# Sculptor Charter School



# 2022-23 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 |
| **2021-22 Title I School** | No |
| **2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) | 27% |
| **2021-22 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** | 2021-22: A (66%) 2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (65%) |
| **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** | ATSI |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#). | |

## School Board Approval

N/A

## 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.](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) | **2021-22 Title I School** | **2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| Combination School KG-8 | No | 27% |

| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | Yes | 20% |

## School Grades History

| Year | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | A | | A | A |

## School Board Approval

N/A

## 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**
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| Bernhard, Renee | Principal | * Instructional leader focused on student achievement<br>* Collaborates with others to develop strategies to improve student achievement<br>* Encourages others to collaborate<br>* Uses data to improve learning<br>* Provides support to all staff, particularly instructional staff<br>* Provides feedback to instructional staff<br>* Assists in aligning curriculum, assessment, and instruction<br>* Provides and allocates resources<br>* Uses data to determine staff professional development activities to strengthen instructional skills<br>* Writes plans for funding and monitors progress of same<br>* Ensures school safety needs are met<br>* Serves on the Threat Assessment team<br>* Handles school discipline |
| Quam, Christine | Assistant Principal | * Instructional leader focused on student achievement<br>* Collaborates with others to develop strategies to improve student achievement<br>* Encourages others to collaborate<br>* Uses data to improve learning<br>* Provides support to all staff, particularly instructional staff<br>* Provides feedback to instructional staff<br>* Assists in aligning curriculum, assessment, and instruction<br>* Provides and allocates resources<br>* Uses data to determine staff professional development activities to strengthen instructional skills<br>* Testing Coordinator<br>* Ensures school safety needs are met<br>* Serves on the Treat Assessment Team<br>* Handles school discipline |
| Hoogerwerf, Michelle | School Counselor | * Provides counseling services to students to ensure their mental health needs are being met<br>* Assists in developing and implementing behavior plans, as needed<br>* Instrumental in the MTSS process<br>* Collaborates with others to develop strategies to improve student achievement<br>* Encourages others to collaborate<br>* Uses data to improve learning<br>* Provides support to instructional staff as they work throught the IPST/ MTSS process |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Tuesday 8/1/2017, Renee Bernhard

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

3

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

13

**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 2021-22 school year.**

3

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.**

3

**Demographic Data**

## Early Warning Systems

**Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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 | 54 | 55 | 66 | 66 | 68 | 65 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 554 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Course failure in ELA | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 13 | 13 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 3 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |

**Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":**

| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

Friday 10/7/2022

**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 | 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 |

**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 | 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 |

## 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 | 2022 | | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 68% | 63% | 55% | | | | 74% | 65% | 61% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 59% | | | | | | 65% | 58% | 59% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 44% | | | | | | 59% | 54% | 54% |
| Math Achievement | 68% | 40% | 42% | | | | 70% | 67% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | 69% | | | | | | 66% | 62% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 66% | | | | | | 57% | 59% | 52% |
| Science Achievement | 58% | 64% | 54% | | | | 70% | 62% | 56% |

| School Grade Component | 2022 | | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Social Studies Achievement | 90% | 61% | 59% | | | | 82% | 80% | 78% |

**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 |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 76% | 64% | 12% | 58% | 18% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 80% | 61% | 19% | 58% | 22% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -76% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 76% | 60% | 16% | 56% | 20% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -80% | | | | |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 58% | 60% | -2% | 54% | 4% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -76% | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 75% | 58% | 17% | 52% | 23% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -58% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 79% | 63% | 16% | 56% | 23% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -75% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 47% | 61% | -14% | 62% | -15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 79% | 64% | 15% | 64% | 15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -47% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 64% | 60% | 4% | 60% | 4% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -79% | | | | |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 60% | 67% | -7% | 55% | 5% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -64% | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 76% | 62% | 14% | 54% | 22% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -60% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 81% | 43% | 38% | 46% | 35% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -76% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 76% | 56% | 20% | 53% | 23% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -76% | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 64% | 53% | 11% | 48% | 16% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 83% | 74% | 9% | 71% | 12% |

| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 97% | 61% | 36% | 61% | 36% |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 95% | 60% | 35% | 57% | 38% |

## Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 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 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| SWD | 32 | 48 | 46 | 41 | 42 | 33 | 30 | | | |
| HSP | 73 | 58 | | 67 | 65 | | | | | |
| MUL | 81 | 80 | | 69 | 76 | | 50 | | | |
| WHT | 66 | 57 | 40 | 68 | 67 | 67 | 58 | 90 | 68 | |
| FRL | 64 | 62 | 40 | 64 | 75 | 61 | 52 | 80 | 69 | |

| 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 | |

## ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 66 |
| 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 | 593 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 9 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 39 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **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% | 0 |
| **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% | 0 |
| **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% | 0 |
| **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% | 0 |

| Hispanic Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 66 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Multiracial Students** | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 71 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **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% | 0 |
| **White Students** | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 65 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Economically Disadvantaged Students** | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 63 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**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 number of students who scored Level 3 or above: In ELA, the percentage of students scoring Level 3 or above has declined across all grade levels except 6th grade (when comparing data from 2019-2021). In Math, increases were seen in grades 3, 6. and 7; decreases were seen in grades 4,5, and 8. In Science, significant losses were seen in 5th grade but gains were seen in 8th. In the EOCs, gains were seen in Civics and losses seen in Algebra and Geometry. Students with disabilities, overall, underperformed students in other subgroups.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?**

While the number of students scoring Level 3 or above in ELA for Sculptor is above that of the District and State in most grade levels, we have still seen an overall decline in this measure of achievement. In Math, gains were made in 3 grade levels; however, performance is still not strong in this area. In 5th grade Science, performance significantly declined (from 76% scoring Level 3 or above to 45%). In the subgroup students with disabilities, while improvements were seen in ELA (ELA Achievement went from 21 to 32), Math (achievement went from 32-41) and Science (achievement went from 17 to 30), much more progress needs to be made in this area.

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

Many of the declines can be attributed to learning loss that occured during the years of the pandemic. However, in Math, we believe that our curriculum is no longer matching how students are being tested. In 5th grade Science, a new teacher started mid-year. In addition, more focus needs to be placed in all Science classes on hands-on, Inquiry based learning.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

Sixth grade ELA showed growth. In Math, 3rd, 6th, and 7th grades had an increase in the number of students scoring Level 3 or above. In 8th grade Science, 7% more students scored at or above grade level.

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

We have focused on Math for the last several years. Small gains have occured as a result. In 8th grade Science, emphasis was placed on hands-on learning through STEM activities. We continue to work on student motivation.

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

Continue to implement effective progress monitoring through the FAST assessments, iStation assessments, iReady assessments, and/or curriculum/classroom based assessments. Provide interventions to students who are struggling. Increase hands-on, inquiry based learning in all classrooms.

**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.**

Teachers will be provided with professional development in the area of Inquiry in the Classroom, as well as on Standards Based Inquiry for Mathematics. Teachers will also be offered opportunities to participate in a variety of Reading, Math, and Science based workshops provided by Brevard Public Schools.

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

Progress monitoring will continue to be a critical component of measuring student achievement. Professional development opportunities will continue to be provided to teachers, especially in Math/ STEM. All teachers will be provided with a membership to NCTM (National Council of Teachers of Mathematics) which will allow them to access resources to assist them in lesson planning for math.

**Areas of Focus**
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

**:**

### #1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

| | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. | This subgroup did not meet the Federal Index level of 40%. This subgroup scored at 39%. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. | The performance of students with disabilities will improve by at least 1% in order to meet the Federal Index requirement. |
| **Monitoring:** Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. | Students with disabilities will be progress monitoring (Reading and Math) through iReady or iStation (depending on grade level of the student), as well as curriculum based assessments, in order to determine specific areas of learning gaps. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Renee Bernhard (bernhard.renee@sculptorcharter.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. | Direct/Explicit Instruction and Feedback: Through progress monitoring results, Identify target skill, teach skill/concept in multiple ways, model, provide practice opportunities for students, provide feedback that is specific and timely, provide additional practice, post-test (progress monitoring), reteach as needed. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy. | John Hattie has identified direct instruction as a high yield strategy (.59 effect size). Both Robert Marzano and John Hattie agree that struggling learners need immediate feedback in order to improve their learning. |

### Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Meet with ESE teachers to discuss achievement of students with disabilities.
2. Provide time for ESE and General Education teachers to collaborate.
3. Provide resources to teachers, as needed, to ensure they have the tools necessary to provide the most effective instruction to students with disabilities.
4. Tutoring will be offered/provided to students.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Renee Bernhard (bernhard.renee@sculptorcharter.org) |

| #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. | While improvements were seen in Math over 3 grade levels (3rd, 6th, and 7th), we showed declines in 4th, 5th, and 8th grades. Therefore, there is a need to continue to focus on Math instruction and Math practice. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. | All grade levels will show an increase in the percentage of students scoring level 3 or above in math. |
| **Monitoring:** Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. | Students will participate in progress monitoring through FAST assessments, iReady, iStation, and/or curriculum based assessments. Interventions will be provided for students who are not showing adequate progress on such assessments.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:** Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. | Teachers will continue to ensure students are: actively engaged in doing mathematics, making inter-disciplinary connections, sharing mathematical ideas, using multiple representations to communicate mathematical ideas, and using manipulatives and other tools. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy. | Research has shown the above strategies to be effective. By using the above strategies, we have begun to see improvements in math. By continuing to utilize these strategies, we anticipate that growth to continue. |

**Action Steps to Implement**
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Continue to provide teachers with professional development that supports their math curriculum.
2. Meet with teachers/grade level teams to discuss student progress in math.
3. Ensure teachers are utilizing the MTSS process for students that are struggling in Math so that appropriate interventions can be implemented.
4. Tutoring will be offered/provided to students.

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

## 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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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

The parent survey indicated that over 88% 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 (92% agreed), Their child feels safe at school (93% agreed), and over 95% of familes said that the overall environment is welcoming for families.

Improvement was made in the following area: Staff consistently enforces school rules (91% agreed in 2021-22, vs 89% in 2020-2021; however in 2019-2020, 94% of families believed that rules were consistently enforced, so more work is needed in this area). One of the main areas parents believe rules are inconsistently enforced is with the uniform policy. We are working hard this year to ensure consistent enforcement.

An area for improvement is helping families feel they are an important part of the school. On the 2021-2022 parent survey, over 16% of families did not believe they were an important part of improving the school. Much of this stemmed from their inability to volunteer in the school the way they had been able to before the pandemic. We are hoping to see improvement in this area during the 2022-2023 school year as we are now able to utilize volunteers within the building.

A new initiative this year to improve the culture of the school is through the implementation of PBIS-Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports. Having a consistent set of school-wide expectations will help students be succesful wherever they are in the school and whoever they are with. Through this program, we hope to decrease discipline reports and increase the feeling of belonging within the student body and the staff.

We will continue to train teachers in Restorative Practices so that they can implement strategies to build positive relationships with their students and assist students in repairing relationships that have been harmed through misbehavior.

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

Teachers- teachers meet weekly to discuss data and determine interventions to close any achievement gaps. Teachers will post grades in FOCUS weekly and ensure parents are kept updated regarding their child's progress. In addition, teachers will implement PBIS within their classrooms.

All teachers, staff, and Administrators are responsible for building positive relationship with the students. We expect to provide training to an additional 3-5 teachers in Restorative Practices in 2022-2023. This training will help teachers/staff enforce school rules while, at the same time, maintain and repair positive relationships with students and families.

Our Activities team and their assistant will continue to provide and promote various events for the students. Such events include: Clash of Colors (field day in which teams of students in K-8 have friendly competitions throughout the day), Walk-A-Thon, and Dance-A-Thon.

The school Leadership team (Adminstration and teacher leaders) are working to fundraise for a new playground (consistently a requested item from our families), assist in the implementation of PBIS, and assist in determining staff technolgy needs.

Our PTO (made up of staff and parents) will continue their partnership and implement school-wide fundraising and/or school community events so that all parents have an opportunity to feel included in the school.