

Broward County Public Schools

Franklin Academy F



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	21
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	23

Franklin Academy F

5000 SW 207TH TERRACE, Pembroke Pines, FL 33332

franklin-academy.org

Demographics

Principal: Diane Showalter

Start Date for this Principal: 9/22/2021

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)	52%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (56%)
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	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	21
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Franklin Academy F

5000 SW 207TH TERRACE, Pembroke Pines, FL 33332

franklin-academy.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	53%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	91%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	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.

Utilizing an intercultural mindedness model and a standards-based curriculum, the mission of Franklin Academy is to create compassionate, engaged, life-long learners by promoting a culture of collaboration and high expectations that emphasize character development through active service in the local, national and international community, while adhering to the principle that all children can learn.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Utilizing an intercultural mindedness model and a standards-based curriculum, the mission of Franklin Academy is to create compassionate, engaged, life-long learners by promoting a culture of collaboration and high expectations that emphasize character development through active service in the local, national and international community, while adhering to the principle that all children can learn.

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
Showalter, Diane	Principal	The instructional leader responsible with ensuring that all students receive an effective standards-based instruction.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 9/22/2021, Diane Showalter

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

83

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,139

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

26

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

23

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	71	114	84	69	102	95	170	211	222	0	0	0	0	1138
Attendance below 90 percent	10	11	10	6	14	15	25	40	45	0	0	0	0	176
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	34	33	0	0	0	0	96
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	10	24	34	43	0	0	0	0	111
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	1	5	4	4	4	1	47	96	81	0	0	0	0	243

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	1	2	3	0	8	40	57	60	0	0	0	0	171

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	2	3	0	8	40	57	60	0	0	0	0	171
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/22/2021

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	71	114	84	69	102	95	170	211	222	0	0	0	0	1138
Attendance below 90 percent	10	11	10	6	14	15	25	40	45	0	0	0	0	176
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	34	33	0	0	0	0	96
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	0	0	9	22	34	24	0	0	0	0	89
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	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	1	2	3	0	8	40	57	60	0	0	0	0	171

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	6	15	24	0	0	0	0	45	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	0	0	0	8	

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				62%	58%	61%	59%	57%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				59%	58%	59%	58%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	52%	54%	53%	49%	52%
Math Achievement				68%	58%	62%	64%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains				69%	58%	59%	60%	56%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				67%	51%	52%	55%	49%	52%
Science Achievement				56%	51%	56%	51%	52%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				77%	74%	78%	74%	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					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2021					
	2019	46%	57%	-11%	54%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2021					
	2019	63%	55%	8%	52%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
08	2021					
	2019	66%	59%	7%	56%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2021					
	2019	64%	58%	6%	55%	9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2021					
	2019	59%	53%	6%	54%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
08	2021					
	2019	56%	45%	11%	46%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	44%	43%	1%	48%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	98%	67%	31%	67%	31%
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	91%	61%	30%	61%	30%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	97%	56%	41%	57%	40%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Progress monitoring provides all stake holders the opportunity to track students' academic progress throughout the calendar year. Progress monitoring allows teachers to drive their instruction based on the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of their teaching. This allows teachers to adjust instruction to better meet the needs of their students.

In Kindergarten, we utilized the FIKRS assessment. FLKRS is used to calculate Kindergarten Readiness rates for the VPK Program.

57% are At/Above Grade level

14% On Watch

10% Intervention

19% Urgent Intervention

In grades 1-5, we will use I-Ready Diagnostics for Fall, Winter and Spring. In addition, we will utilize USA Test Prep for grades 3-5 to monitor what information students have mastered and what needs to be retaught. We will follow the Franklin Academy Scope and Sequences which are aligned with Best Standards to allow teachers to monitor student's understanding of the standards and to make decisions that best support all learners.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	42	49	59
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	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	44	52	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	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	66	71	70
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners			
	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	44	43	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35	44	49
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	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			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	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			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	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	16	38	42	16	31	38	10	23			
ELL	43	57	57	31	27	31	29	44	60		
ASN	85	80		68	33		80		85		
BLK	48	34	31	25	22	32	21	49	24		
HSP	52	57	62	34	23	28	35	52	45		
MUL	33			45							
WHT	51	42		40	14		50	29	65		
FRL	45	50	56	27	20	25	28	44	44		
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	22	38	45	33	60	56	11	54			
ELL	47	60	58	56	71	73	41	69	81		

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
ASN	75	55		84	74		82		93		
BLK	61	58	50	62	58	56	58	83	78		
HSP	60	60	57	65	69	67	54	72	75		
WHT	68	61	69	82	78	80	57	83	83		
FRL	55	54	57	63	66	66	44	76	75		
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	22	42	33	28	35	32	24	5			
ELL	40	58	53	54	61	58	26	62	44		
ASN	85	62		81	69			92	83		
BLK	55	65	67	54	50	45	42	72	52		
HSP	57	54	48	65	60	56	52	69	66		
MUL	38	54		42	58						
WHT	65	62	58	71	68	58	45	85	69		
FRL	54	57	56	57	56	53	48	66	59		

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	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	432
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	86%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
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	43

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	72
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	32
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	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	39
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	42
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	38
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 trends that emerged across the grade levels include that all grade levels Iready data increased from the Fall Diagnostic to the Spring Diagnostic assessment.

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

Franklin Academy F did not have 2019 state assessments. Using IReady data, our greatest need for improvement is in reading. Grade 4 and 5 were less than 50% proficient. There is some question regarding the impact of Covid during the FY20 and FY21 school years.

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

During the final quarter of FY20 school year, our students were attending school virtually and had minimal contact with their teacher. Students were presented video lessons and assignments through google classroom. As we continued to FY21 school year, over 85% of our students were learning virtually through the entire school year with many students alternating from in person to virtual learning. With the FY22 school year, all our students have returned to in person instruction. We meet regularly with our teams and hold bi-weekly curriculum meetings to break down data and plan instruction that will aid in closing the instructional gaps.

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

Using the FY21 Iready data, our greatest area of improvement was mid-year to Spring diagnostic assessments. Our 3rd grade students had a 69% proficiency. Fourth and Fifth grade were stagnant with results of 48% proficiency.

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

Using the FY21 Iready data, our greatest area of improvement were from mid-year to spring diagnostic in 3rd grade. These students had a proficiency of 69%. This year all students have returned to in person instruction. Our teachers meet bi-weekly to review student data and progress plan for whole group and small group instruction. Leadership team members are available to support classrooms and those students in need of intervention.

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

This year all students have returned to in person instruction. Our teachers meet bi-weekly to review student data and progress plan for whole group and small group instruction. Leadership team members are available to support classrooms and those students in need of intervention. Our ELL population will utilize new reading software to assist in language acquisition.

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.

K-5 teachers will participate in bi-weekly curriculum meetings facilitated by administration and curriculum specialist. Leadership team will support classrooms and provide intervention to those students identified. Teachers received 4 days of PDD during pre-planning that focused on unpacking the standards, Best standards for K-2 and small group differentiated instruction.

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

This school year we are implementing a tutoring program that will support our lowest 25% in the area of reading. Tutoring will be offered afterschool and on Saturday. There will be no cost for tutoring. Our Professional development days at the end of the quarter will focus on understanding the data and how to drive instruction.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>To increase number of ELA proficient students in the L25 group. Franklin Academy F did not have 2019 state assessment data. FY21 Iready data indicates 69% of grade three students tested proficient in reading, 48% of grade four students tested proficient , and 48% of grade five students tested proficient.</p> <p>The FY22 Iready data revealed 33% of Kindergarten students were proficient in reading, 23% of first grade students were proficient in reading, 31% of second grade students were proficient in reading, 49% of third grade students were proficient in reading, 35% of fourth grade students were proficient in reading, and 32% of fifth grade students were proficient in reading.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	On FY 22 Winter Iready ELA Diagnostic, we will increase our Kindergarten proficiency from 33% to 45% and first grade proficiency from 23% to 45% and second grade from 31% to 45% and third grade from 49% to 55% and fourth grade from 35% to 45% and fifth grade from 32% to 45%.
Monitoring:	Bi-weekly curriculum meetings with team, admin and curriculum specialist will be held. During these meetings, current data for all students will be examined and monitored for progress. Small group instruction will be created and adjusted based on new data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Diane Showalter (charter5046@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Students will be remediated through learning opportunities using iReady, in addition to other standards based resources.</p> <p>ESE teachers will attend grade level meetings and curriculum meetings to increase communication between general education teacher and ESE teacher.</p> <p>Differentiated small groups in ELA</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Small group instruction during the literacy block. 2. Students who are in need of intervention will receive additional instruction by one of our interventionist. 3. Weekly required minutes of Iready instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will utilize USA test prep data to identify student needs and to formulate small group instruction as well as to aid in intervention.
2. Interventionist will be utilized to aid in small group instruction and to be able to progress monitor. These groups are fluid and changing based on the bi-weekly curriculum meetings.
3. Students are required to participate in weekly Iready lessons. Teachers utilize the information to assign specific lessons outside the instructional pathway to aid in current topics that need intervention.

Person Responsible Diane Showalter (charter5046@browardschools.com)

#2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:****Measurable Outcome:****Monitoring:****Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:****Action Steps to Implement***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***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.

NA

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

NA

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

NA

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00