade scoring below grade level (64%) as measured by the iReady Diagnostic will decrease by 5%.
 By December 2021, the percentage of students in 4th grade scoring below grade level (86%) as measured by the iReady Diagnostic will decrease by 5%.
 By December 2021, the percentage of students in 5th grade scoring below grade level (67%) as measured by the iReady Diagnostic will decrease by 5%.

Monitoring:

The principal and teachers are monitoring student growth through I-Ready progress monitoring as well as teacher observations based on lessons. The principal reviews monthly data from i-Ready standard based test and has data discussions with teachers during PLCs. Teachers are keeping folders for each student and are charting progress weekly. Teachers also have data chats with students and record date of conference along with goals for the next two weeks

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Belinda Hope (bhope@encs.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Morphemic Analysis Routines help students develop strategies for approaching unfamiliar vocabulary by teaching morphemes (prefixes, roots, and suffixes). Students are taught morphemic analysis routines to help them engage in independent word study.
 Frayer Models are graphic organizers that build vocabulary and conceptual knowledge across content areas. The strategy requires students (not the teacher) to define a vocabulary word and then list its characteristics, examples, and non-examples.
 Cognates are words in different languages that are derived from the same original word or root, like family and familia. ELLs can guess at words and try to decipher text based on this existing knowledge.
 SWD students will be provided with the following strategies to assist with vocabulary:
 Preview the text, even when using text that has pre-selected vocabulary words; Read the

passage and identify vocabulary words they may find unfamiliar; and Select words that are key/important to understanding the text.

Vocabulary instruction must be explicit. This includes an easy-to-understand definition presented directly to students along with multiple examples and non-examples of the target word, brief discussion opportunities, and checks for understanding.

Vocabulary instruction must include multiple practice opportunities for using words within and across subjects. That is, instruction must be extended over time with opportunities for students to hear, speak, read, and write words in various contexts. Each subject has a unique set of vocabulary terms, and students need to know their meanings and how to use them in various contexts.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

ELL students will be included and integrated in all vocabulary activities by incorporating visual and auditory lessons from the iReady platform.

SWD students will be included and integrated in all vocabulary activities which will be supplemental to the ESE services prescribed by the student's IEP as a means of targeting IEP goals and gap skills.

Action Steps to Implement

Students in grades K-5 will utilize I-Ready supplemental materials in literacy instruction based on Vocabulary, the identified deficiencies. Teachers will incorporate daily I-Ready supplemental lessons targeting vocabulary instruction during whole group literacy block.

Center activities pulled from FCRR focusing on vocabulary will be implemented during the literacy block. In addition, vocabulary instruction will be provided through the core series, Journeys. Journey's Intervention Toolkit will be used during small group sessions.

ELL students will be included and integrated in all remediation activities for Literacy. In addition, teachers will pay special attention to helping ELL students acquire new vocabulary. This is to include incorporating visual and auditory lessons from I-ready platform, and Flocabulary.

SWD students will be included and integrated in all activities for Literacy. This is supplemental to the ESE services prescribed by the student's IEP as a means of targeting IEP goals and gap skills.

Person Responsible Belinda Hope (bhope@enccs.org)

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.

Not applicable at this time.