

Broward County Public Schools

Ben Gamla Charter School North Campus School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	26
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Ben Gamla Charter School North Campus

2620 HOLLYWOOD BLVD, Hollywood, FL 33020

bengamla-charter.com

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Broward County School Board on 11/9/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Ben Gamla Charter School provides a safe environment for innovative instructional practices that continuously light the path toward maximum student achievement and personal growth. As the first English-Hebrew Charter School in the United States, Ben Gamla Charter School integrates Hebrew instruction giving our students a useful tool in our global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ben Gamla Charter School is a community of learners that honors individual student needs, varied modalities of instruction, and nurtures character traits that help to develop good citizenship.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Confer, Heather	Principal	Instructional leader, Compliance leader, Professional Development leader, Teacher accountability, PLC administrator
Schoonover, Anamarie	Administrative Support	ESE Specialist - SWD Compliance and Program Oversight, SBTMT Vice Chair - Threat prevention team
Pollack, Lindsay	Assistant Principal	Instructional Implementation, Behavior Support

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

School Improvement and Student Achievement are an absolute priority at Ben Gamla. Our goal is to ensure student achievement among all students enrolled at Ben Gamla Charter School. We use a variety of data to determine the needs of our students and to drive instruction. Ben Gamla staff, students, and parents play an integral part in developing the goals to improve our school. A School Advisory Council put together by the principal of the school studies the school's historical and current data and contributes to a plan to improve educational practices in vital content areas and promote student achievement. A team of diverse stakeholders provide varying perspectives to the School Improvement Plan. The School Advisory Council (SAC) is a team of people representing various segments of the school community – parents, teachers, administrators, support staff, and other interested community members are invited to provide input to the school’s improvement goals and efforts.

A Needs Assessment is conducted and input from stakeholders is included. The needs assessment is based on student data gathered throughout the school year. Student data reviewed for a needs assessment includes the school's state assessment data, state and district comparison data, progress monitoring data, behavior and discipline data, attendance data, and early warning signs information. The team also looks at disaggregated data in order to look for trends within specific subgroups and grade levels. The goals created and interventions proposed are better targeted when needs are identified by specific subgroups; students with disabilities, English language learners, students from low-socioeconomic backgrounds, and minority groups. During the 2021-2022 school year, Ben Gamla's students with disabilities subgroup was identified as a subgroup falling below the federal index of 41%. School Advisory Council members gather to discuss the school's academic plan and progress. The members discuss the development of a School Improvement Plan which includes goals and objectives established from information gained in the needs assessment. The purpose of the School Improvement Plan is to increase student achievement and performance. The School Advisory Council assists the principal with recommendations and input throughout the year continually assessing needs and progress as the school pursues the accomplishment of the goals set forth in the School Improvement Plan. Teachers and Administrators meet weekly during grade level Professional Learning Communities to analyze data, brainstorm instructional strategies to increase academic progress. Our Professional Learning Communities are data driven meetings that allow teachers and administrators to make instructional decisions based on student data. Academic, behavioral, and attendance are all topics discussed during these weekly meetings.

Due to the learning losses caused by the COVID-19 Pandemic, the school has acquired several intervention programs to assist teachers in closing student learning gaps. The effectiveness of these programs is continually monitored to ensure the extra programs are effective in meeting the needs of our students.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Student data will be regularly collected and analyzed to track student progress. Data will be collected and analyzed through Professional Learning Communities (PLC) on a weekly basis. Students who consistently fall within the lowest quartile on weekly skills assessments will receive tiered interventions through the Multi-Tiered Support System (MTSS). Students identified as at-risk students will be monitored by evaluating Response to Intervention (RtI) data collected on a weekly basis and analyzed monthly during Collaborative Problem Solving Team (CPST) meetings. Research-based intervention strategies and programs will be implemented and adjusted based on each identified students' needs. Subgroup data will also be analyzed with input from staff members who specialize in these subgroups to ensure all groups' needs are met and progress is achieved.

Students with disabilities will receive push-in or pull-out support by certified Exceptional Student Education (ESE) teachers. Individual Education Plan (IEP) goals are monitored weekly by general education teachers of students with disabilities (SWD) and ESE teachers. Weekly progress is tracked using assessments that measure goal achievement and grade level standards progress.

Student grade level standards progress is monitored by analyzing specific progress monitoring data throughout the year. Progress monitoring data is administered 3-4 times per year. The first administration serves as baseline data, while the second administration is used to monitor progress. The third administration is used to measure mastery. Ben Gamla's progress monitoring tools are i-Ready Reading Diagnostic and i-Ready Math Diagnostic, F.A.S.T. Cambium and STAR progress monitoring, Science Broward Standards Assessment and Science FACT, and Kindergarten Literacy Concepts.

*i-Ready Diagnostics are administered in grades 1-5 three times per year (Progress Monitoring 1 [PM1], *Progress Monitoring 2 [PM2], Progress Monitoring 3 [PM3]). i-Ready Diagnostics are administered in

kindergarten two times per year (PM2 and PM3).

*FAST Assessments are administered three times per year in grades K-5 (PM1, PM2, PM3).

*FAST Assessments include:

*STAR Early Literacy that assesses students’ foundational reading, language, and vocabulary skills in key

domains down to the subskill level - Kindergarten (PM1, PM2, PM3) and 1st grade (PM1)

*STAR Reading that assesses reading comprehension: 1st grade (PM2, PM3) and 2nd grade (PM1, PM2, PM3)

*STAR Math that assess math skills in 4 domains: Kindergarten – 2nd grades (PM1, PM2, PM3)

*Cambium ELA that assesses grade level BEST ELA standards: 3rd – 5th grades (PM1, PM2, PM3)

*Cambium Math that assesses grade level BEST Math standards: 3rd – 5th grades (PM1, PM2, PM3)

*Science Broward Standards Assessment is administered to 5th grade students during the PM2 window to

assess the progress of students’ science skills.

*Science FCAT Assessment is administered to 5th grade students during the PM3 window to assess mastery

of students’ science skills.

*Kindergarten Literacy Concepts track the progress of students’ development of letter names, sounds, and

concepts of print – Kindergarten (Quarter 1, Quarter 2, Quarter 3, Quarter 4).

The purpose of regular student data collection and analysis is to ensure data driven instruction that is differentiated to meet the needs of all students.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	46%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	38%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A

	2018-19: A
	2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	4	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	8
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	3	8	2	3	4	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	2	2	2	2	5	0	0	0	13
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	8	2	3	4	0	0	0	20

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Absent 10% or more school days		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level								Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8
Absent 10% or more school days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	3	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	3	8	2	3	4	11	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	2	2	2	2	5	7	0	0	0	20
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	8	2	3	4	11	0	0	0	31

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level								Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	63	55	53	75	57	55	71		
ELA Learning Gains				61			67		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50					
Math Achievement*	68	52	55	75	47	42	67		
Math Learning Gains				68			56		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50			30		
Science Achievement*	43	50	52	59	52	54	76		
Social Studies Achievement*		68	68		64	59			
Middle School Acceleration		72	70		57	51			
Graduation Rate		68	74		50	50			
College and Career Acceleration		54	53		66	70			
ELP Progress	79	53	55	69	75	70	50		

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	321
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	507
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	27	Yes	2	1
ELL	57			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	62			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	67			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	53			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	38	Yes	1	
ELL	60			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	60			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	61			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	63			68			43					79
SWD	18			36							2	
ELL	50			65			33				5	79
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	60			62			41				5	80
MUL												

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	67			73			47				5	79
FRL	52			52			33				4	76

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	75	61	50	75	68	50	59					69
SWD	38			38								
ELL	67	55	50	69	68	38	64					69
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	75	51	50	75	64	50	50					67
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	74	68	50	76	73		65					71
FRL	66	61		66	55		55					64

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	71	67		67	56	30	76					50
SWD	50											
ELL	67	60		61	60		68					50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	71	71		65	48		83					40
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	69	65		69	71		67					62
FRL	67	75		66	69		85					50

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	53%	56%	-3%	54%	-1%
04	2023 - Spring	80%	61%	19%	58%	22%
03	2023 - Spring	70%	53%	17%	50%	20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	67%	62%	5%	59%	8%
04	2023 - Spring	85%	65%	20%	61%	24%
05	2023 - Spring	64%	58%	6%	55%	9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	42%	46%	-4%	51%	-9%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year’s low performance and discuss any trends.

The lowest performing ESSA subgroup was Students with Disabilities (SWD) with a score of 38 on the Federal Index. Several contributing factors led to the low performance of this subgroup. The Covid Slide is one phenomenon that contributed to low performance. Research has found that students with disabilities were more profoundly affected by the loss of in person instruction than their non-disabled peers. Many students with disabilities, particularly students with specific learning disabilities, who were already performing behind their grade level expectations pre-pandemic fell further behind during online learning. Many of our younger students with disabilities lost out on acquiring foundational skills needed for phonemic awareness, phonics, and fluency mastery. We are finding that this subgroup is now having difficulty in the area reading comprehension due to a lack of foundational skills mastery. Trending data

supports that students who were in 1st or 2nd grade during the covid virtual learning years continue to perform lower than grade level expectations. Data from the 2018 and 2019 school years show 80% of all students earned a level 3 or higher in English Language Arts, but proficiency fell to 71% and 74 % during the 2021 and 2022 test administrations, respectively. During the 2018 and 2019 school year, Ben Gamla North Broward did not have enough students with disabilities to meet the requirements of the federal index data collection. After the pandemic, the school had enough students with disabilities to meet the data collection requirements with 50% of students with disabilities scoring a level 3 or higher but falling to only 38% of students earning a level 3 or higher during the 2022 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA). After covid, the school implemented more interventions such as targeted small group instruction, hiring interventionists for pull-out support to help students demonstrating a need for tier 2 and tier 3 interventions. Due to more targeted and specialized instruction as well as an increase in progress monitoring using i-Ready has led to an increased identification of students with disabilities. Although the school has increased intervention efforts, students with disabilities continue to perform significantly lower than their peers without disabilities on the new FSAT assessments administered in 2023. Another contributing factor is that all Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) assessments are administered online, which supports the struggles noted during online learning during the pandemic. Although the school has implemented a significant increase in multi-tiered supports to help students close learning gaps that increased during covid, the switch to the online testing platform has presented new challenges for our students, especially our students with disabilities

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

The greatest decline was found in the ESSA subgroup students with disabilities (SWD) in English Language Arts (ELA). Several contributing factors led to the low performance of this subgroup. The Covid Slide is one phenomenon that contributed to low performance. Research has found that students with disabilities were more profoundly affected by the loss of in person instruction than their non-disabled peers. Many students with disabilities, particularly students with specific learning disabilities, who were already performing behind their grade level expectations pre-pandemic fell further behind during online learning. Many of our younger students with disabilities lost out on acquiring foundational skills needed for phonemic awareness, phonics, and fluency mastery. We are finding that this subgroup is now having difficulty in the area reading comprehension due to a lack of foundational skills mastery. After covid, the school implemented more interventions of multi-tiered levels of support to assist students identified as having a learning gap. Due to more progress monitoring has led to an increased identification of students with disabilities. Our data shows that 50% of our students with disabilities in 2021 scored a level 3 or higher but the number decreased to only 38% of our students earning a level 3 or higher during the 2022 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA). Although the school has increased intervention efforts, students with disabilities continue to perform significantly lower than their peers without disabilities on the new FSAT assessments administered in 2023. An additional contributing factor is that all Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) assessments are administered online, which supports the struggles noted during online learning during the pandemic. Although the school has implemented a significant increase in multi-tiered supports to help students close learning gaps that increased during covid, the switch to the online testing platform has presented new challenges for our students, especially our students with disabilities.

Another area of decline is 5th grade science scores. In 2021, 76% of students earned a level 3 or higher on the 5th Grade Science FCAT and only 59% of students earned a level 3 or higher in 2022. The 2023 administration of the 5th grade Science FCAT fell further to only 42% of students earning a level 3 or higher. A contributing factor is the extended time spent on closing gaps in reading and math which has taken away time that was previously spent on science instruction in lower grades. Students entering 5th grade are less prepared with the knowledge of scientific concepts and vocabulary. We have found that 5th grade science instruction must cover previous grade level content in order to teach 5th grade level standards.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Ben Gamla Charter School North Broward is above the state average in all tested areas. Therefore, we are looking at the smallest gap compared to the state average. In English Language Arts (ELA) our overall percentage of students earning a level 3 or higher historically is:

2018 – 80% compared to the state average of 56%
 2019 – 80% compared to the state average of 57%
 2021 – 71% compared to the state average of 53%
 2022 – 74% compared to the state average of 53%
 2023 – 67%

All subgroups were also above the state average. The identified SWD subgroup demonstrated a decline from 50% of SWD earning a level 3 or higher in ELA compared to the state average of 23% in 2021. In 2022, 38% of SWD earned a level 3 or higher compared to the state average of 24%.

In Mathematics our overall percentage of students earning a level 3 or higher historically is:

2018 – 100% compared to the state average of 59%
 2019 – 83% compared to the state average of 59%
 2021 – 67% compared to the state average of 48%
 2022 – 75% compared to the state average of 53%
 2023 – 73%

All subgroups were also above the state average. The identified SWD subgroup did not have enough data to report in 2021, but in 2022 the school's average in this subgroup of proficiency was 38% compared to the state average of 28%.

In Science our overall percentage of students earning a level 3 or higher historically is:

2018 – Not enough data
 2019 – Not enough data
 2021 – 76% compared to the state average of 52%
 2022 – 59% compared to the state average of 53%
 2023 – 42%

Although our overall average is above the state average, the percentage of proficient students in Science is the smallest gap compared to the state average and has the largest decline over time. Drilling down further, 84% of our students identified as economically disadvantaged who scored a level 3 or higher compared to the state average of 41% in 2021 and 54% of economically disadvantaged students earned a level 3 or higher in 2022 compared to a state average of 42%. The English Language Learner (ELL) subgroup was also above the state average in 2021 with 68% earning a level 3 or higher compared to the state average of 31% and in 2022 63% of ELL students earned a level 3 or higher compared to the state average of 32%. There was not enough data in the SWD subgroup to report. A contributing factor is the extended time spent on closing gaps in reading and math which has taken away focus as previously spent on science instruction in lower grades. Students entering 5th grade are less prepared with the knowledge of scientific concepts and vocabulary. We have found that 5th grade science instruction must cover previous grade level content in order to teach 5th grade level standards.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Historically, Ben Gamla students overall have had more students earn a level 3 or higher on Mathematics state assessments than on ELA or Science state assessments except during the covid pandemic year. The historic overall proficiency percentages are:

2018 – 100% compared to 80% in ELA
 2019 – 82% compared to 80% in ELA
 2021 – 67% compared to 71% in ELA and 76% in Science
 2022 – 75% compared to 74% in ELA and 59% in Science
 2023 – 73%

Although the overall proficiency in all subject areas has not reached pre-pandemic percentages, a

significant increase was noticed in math between the years of 2021 and 2022 in contrast to the declines in Science and small growth in ELA. Continued growth was not realized in math between the 2022 and 2023 school year, but we feel this can be attributed to the switch from paper-based state testing to computer-based testing.

Drilling down further, significant increases in math from the 2021 to 2022 school year are noted in several subgroups:

Hispanic students grew from 64% proficient in 2021 to 74% proficient in 2022.

White students grew from 69% proficient in 2021 to 76% proficient in 2022.

Non-economically disadvantaged students grew from 67% proficient in 2021 to 79% proficient in 2022.

English Language Learners grew from 61% proficient in 2021 to 68% proficient in 2022.

Students without disabilities grew from 68% proficient in 2021 to 80% proficient in 2022.

Female students grew from 65% proficient in 2021 to 71% proficient in 2022.

Male students grew from 69% proficient in 2021 to 81% proficient in 2022.

In contrast, our economically disadvantaged students did not demonstrate growth and remained at 65% in both 2021 and 2022.

After the return to in-person instruction, our school hired additional interventionists to provide multi-tiered supports for students demonstrating a need for tier 2 and tier 3 interventions. Increased progress monitoring allowed for the Collaborative Problem Solving Team to determine the needs of these students and adjust supports as needed. The school implemented daily math fluency labs for students demonstrating a need for additional foundational math skills support. Additionally, a school-wide math facts fluency initiative was implemented with daily timed math facts practice in grades 1-5. This initiative included incentives for students mastering basic math fact fluency proficiency. Our teachers utilized small group instruction to implement differentiated and targeted multi-sensory lessons which were missing in the online instruction provided during the pandemic. The use of manipulatives and differentiated small group instruction has led to an increased understanding of math concepts and problem solving skills. Although our math teachers continue to notice a lack of number sense in students affected by the interruption of in-person instruction during the pandemic. With the use of ESSER funds, the school also provided free tutoring to over 100 students. The students receiving free tutoring were identified as students needing additional support based on i-Ready diagnostics data to close learning gaps.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

An area of concern based on the Early Warning Signs data is the increased number of students that earned a level 1 on either the FAST ELA 2023 state assessment or the FAST Math 2023 state assessment or both. The highest number of students earning a level 1 on these assessments were in grade 5. All of these students were able to pass an alternative assessment or met other good cause promotion criteria meaning that they are no longer at our school. The 5th grade data is being reviewed to guide changes in instruction and provide preparation for the new state testing format.

The FAST 2023 school-wide ELA data by grade below shows the number of students earning each achievement level:

3rd Grade

Level 1: 3 students

Level 2: 5 students

Level 3: 14 students

Level 4: 4 students

Level 5: 1 student

4th Grade

Level 1: 4 students

Level 2: 4 students

Level 3: 14 students

Level 4: 11 students

Level 5: 7 students

5th Grade

Level 1: 11 students

Level 2: 10 students

Level 3: 9 students

Level 4: 12 students

Level 5: 4 students

Based on progress monitoring and state testing data, the number of students demonstrating a substantial reading deficiency at the end of the 2022-2023 school year is:

Kindergarten: 3 students

1st grade: 8 students

2nd grade: 2 students

3rd grade: 3 students

4th grade: 4 students

5th grade: 11 students

The FAST 2023 school-wide Math data by grade below shows the number of students earning each achievement level:

3rd Grade

Level 1: 2 students

Level 2: 7 students

Level 3: 16 students

Level 4: 2 students

Level 5: 0 students

4th Grade

Level 1: 5 students

Level 2: 1 student

Level 3: 8 students

Level 4: 16 students

Level 5: 10 students

5th Grade

Level 1: 7 students

Level 2: 9 students

Level 3: 6 students

Level 4: 12 students

Level 5: 12 students

Based on the preliminary 2023 FAST data, online testing practice has been implemented in all grades levels. Additionally, a new math curriculum has been adopted to better support students with the new state testing. The use of adaptive progress monitoring tools such as i-Ready are being continued and online curriculum testing is being used to assist students in becoming more proficient at online testing. Professional Development for teachers is planned to increase the use and understanding of student data to drive instruction and raise student achievement.

Although absenteeism is not a major concern at our school, we do have many families that take their children out for long periods of time for Jewish holidays which interrupts instruction for many of our students during these times.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

Priority #1 is to increase student achievement among our students with disabilities. We have increased our ESE instructional staff to help facilitate students with disabilities. Our ESE teachers use a pull-out/push-in model to support our students with disabilities. Additional before and after school learning labs allow our students with disabilities to seek additional support in addition to their IEP services.

Priority #2 is to decrease testing anxiety among students. We would like to implement initiatives that help prepare students for state testing without the main focus of the school day being on test preparation. We

believe that although a rigorous academic program is important, this balanced with an engaging and fun learning environment will result in better student achievement on state tests.

Priority #3 is to increase science proficiency. To achieve this multi-year goal, all grade levels will teach science standards with fidelity as well as integrate grade level science concepts and vocabulary into ELA blocks. During weekly PLC team meetings, grade level teachers will include science data in the discussions. In previous years, weekly PLC meetings included the analysis of ELA and Math data with the exclusion of science. The data analysis also helps hold teachers accountable to teach science weekly and monitor student progress.

Priority #4 is to increase vocabulary proficiency across all content areas. This will be accomplished through systematic and explicit vocabulary instruction. Additionally, introducing and using content area vocabulary across the curriculum through the use of reading passages containing scientific content and social studies content during ELA instruction will help to build vocabulary proficiency and increase the understanding of content area concepts. Also, the implementation of writing in all subject areas will increase the use and comprehension of content area vocabulary. Our ELL students make up 35% of our school population, making academic vocabulary an important part of our daily instruction to facilitate language acquisition.

Priority #5 is to increase writing proficiency. To accomplish this, we have implemented a school wide (2nd grade through 5th grade) writing structure to increase writing proficiency and development through spiraling standards among grade levels. In addition, typing has been implemented within the school day as the new FAST writing assessment is computer-based.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Area of Focus #1: Ben Gamla Charter School North Broward aims to support our Students with Disabilities (SWD) in improving performance in English Language Arts (ELA). Since our SWD subgroup is our lowest performing subgroup, it is essential that our school improvement goals this year incorporate a targeted focus on the academic progress of the students in this subgroup.

The identified SWD subgroup demonstrated a decline on ELA state assessments from 50% of SWD earning a level 3 or higher in ELA compared to the state average of 23% in 2021. In 2022, 38% of SWD earned a level 3 or higher compared to the state average of 24%.

Due to the effects of the loss of in-person instruction due to the Covid-19 Pandemic, our SWD students demonstrated a significant decline on state assessments. Research has found that students with disabilities were more profoundly affected by the loss of in person instruction than their non-disabled peers. Many students with disabilities, particularly students with specific learning disabilities, who were already performing behind their grade level expectations pre-pandemic fell further behind during online learning. Many of our younger students with disabilities lost out on acquiring foundational skills needed for phonemic awareness, phonics, and fluency mastery. We are finding that this subgroup is now having difficulty in the area reading comprehension due to a lack of foundational skills mastery.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By May 2024 our SWD students will improve ELA proficiency on the FAST PM3 assessment by 5 percentage points.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

To achieve this desired outcome, active monitoring must be a part of our school improvement plan. To properly monitor our SWD students, we need classroom teachers, ESE teachers, and our School Leadership team to consistently communicate and collaborate around interventions and progress. Interventions will be selected and applied with a focus on their strengths, dosage, comprehensiveness, and alignment to the targeted need. To monitor, data collection is crucial. We will collect data on a regular basis to measure student progress. This data will include assessments, observations, work samples, and behavior logs. We will use qualitative and quantitative data to gain a comprehensive understanding of each student's strengths and areas for improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Confer (hconfer@bengamlacharter.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Our evidence-based interventions for this Area of Focus include and are dependent on the needs of the student:

- explicit and systematic instruction (the big 5 - phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension)
- small groups
- cooperative groups
- graphic organizers
- scaffolding
- technology integration

-feedback

-mastery of learning

All interventions will align with each student's IEP goals to provide clear and measurable indicators of progress. Interventions will be implemented by classroom teachers, ESE teachers, and an interventionist.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for using evidence-based strategies with students is grounded in the belief that education should be based on research and data-driven practices to maximize student learning and achievement. The reasons include improved learning outcomes, equity and fairness, and data-driven decision making. Small groups, cooperative groups, graphic organizers, scaffolding, technology integration, and feedback allow for differentiation to meet the specific needs of each student.

Explicit and systematic instruction involves teaching a specific concept or procedure in a highly structured and carefully sequenced manner. This strategy has been shown to be effective across all grade levels and for diverse groups of students, including students with disabilities.

Studies show that Mastery Learning closes the gap between aptitude levels by focusing on instruction to mastery rather than teaching to the standards allowing time for every student succeeds.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Our team will review fall 2023 PM1 data and complete a comparative analysis between the PM3 data from 2023 to the fall 2023 PM1 data.

Person Responsible: Heather Confer (hconfer@bengamlacharter.org)

By When: September 2023

Our team will monitor student progress during weekly grade level PLC data analysis meetings.

Person Responsible: Lindsay Pollack (lpollack@bengamlacharter.org)

By When: This is ongoing weekly throughout the school year.

Convene Collaborative Problem Solving Team meetings to address specific student needs.

Person Responsible: Anamarie Schoonover (aschoonover@bengamlacharter.org)

By When: This is ongoing monthly throughout the school year.

Review and analyze 2023 PM2 data in order to identify students needs and drive instruction. It will be important for student achievement to look for growth and areas needing improvement based on PM1 performance compared to PM2 data.

Person Responsible: Heather Confer (hconfer@bengamlacharter.org)

By When: January 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Area of Focus #3 is to increase science proficiency. To achieve this multi-year goal, all grade levels will teach science standards with fidelity as well as integrate grade level science concepts and vocabulary into ELA blocks.

In 2021, 76% of students earned a level 3 or higher on the 5th Grade Science FCAT and only 59% of students earned a level 3 or higher in 2022. The 2023 administration of the 5th grade Science FCAT fell further to only 42% of students earning a level 3 or higher. A contributing factor is a focus on closing gaps in reading and math resulting in less science instruction in lower grades. Students entering 5th grade are less prepared with the knowledge of scientific concepts and vocabulary.

Although our overall average is above the state average, the percentage of proficient students in Science has the largest decline over time. Drilling down further, 84% of our students identified as economically disadvantaged who scored a level 3 or higher compared to the state average of 41% in 2021 and 54% of economically disadvantaged students earned a level 3 or higher in 2022 compared to a state average of 42%. The English Language Learner (ELL) subgroup was also above the state average in 2021 with 68% earning a level 3 or higher compared to the state average of 31% and in 2022 63% of ELL students earned a level 3 or higher compared to the state average of 32%. There was not enough data in the SWD subgroup to report.

We have found that 5th grade science instruction must cover previous grade level content in order to teach 5th grade level standards.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By May 2024, our 5th grade students will increase performance on the FCAT Science assessment by 5 percentage points.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Professional development to help teachers learn how to integrate science into their ELA block will increase the instruction of scientific concepts and provide opportunity to introduce scientific vocabulary. Building upon standards beginning in Kindergarten by integrating science into the reading block will better prepare students for 5th grade science content. During weekly PLC team meetings, grade level teachers will include science data in the discussions. In previous years, weekly PLC meetings included the analysis of ELA and Math data with the exclusion of science. The data analysis also helps hold teachers accountable to teach science weekly and monitor student progress. Additionally, Ben Gamla Charter School will administer the Broward Science Assessment in January to better identify weaknesses and strengths of 5th grade students. This will help our 5th grade science teacher to use assessment data to drive her instruction and planning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Confer (hconfer@bengamlacharter.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Our evidence-based interventions for this Area of Focus include and are dependent on the needs of the student. We will implement explicit and systematic instruction, small groups to provide differentiated instruction, and utilize cooperative groups. During whole and small group instruction, teachers will use strategies such as graphic organizers, scaffolding, immediate feedback, and the integration of technology.

The ideology of mastery of learning will also assist teachers in planning and delivery to help students better grasp concepts.

The use of evidence-based interventions such as the ones mentioned have proven to increase student understanding of scientific concepts. By using these strategies with fidelity we will be able to help students increase their proficiency on the FCAT Science state assessment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for using evidence-based strategies with students is grounded in the belief that education should be based on research and data-driven practices to maximize student learning and achievement. The reasons include improved learning outcomes, equity and fairness, and data-driven decision making. Small groups, cooperative groups, graphic organizers, scaffolding, technology integration, and feedback allow for differentiation to meet the specific needs of each student.

Explicit and systematic instruction involves teaching a specific concept or procedure in a highly structured and carefully sequenced manner. This strategy has been shown to be effective across all grade levels and for diverse groups of students, including students with disabilities.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Area of Focus #2 is to increase student independence and self-advocacy while decreasing testing anxiety among students. We would like to implement initiatives that will help increase problem solving skills among students. We believe that students who have autonomy over their own education are more successful in school and have a more positive outlook on education.

During weekly PLC meetings students indicate frequently that students give up quickly and do not seem to know how to persevere when faced with a difficult task. During parent conferences, a frequent conversation is encouraging parents to allow their children to struggle while supporting from afar. Additionally students struggle to follow multi-step written and oral directions. Students quickly ask for assistance before trying to solve problems or gain understanding on their own. We feel this stems from the same issue of parents over supporting their children.

We would like to implement initiatives that help prepare students for state testing without the main focus of the school day being on test preparation. We believe that although a rigorous academic program is important, this balanced with an engaging and fun learning environment will result in better student achievement on state tests. Helping our students become independent learners will build confidence, problem-solving skills, and perseverance.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By May 2024, Ben Gamla will implement incentive driven initiatives that will help to equip students with healthy strategies that will help them build problem solving skills evidenced by a decrease of 2 percentage points in discipline referrals.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

During weekly grade PLCs, emotional and behavioral patterns among students will be monitored. Part of our PLC is and monthly Collaborative Problem Solving Team meetings is evaluating the emotional health of students. The team discusses signs of anxiety, low motivation, and/or acting out. These signs of distress about school are then monitored and if the behaviors do not improve, a behavior plan is implemented to build motivation, reduce anxiety, and decrease disruptive behavior. As part of our Leader in Me adoption, we have implemented student leadership groups. Teachers heading these initiatives will monitor the independence and initiative of students through observation and conferencing.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lindsay Pollack (lpollack@bengamlacharter.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The school uses Move this World and Leader in Me as social emotional evidence based resources. Within these evidence-based programs that are implemented in the classrooms daily, strategies are taught that help students handle stress and anxiety related to various topics including testing. Our initiative to build independence and help students have ownership of their education will increase problem solving skills. According to the American Psychological Association, "Metacognition is thus a key area of research because it shows that if students learn how to control their thinking they become more autonomous and self-regulated learners."

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Leader in Me helps students learn how to become self-reliant, take initiative, plan ahead, set and track goals, do their homework, prioritize their time, manage their emotions, be considerate of others, express their viewpoint persuasively, resolve conflicts, find creative solutions, value differences, and live a balanced life. The process helps students develop the skills and self-confidence they need to lead their lives and succeed in school and beyond.

Move This World's programs not only provide a solid foundation for students to successfully set, pursue, and achieve lifelong goals, but they also create a healthy environment where students strengthen their interpersonal skills, cultivate a growth mindset, and foster the development of self-management techniques.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

School Advisory Council members gather to discuss the school's academic plan and progress. The members discuss the development of a School Improvement Plan which includes goals and objectives established from information gained in a needs assessment. The purpose of the School Improvement Plan is to increase student achievement and performance. The School Advisory Council assists the principal with recommendations and input throughout the year continually assessing needs and progress as the school pursues the accomplishment of the goals set forth in the School Improvement Plan.

The school's governing board meets four times per year and reviews the school's funding allocation and reviews the use of funding allocations to ensure the resources purchased are in line with the school's vision, mission, and school improvement goals.

Ben Gamla Charter School North Broward was able to use ESSER funds to purchase software programs that help teachers reinforce scientific skills. Programs purchased were Generation Genius, Brain Pop, and IXL as supplements for Science instruction and practice. Generation Genius is a K-8 teaching resource that brings school science standards to life through fun and educational videos paired with lesson plans, activities, quizzes, reading material and more. Videos are produced in partnership with the National Science Teaching Association, and aligned to state standards. BrainPOP Science complements our core science curriculum to bring multi-dimensional science concepts to students. Independent review has verified that IXL meets the ESSA Tier 2 and WWC with evidence-based efficacy. IXL is based on best practices from learning science research.

Additionally, funds were used to purchase i-Ready to increase proficiency in Reading and Math. This program allows teachers to assign specific skills and levels of difficulty. This is important for our students with disabilities to ensure they are receiving instruction that is on their level.

Also purchased were student laptops to increase our technology inventory to a 1:1 student ratio. This allows

teachers to utilize supplemental and core curriculum programs within the classroom. The use of technology also allows for differentiation as the teacher is able to assign individualized assignments within each program. The daily use of computers will increase our students' computer literacy to better prepare them for state computer-based testing.

Nothing replaces face to face instruction and the additional hiring of a second ESE teacher and a part time interventionist will support our teachers in providing differentiated instruction and targeted explicit and systematic instruction for students with disabilities and those demonstrating a need for tiered support. Our ESE teachers support students in the classroom as well as out of the classroom in small groups. Our interventionist assists by working with students individually or in groups of 2-3 students for tier 3 support.

Leader in Me and Move this World were also purchased with ESSER funds to enhance social and emotional learning. The integration of these programs into our school's culture, we believe, will greatly increase autonomous learning, reduce anxiety, and increase motivation. In order help monitor and implement the ideology of these programs, the school has hired a full-time school counselor.