Palm Bay Academy Charter School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Palm Bay Academy Charter School

2112 PALM BAY RD NE, Palm Bay, FL 32905

http://www.palmbayacademy.org

Demographics

Principal: Madhu Longani A

Start Date for this Principal: 9/28/2020

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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.](http://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

Palm Bay Academy is dedicated to serving the needs of its students by providing an opportunity for an enriched academic environment and to serve each student with excellence as the standard.

Provide the school's vision statement

Palm Bay Academy's vision is to continue its role as a pioneer in education by establishing community partnerships to enhance its resources so as to inspire and stimulate intellectual growth of its students.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Allred, Michelle	Other	Mrs. Allred is the Title 1 Coordinator for PBA. Her responsibilites include small group instruction with our lowest 25% groups as well as all facets of the Title 1 program 1) Parent Engagement 2) Inventory 2) Data collection and analysis.
Longani, Madhu	Principal	Serves as the Director of all campuses. Oversees the overall operations of the school and has the command responsibility over the students' population, school personnel and staff and physical facility. Serves as the instructional leader at both campuses. She is actively engaged in daily operations and decision-making process of Palm Bay Academy particularly overseeing academic instruction and delivery. Using current data from edmentum to drive instruction and implement a strategic plan to improve academic outcomes.
Kinsel, Marilyn	Other	Mrs. Kinsel's is responsible for the daily operations at the school such as staffing, scheduling, student discipline, as well as completion of required documents and reports that are necessary.
Gilchrist, Christina	Instructional Coach	Ms. Gilchrist is the Reading/ELA Coach for PBA. Her responsibilities include coordinating content area curriculum, maintaining PBA's digital platforms for progress monitoring, collecting and analyzing the schools reading and writing data, and gifted and talented education teacher for both the elementary and middle school campuses.
Lackey, Erica	Instructional Coach	Ms. Lackey is the Technology and Math Coach for PBA. Her responsibilities as math coach is to support best practices in using data, provide analysis of grade level trends in instruction, and make recommendations about potential next steps to address areas of need. Together with grade level teams Ms. Lackey supports teachers in the design of units and lessons for the development of their yearlong curriculum while analyzing data in order to modify curriculum and forms of assessment to meet students' needs,
Pearce, Tara	Teacher, K-12	
Orellana, Kristina	Other	MTSS Coordinator - Facilitator/teacher of academic intervention groups and Individual Problem Solving Team composed of district and school staff and families; evaluator of student and family needs and link to services, mental health and behavior intervention coordinator.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 9/28/2020, Madhu Longani A

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

28

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims

Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here]().	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	46	45	38	45	31	35	34	34	37	0	0	0	0	345
Attendance below 90 percent	9	9	14	7	3	3	11	4	16	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	2	1	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	3	10	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	8	18	9	8	0	0	0	0	46

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	3	3	4	1	1	1	5	4	10	0	0	0	0	32

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 9/29/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	63	54	54	54	46	45	33	47	36	0	0	0	0	432
Attendance below 90 percent	4	3	4	6	1	3	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	29
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	2	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	12	25	12	17	11	0	0	0	0	80

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	4	3	2	7	4	0	0	0	0	22

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	2	3	3	3	2	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	14

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	63	54	54	54	46	45	33	47	36	0	0	0	0	432
Attendance below 90 percent	4	3	4	6	1	3	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	29
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	2	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	12	25	12	17	11	0	0	0	0	80

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	4	3	2	7	4	0	0	0	0	22

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	2	3	3	3	2	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	14

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	42%	65%	61%	48%	68%	60%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	58%	59%	49%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	54%	54%	44%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	36%	67%	62%	51%	67%	61%
Math Learning Gains	41%	62%	59%	59%	61%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	59%	52%	53%	56%	52%
Science Achievement	32%	62%	56%	48%	63%	57%
Social Studies Achievement	43%	80%	78%	63%	81%	77%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	55%	64%	-9%	58%	-3%
	2018	48%	63%	-15%	57%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	31%	61%	-30%	58%	-27%
	2018	38%	57%	-19%	56%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				
05	2019	43%	60%	-17%	56%	-13%
	2018	42%	54%	-12%	55%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
Cohort Comparison		5%				
06	2019	36%	60%	-24%	54%	-18%
	2018	61%	63%	-2%	52%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-25%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
07	2019	40%	58%	-18%	52%	-12%
	2018	32%	56%	-24%	51%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-21%				
08	2019	50%	63%	-13%	56%	-6%
	2018	65%	65%	0%	58%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	37%	61%	-24%	62%	-25%
	2018	47%	62%	-15%	62%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	21%	64%	-43%	64%	-43%
	2018	21%	59%	-38%	62%	-41%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-26%				
05	2019	32%	60%	-28%	60%	-28%
	2018	56%	58%	-2%	61%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-24%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
06	2019	40%	67%	-27%	55%	-15%
	2018	52%	68%	-16%	52%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				
07	2019	33%	62%	-29%	54%	-21%
	2018	58%	62%	-4%	54%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-25%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				
08	2019	39%	43%	-4%	46%	-7%
	2018	72%	41%	31%	45%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-33%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	29%	56%	-27%	53%	-24%
	2018	40%	57%	-17%	55%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	36%	53%	-17%	48%	-12%
	2018	50%	55%	-5%	50%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	49%	74%	-25%	71%	-22%
2018	62%	73%	-11%	71%	-9%
Compare		-13%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	76%	61%	15%	61%	15%
2018	93%	62%	31%	62%	31%
Compare		-17%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	16	33	41	17	48	47	11				
ELL	34	44		30	43		20				
BLK	29	47	44	23	36	43	23	24			
HSP	47	54		35	46		25				
MUL	59	53		44	29						
WHT	59	66	70	58	52		47	91			
FRL	42	53	51	36	41	48	32	45	55		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	19	36	47	9	33	35	20	45			
ELL	32	53	60	45	65						
BLK	39	42	37	40	55	59	39	48	33		
HSP	57	57		54	57		67				
MUL	33	47		57	56						
WHT	59	55		64	65	20	54	75	43		
FRL	48	49	44	51	59	53	48	63	41		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	458
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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	34
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	43
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	46
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
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	63
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	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant 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 data component that showed the lowest performance was Science. This is a direct correlation to the limited use of the provided curriculum, lack of commitment to the subject until the student reaches the grade that the state assesses, and limited spiral review of previously taught concepts.

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

The data component that shows the greatest decline from the prior year is Social Studies. This is a result of Social Studies being the last priority subject and is often sacrificed to address greater needs in student data.

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

The component that shows the greatest gap when compared to the state average is Social Studies. This is a result of Social Studies being the last priority and is often sacrificed to accommodate the needs of Reading, Language Arts, and Math.

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

The data component with the most improvement is the lowest 25% in ELA. This is a direct reflection of the work and resources dedicated to working with the lowest 25% and an overall school focus on ELA. We were highly focused on our professional development in writing, supporting teachers in ELA instruction through modeling and planning, and the inclusion of a school-wide goal to improve ELA performance.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Our major areas of concern for this year are the areas of students with attendance below 90% and state assessment scores in the subject area of Math.

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

1. Increased student performance in the area of Math
2. Improve student attendance in the times of e-learning
3. Improve student performance in Science
4. Improve student performance in Social Studies
5. Improve the overall mental health of students and staff

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on our assessment scores and coach observations, attention needs to be given to the ELA/Writing blocks. The focus will be on the structure of the 90-minute reading block and the additional 30-45 minute writing block. There needs to be more standards-based instruction provided during these times of the day. All too often the teachers are witnessed simply teaching to a theme or a genre versus specific standards and skills. This impacts student learning because there is a lack of focus and purpose for learning during this dedicated reading/writing time and no real learning gaps are being addressed.
Measureable Outcome:	PBA will monitor reading progress through a variety of assessments and observations. We will monitor quarterly assessment data collected via the Exact Path platform. There will also be a monthly assessment piece. In grades, K-2 students will be focusing on improving their High-Frequency Word knowledge and grades 3-5 will be focused on improving their words correct per minute on the Dibels Oral Reading Fluency. A baseline will be collected in August and progress will be tracked each month. Goal is to see 5% increase in learning gains for the lowest 25% student population.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christina Gilchrist (cgilchrist@palmbayacademy.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will be implementing a structured ELA/Writing block where teachers are required to address the five pillars of literacy. During the 90-minute reading block, teachers will address comprehension, fluency, word study, grammar, and phonics/phonemic awareness. Each segment of the reading block will have a focus lesson to not only provide direct-instruction but also provide an opportunity for engagement and setting the purpose for learning. During the dedicated writing block, teachers will utilize the I do, we do, you do methodology to provide instruction, guidance, and practice of the complete writing process.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The segmented balance literacy focus during the 90-minute reading block was chosen because of our work with Columbia University's Teacher College and the research conducted using Jahn Hattie's Visible Learning. The strategies are proven to not only be effective but also are high-yield learning strategies (classroom management and quality of teaching are both high-yield strategies with an effect size of 0.40+).

Action Steps to Implement

Specific pacing guides with unit plans completed up to the day-by-day portion of the plan.

Person Responsible	Christina Gilchrist (cgilchrist@palmbayacademy.org)

Model and observe effective teaching practices during the reading and writing block.

Person Responsible	Christina Gilchrist (cgilchrist@palmbayacademy.org)

Track monthly high-frequency word/DORF data

Person Responsible	Christina Gilchrist (cgilchrist@palmbayacademy.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on PBA assessment data and observations, math is a major area of focus for this school year. The focus will be put into the delivery of instruction based on targeted concepts, skills and student engagement. Throughout the math block, more direct and targeted instruction needs to be provided that correlates directly to the MAFS. It has been observed that students are behind in both conceptual and procedural knowledge of grade level math concepts and skills.
Measureable Outcome:	PBA will monitor math progress both through observations and assessments throughout the year. We will be collecting data quarterly from the Exact Path platform. Monthly, teachers will also be assessing and monitoring students fact fluency by administering the Mad Minute. A baseline assessment will be given in August and data will be collected and tracked monthly. Goal: 5% increase in learning gains for the lowest 25% student population.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Erica Lackey (elackey@palmbayacademy.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Grade level teams will meet weekly to plan and reflect on quality instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The math workshop focus was chosen because of the extensive successful research that has been completed that supports the I do, we do, you do methodology to provide instruction, guidance and practice while mastering concepts and skills. Math workshop also allows students independence while also allowing time for teachers to remediate students that need further instruction and practice. The strategies which we have given as a choice for teams are proven to be effective and successful.

Action Steps to Implement

Planned and focused pacing guides aligned with the MAFS with embedded unit plans to include day by day lessons which are designed by collaborating grade level members with strategies and resources

Person Responsible	Erica Lackey (elackey@palmbayacademy.org)

Grade level teams will meet weekly to plan and reflect on quality instruction and strategies

Person Responsible	Erica Lackey (elackey@palmbayacademy.org)

Each team will choose a section of math workshop to implement and reflect on throughout the year (number routines, focus lessons, stations, reflection, problem strategy, tasks).

Person Responsible	Erica Lackey (elackey@palmbayacademy.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Social Studies scores have had a significant drop over the last few years. This is most likely due to the lack of attention paid to the content because it is not a test subject until middle school. This impacts students because they do not get the civic and historical knowledge needed to be a well-informed contributor to society. By ignoring or sacrificing this content area we are losing a critical opportunity for developing well-rounded members of society and an opportunity to develop good research and writing skills.
Measureable Outcome:	We will measure growth in Social Studies by implementing short content-area research, directly-teaching skills involved and tracking the progress made on Document-Based Questions. Each grade level will be responsible for completing at least 4 document-based questions a year and each time students' responses will improve. Goal: To see a 5% increase in learning gains for the lowest 25%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christina Gilchrist (cgilchrist@palmbayacademy.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will work with Columbia University Teaching College to provide professional development and follow through with expectations that result in quality teaching of document-based questions. Students will use their reading skills to understand and interpret the information provided by a variety of media sources. They will then use this information to answer a document-based question providing reasons and supports that stem from the text.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When students complete document-based writing assignments they are utilizing all the Language Arts Florida Standards. We selected this strategy because of the low performance in both social studies and writing.

Action Steps to Implement

Work with Columbia University to develop a professional development series that teaches educators how to walk students through the document-based questions process and offer best practices suggestions.

Person Responsible	Christina Gilchrist (cgilchrist@palmbayacademy.org)

Provide quarterly document-based question practices and follow through with observations of lessons.

Person Responsible	Christina Gilchrist (cgilchrist@palmbayacademy.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

To address the area of attendance, we are contacting families of students experiencing high absenteeism to see what other supports we can provide to ensure that their children are present at school whether face-to-face or e-learner.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Palm Bay Academy (PBA) has put forth an incredible effort to reach out to our families and bring them into the school. Last year, attendance at our school events more than doubled from previous years due to a strong focus on family engagement and staff dedication to our families. PBA included students in performances at every event which drew families and stakeholders to the school who then discovered that our family engagement events were meaningful and worthwhile. The Covid-19 pandemic has been a challenge for keeping school involvement growing but it is a challenge that we are learning to overcome with great success. Our virtual events are modeled after our in-person events and include the students as the stars of the show leading families to click the link and watch their children fully engaged in their school environment. While the parents are discovering their student's school virtually, they are exposed to a plethora of learning activities designed to help them practice the skills needed to become better at home teachers for their child. Parents will also find a link to well-designed exit slips specific to issues that may need to be addressed at the school. We are asking for parents to give PBA their honest and true opinions about things that we could do to improve the school. We have also increased the number of surveys that we have distributed to families with the purchase of Survey Monkey. PBA used Survey Monkey to create the Annual Survey and we will continue to use it throughout the year as a tool to ask all stakeholders specific questions designed to gather information for improvement. The addition of the Parent Panther Leaders (PPL) group/class has been beneficial to the school culture. PPL is designed to help parents learn the Seven Habits of the Leader in Me program which is vital to our school culture. The parents who attend the PPL class are a strong group of parents who have been successfully charged with inviting other friends and families from the school to join them for each event. Although we have become technologically savvy in our adjustment to Covid-19 and the demands of today's society, we still ensure that all parents receive a paper copy if needed and all information is properly translated to Spanish and Haitian Creole, regardless of the format of delivery.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget						
1	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**				**$6,500.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	590-Other Materials and Supplies	6501 - Palm Bay Academy Charter School	Title II		$6,500.00
			Notes: Center for Professional Education for Teachers. Columbia University Teachers College. The Center for Professional Education of Teachers (CPET) at Teachers College, Columbia University is a professional development organization that supports schools and educational organizations towards transformative and sustainable change. Palm Bay Academy serves students in Kindergarten through 8th Grade. Though teachers have received professional development in literacy in the past, the transient population of students, combined with the academic needs of emerging and advancing English Language Learners—students need even more attention and support in Literacy. From grammar and conventions to focus and organization, the school data shows that students are struggling with writing. Furthermore, the data shows that students are struggling with document or text-based questions in the area of social studies. Literacy is the key to unlocking content knowledge and skills across all disciplines and therefore is a specific area of focus for professional development! During the 2020-21 CPET will continue their partnership with Palm Bay to design highly customized online professional development to advance teacher practice as it relates to literacy instruction. PROJECT GOALS The CPET coach(es) will... 1. Design and facilitate an asynchronous course aimed at supporting teachers with literacy instruction. This course will include: Three modules, each of which consists of 4-5 instructional videos, helpful resources, a discussion board and a related assignment. 2. Provide online, synchronous support for individual/teams of teachers when it comes to implementing the strategies and practices explored in the course, making connections and engaging in critical reflection.				
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**				**$0.00**
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$6,500.00**