Sculptor Charter School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sculptor Charter School

1301 ARMSTRONG DR, Titusville, FL 32780

http://www.sculptorcharter.org

Demographics

Principal: Renee Bernhard

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2017

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	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	27%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Asian Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (66%)
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 Brevard 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

Sculptor Charter School

1301 ARMSTRONG DR, Titusville, FL 32780

http://www.sculptorcharter.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	No	22%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	18%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard 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.

Sculpting Young Minds to Shape the Future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Sculptor Charter School will develop culturally literate citizens who are successful in the real world by delivering a world class education in a collaborative environment with a passion for learning.

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
Bernhard, Renee	Principal	*Instructional leader focused on student achievement *Collaborates with others to develop strategies to improve student achievement *Encourages others to collaborate *Uses data to improve learning *Provides support to all staff, particularly instructional staff *Provides feedback to instructional staff *Assists in aligning curriculum, assessment, and instruction *Provides and allocates resources *Uses data to determine staff professional development activities to strengthen instructional skills.
Quam, Christine	Assistant Principal	*Instructional leader focused on student achievement *Collaborates with others to develop strategies to improve student achievement *Encourages others to collaborate *Uses data to improve learning *Provides support to all staff, particularly instructional staff *Provides feedback to instructional staff *Assists in aligning curriculum, assessment, and instruction *Provides and allocates resources *Uses data to determine staff professional development activities to strengthen instructional skills *Testing coordinator
Hoogerwerf, Michelle	School Counselor	*Provides counseling services to students to ensure their mental health needs are being met *Assists in developing and implementing behavior plans, as needed *Instrumental in the MTSS process *Collaborates with others to develop strategies to improve student achievement *Encourages others to collaborate *Uses data to improve learning *Provides support to instructional staff as they work through the IPST/MTSS process

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 8/1/2017, Renee Bernhard

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.*
4

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.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
38

Total number of students enrolled at the school
554

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
3

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	57	57	55	54	65	66	68	64	68	0	0	0	0	554
Attendance below 90 percent	0	3	2	2	3	7	5	0	6	0	0	0	0	28
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	5
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	0	0	0	6	2	5	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	6	0	0	0	0	14
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	0	1	1	0	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	11
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA ELA	0	0	0	1	4	5	8	2	5	0	0	0	0	25
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA MATH	0	0	0	1	10	21	18	3	7	0	0	0	0	60
	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	2	1	0	8	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	18

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/16/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	56	53	55	60	67	69	68	67	58	0	0	0	0	553
Attendance below 90 percent	0	8	2	9	9	9	8	2	6	0	0	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4	3	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	5	9	0	0	0	0	23

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	1	1	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	6

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	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	56	53	55	60	67	69	68	67	58	0	0	0	0	553
Attendance below 90 percent	0	8	2	9	9	9	8	2	6	0	0	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4	3	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	5	9	0	0	0	0	23

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	1	1	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	6

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	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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				74%	65%	61%	72%	68%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				65%	58%	59%	58%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	54%	54%	54%	54%	52%
Math Achievement				70%	67%	62%	68%	67%	61%
Math Learning Gains				66%	62%	59%	66%	61%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57%	59%	52%	62%	56%	52%
Science Achievement				70%	62%	56%	50%	63%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				82%	80%	78%	92%	81%	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	76%	64%	12%	58%	18%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	80%	61%	19%	58%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2021					
	2019	76%	60%	16%	56%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
06	2021					
	2019	58%	60%	-2%	54%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
07	2021					
	2019	75%	58%	17%	52%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
08	2021					
	2019	79%	63%	16%	56%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	47%	61%	-14%	62%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	79%	64%	15%	64%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2021					
	2019	64%	60%	4%	60%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
06	2021					
	2019	60%	67%	-7%	55%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
07	2021					
	2019	76%	62%	14%	54%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
08	2021					
	2019	81%	43%	38%	46%	35%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				

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	76%	56%	20%	53%	23%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	64%	53%	11%	48%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				

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	83%	74%	9%	71%	12%
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	97%	61%	36%	61%	36%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	95%	60%	35%	57%	38%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

ELA - K-2 - istation; 4-8 - FAIR
Math - K-2 - Dibels; 3-5 APM; 6-IXL; 7-8-Teacher created
Science - 5th/8th - Teacher created
FSA-Spring, 2021-grades 3-8

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	56	61	67
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	100	91	93
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	73	76	79
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	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	59	66	65.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	
	Students With Disabilities	17	33	
	English Language Learners	0	0	
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students			58.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	45	47	68.2
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	
	English Language Learners	0	0	
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students			49.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	46	51	60.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0	20	
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			35.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	51	70	47.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	75	75	
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	53	67	76.1
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	33	33	
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	87	97	79.1
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	78	80	76.1
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	25	25	
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	63	82	59.1
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	95.5
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	80	85	67.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	33	33	
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	75	85	25.9
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	65	75	51.9
	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	21	37	45	32	26	30	17				
HSP	71	62		58	52						
MUL	76	72		60	50						
WHT	69	62	56	59	50	42	53	94	80		
FRL	66	62	60	51	52	63	55	100	71		
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	55	55	56	57	66	69	43				
HSP	84	77		77	69		92				
MUL	68	57		68	53		42	80			
WHT	74	65	60	70	67	59	71	85	72		
FRL	72	65	64	72	67	62	68	86	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	62	56	65	46	52	53	36				
HSP	78	59		69	74		45				
MUL	74	65		68	73						
WHT	71	57	53	68	64	58	51	94	69		
FRL	63	53	47	63	66	59	19	91	55		

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	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	566
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	
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
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	61
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	65
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	63
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	64
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?

Elementary ELA - the number of students scoring Level 3 or above declined for several grades.(all but 6th and 7th grades showed a decrease in the number of students scoring at Level 3 or above. Math FSA - 4th and 5th grades had significant losses in proficiency (4th - from 79.4% to 49.3%; In 5th - 63.6% to 35.3%)

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

In ELA, progress flatlined or dropped: On FSA ELA, a decrease in proficiency was seen in 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 8th grades. On Math FSA, there was a decrease in proficiency in grades 4, 5, 7, and 8. While we met or exceeded the District Mean Scale Score in most of the grade levels, the declines in both ELA and Math are concerning and demonstrate a great need for 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?

E-learning and non-engaged students were the greatest contributing factors. In addition, teacher effectiveness had a role in the decline. We believe utilizing a consistent progress monitoring system across the grade levels would help assess the students more effectively. Also, providing stronger teacher mentoring to new teachers or teachers in a new subject area would help student achievement.

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

6th ELA-from 58.2% proficiency to 76.1%; FSA EOC Civics-increase from 82.5% level 3 and above to 95.5%; Geometry EOC - 58.2% level 3 and above to 76.1%; 6th grade math - increase in percentage of level 3 and above from 60.3% to 79.1%.

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

6th grade ELA teacher collaborated with 7th/8th ELA teacher; The curriculum aligned to the standards. 6th grade math teacher was in 2nd year of teaching and collaborated effectively with the 7th/8th grade math teachers; Civics teacher utilized Google classroom effectively and taught students how to use it.

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

Consistent progress monitoring software - iReady and EasyCBM - both newly purchased in 2021-22; STEM kit professional development was provided to teachers; Google classroom continued for students that need to be quarantined to ensure they remain caught up with their class and the course work.

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.

Social Emotional Learning - mindfulness training provided to teachers so they can be mentally and emotionally more prepared to handle and engage students in these traumatic times; iReady

professional development was provided to ensure teachers are utilizing the new progress monitoring program with fidelity and to it fullest capacity; Math - Eureka professional development provided to two departmentalized math teachers; STEM training provided to all teachers to ensure kits are used with fidelity and to enhance/reinforce STEM lessons taught in class.

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

iReady/EasyCBM- these programs allow for more consistent progress monitoring across all grade levels. This will help ensure more accurate data. This will also allow our teachers to more effectively provide appropriate and accurate interventions in both Reading and Math. A Reading Coach was added to our staff. This teacher will be essential in helping create and provide Reading interventions to students not performing at grade level proficiency.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	While last year we did begin improvements in math achievement across most grade levels, we showed declines in student achievement in all but 3rd (gain from 46.6% to 58.6% proficiency) and 6th grades (gain from 60.3% to 79.1% proficiency). Therefore there is a need to close achievement gaps created by a year of eLearning/Hybrid learning.
Measurable Outcome:	100% of the instructional staff responsible for teaching math will ensure the Eureka Math/ Engage NY program is implemented with fidelity and aligned to the current standards. Per our charter goals, we will continue to meet or exceed the Mean Scal Score of the District and/or the State in Math. All grade levels or cohorts will show at least 2% growth in math as measured by Math FSA.
Monitoring:	Student will participate in Progress Monitoring through iReady and receive Interventions from EasyCBM to ensure they are making progress on the required Florida standards. Such progress monitoring reports will be reviewed throughout the year. Progress monitoring may occur more frequently with students not showing growth. Classroom walk-throughs and observations will help Administrators see that the Math curriculum is taught in an effective manner.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Renee Bernhard (bernhard.renee@sculptorcharter.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will ensure students are: *Actively engaged in doing mathematics * Making inter-disciplinary connections * Sharing mathematical ideas * Using multiple representations to communicate mathematical ideas * Using manipulatives and other tools
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	While research has show the above strategies to be effective, due to the implementation of hybrid/eLearning in 2020-2021, they were difficult to implement correctly. Through the use of the above strategies, we had begun to see continued improvements in Math. With all of the students back in the building, the above strategies can, once again, be implemented with fidelity and consistency.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide departmentalized teachers with professional development in Eureka Math/Engage NY and continue to support veteran teachers.
2. Meet with teachers at least monthly to discuss student achievement in Math.
3. Continue to utilize the MTSS process for students making insufficient progress in math.
4. Provide interventions targeting specific students gaps, as determined by iReady progress monitoring and EasyCBM interventions.

Person Responsible	Christine Quam (quam.chris@sculptorcharter.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We have consistently met our charter goals of meeting and/or exceeding the mean scale scores of the district and/or the state in ELA across all grades levels. In addition, we have exceeded the District and the State in the number of students who scored Level 3 or above in ELA across all grade levels. However, we have seen a decline in the overall number of students who are proficient in ELA (scoring Level 3 or above on FSA ELA) in grades 3,4, 5 and 8. This decline is concerning as it represents learning gaps that occured during eLearning and Hybrid teaching.
Measurable Outcome:	The percentage of students scoring Level 3 or above on FSA ELA will increase across all grade levels by 2%. In addition, we will continue to meet our charter goals by meeting or exceeding the mean scale scores of the District and/or the State.
Monitoring:	Progress towards this goal will be monitoring through the use of iReady software. Data will be analyzed and learning gaps identified. Specific areas of weakness will be targeted with interventions through EasyCBM.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Renee Bernhard (bernhard.renee@sculptorcharter.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Activating prior knowledge - this strategy will allow students to make connections with information they already know and apply it to new material. This will help students understand what they are reading across all content areas. Text-based writing - students will write analytically in response to reading multiple texts using correct grammar and spelling.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Researchers, such as E.D. Hirsch, Robert Marzano, and Daniel Willingham believe that "students need a broad and rich knowledge base to recognize and understand the meaning of words and ideas they read throughout their years in school and beyond...Content knowledge, and vocabulary acquired through learning about content, is what enables comprehension ability to increase. In fact, no amount of reading "comprehension skills" instruction can compensate for lack of knowledge." Text-based writing - Reading comprehension skills are key to success with text-based writing. In order to write analytically, students must understand the texts they are reading. In addition, grammar and spelling must also be taught as a part of text-based writing. "If not applied with a large degree of automaticity, basic writing skills such as spelling, handwriting, typing, capitalization, punctuation, and grammar can become obstacles to productively written expression (Troia & Graham, 2003)."

Action Steps to Implement

*Weekly classroom walk-throughs/observations and monthly meetings with teachers will be implemented by both the Assistant Principal and the Principal.
* Provide professional development for programs such as iReady and EasyCBM.
* Implement progress monitoring through iReady and implement interventions through EasyCBM.
* Utilize District Literacy Assessments as a progress monitoring tool for both comprehension and text-based wriring.

Person Responsible	Christine Quam (quam.chris@sculptorcharter.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Through the school year 2018-19, we placed a huge emphasis on Science and saw tremendous growth on the subsequent Science assessment over the previous year (5th grade showed gains of 25% and 8th grade had gains of 13%). The most recent score reports of 2020-2021 showed a huge decline in progress. Fifth grade showed a reduction of students scoring level 3 and above from 75.8% in 2019 to 47.1% in 2021; similarly, 63.9% of 8th grade students in 2019 scored level 3 and above compared to only 51.9% in 2021. We believe this is due to the lack of hands on learning experienced through a year of hybrid and eLearning.
Measurable Outcome:	100% of the Science teachers in grades 4-8 will continue to participate in the Science cadre. This cadre will ensure proper alignment of the Science curriculum to the standards. The cadre will also ensure that science assessments are grade level appropriate and standards based. Through this, we expect to increase the number of students scoring level 3 and above on the FSA Science assessment by 5% for each grade level (5th and 8th). Per our charter goals, we will continue to meet or exceed the Mean Scale Score of the District and/or the State on the FSA Science assessment.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored by classroom walk-throughs, observations, and monthly teacher meetings. Hands on learning of science should be observed throughout the grade levels.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christine Quam (quam.chris@sculptorcharter.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	* Teachers will set clear lesson goals and standards-based learning objectives for Science instruction * Teachers will utilize hands-on and Discovery based learning * Teachers will track student progress using standards-based questioning and assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When teachers set clear goals, they can intentionally plan their instruction and their activities, Marzano's research is clear that students need to know what learing targets they are intended to master. "Students who physically experience scientific concepts understand them more deeply and score better on science tests," according to a new UChicago-led study. "In many situations, when we allow our bodies to become part of the learning process, we understand better," Beilock said (Siam Beilock, 2015). "Reading about a concept in a textbook or even seeing a demonstration in class is not the same as physically experiencing what you are learning about. We need to rethink how we are teaching math and science because our actions matter for how and what we learn.

Action Steps to Implement

*Progress monitor with standards-based assessments throughout the year.
*Reteach (review) standards more extensively (standards from previous grade levels).
*Utilize hands-on, Discovery learning through the use of mobile STEM kits.
* Conduct labs that are connected to multiple standards.

Person Responsible	Christine Quam (quam.chris@sculptorcharter.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

X

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.

The parent survey indicated that 95% of the Sculptor families were satisfied with the quality of Sculptor Charter School. In addition, the parent survey indicated a positive response in the following categories: Feeling welcome when entering the school (93% agreed), Their child feels safe at school (99% agreed), Overall school environment is welcoming for families (93% agreed).

Areas of improvement included: Staff consistently enforces school rules (89% agreed in 20-21 versus 94% in 19-20) and commmunicating academic progress (16% believed not enough communication regarding academic progress occured in 20-21 versus only 7% in 19-20).

In looking at the areas of improvement, enforcing school rules is one area that can continue to help students feel safe. But, while we want to enforce school rules consistently, ultimately we want to reduce the number of events requiring student discipline. In order for students to be successful academically and behaviorally, they need to believe that we truly care about them. If students believe that we care, discipline rates should improve. Relationship building has been way more difficult over the last 2 school years due to eLearning and all of the stress regarding the pandemic. However, we continue to believe that relationship building is key to student success.

One way we build positive relationships is through Restorative Practices. We began using Restorative Practices in 2019 at a very basic level. Each year we continue to train more teachers so that Restorative practices can be implemented with fidelity throughout the school.

Our school also believes that students, regardless of the grade level, can build positive relationships with each other. We implement a Clash of Colors each year whereby teams are created with 1 or 2 students from every grade level on the team. The teams meet twice during the year and then have a field day competing in fun, school spirit filled games. When the younger students are able to meet and get to know the older students, they are not as afraid of them when they see them within the building.

A second area of improvement is communicating academic progress to families. While the expectation is that teachers post grades in FOCUS weekly and to reach out to parents of struggling students via email/telephone/personal conference, some teachers are less effective at this than others. This year, Administration is working with teachers who struggle in this area to ensure that grades are posted timely and communication is provided to parents. By providing parents with this information in a timely manner, parents and teachers can work collaboratively to ensure student achievement and success.

Other ways we are working to build a positive school climate include: developing a school motto to create school spirit and unity and creating "core teams" with our staff. The intention behind these teams, which are comprised of a mixture of all staff members, is to provide everyone with a supportve team. All staff members will have a small "core team" to whom they can turn for help, guidance, and support. It is our hope that by providing support to all staff, the morale of the staff will increase, which will then have a positive impact on the students..

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

Teachers - teachers meet weekly to discuss data and determine interventions to close any achievement gaps. Teachers will post grades in FOCUS weekly. Teachers will contact parents of any students who have failing grades.

All teachers and Admin are responsible for building positive relationships with the students. We expect to provide training to an additional 5-10 teachers in Restorative Practices in 2021-22. This training will help teachers/staff enforce school rules while, at the same time, maintain and repair positive relationships with students and families.

Our PE teacher and the Activities team assistant coordinate and promote the Clash of Colors event.

The school leadership team (comprised of the Principal, Assistant Principa, and various teacher leaders) are working to develop and promote a school motto.

All staff is responsible for participating with the "core team" activities and providing support to all team members..