Process*: Leman Academy of Excellence’s Strategic Planning has been carried out collaboratively with input from representative stakeholders through the* [*Unified Improvement Plan (UIP)*](https://www.cde.state.co.us/schoolview/frameworks/official/0900/5225) *process. Contributors to this Strategic Plan through the UIP process include teachers (who served on the Data and UIP Committee), grade level team shepherds, the School Accountability Committee (SAC), Interventionists and Instructional Coaches, the LCS Board, both vice principals, and the principal.*

**Strategic Planning Goals**

1. Retention
   1. At least 80% of students will re-enroll each school year.
   2. At least 80% of well-performing teachers will renew their teaching agreement each school year.
2. Financial
   1. The school will operate within a small financial margin each school year with the goal of setting at least $1,000,000 (one million dollars) in reserves within the first 5 (five) years.
   2. Staff salaries will remain competitive with the school’s comparable market.
3. Legal
   1. The school will remain 100% compliant with the authorizer’s reporting timeline (DCSD’s charter.tools).
   2. The school will be found legally above reproach in all matters pursuant to state and federal education laws.
4. Academic
   1. At least 70% of scholars will perform at or above grade level in math as measured by MAP and CMAS (3-8 grade).
   2. At least 70% of scholars will perform at or above grade level in literacy as measured by DIBELS (K-2) grade) and CMAS (3-8 grade).

**Summary of Academic Data**

The LAE results for 2019 in achievement and growth per the CMAS examination exemplify strong comparable data that is higher than the average scores of surrounding neighborhood schools. Math is showing exceptional results in both achievement and growth. LEA not only exceeds the average score benchmark as compared to the surrounding schools, LEA also outperformed every school in performance for all students and minority students for both academic achievement and growth in 2019. These are validations we expect and support the evidence in defining LAE as a high performing school.

The 2021 results were significantly impacted by COVID at LAE. Thus, the State understands the randomness of these results and pauses the benchmarks as not being valid and reliable measurements.

Monitoring growth gaps from a second source of academic evidence beyond an annual summative assessment or local formative and summative assessments using the application of the NWEA MAP Growth instrument. MAP Growth is the most trusted and innovative assessment for measuring achievement and growth in K–12 math and reading. It provides teachers with accurate, and actionable evidence to help target instruction for each student or groups of students regardless of how far above or below they are from their grade level.

The data in the tables 13 and 14 show the progress from one year to the next as well as progress overtime with grade-level cohorts. Due to COVID the spring assessment was not implemented in two of the years, but the three interval of annual assessments allows our staff to continue to monitor growth progress without the spring assessment and use this data for each classroom and each student with targeted personal growth goals.

It is a testimony to the school staff and method of teaching the results show in every category measured from the 2020 Means Norming LAE equaled at one and exceeded those norms at every other grade.

**Table 13**

*MAP Historical Data in Math Achievement*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Math Growth** | **2018-2019** | | **2019-2020** | | **2020-2021** | | **2020 National** | **2021-2022** | |
|  | *Fall* | *Spring* | *Fall* | *Winter* | *Fall* | *Winter* | *Mean* | *Fall* | *Winter* |
| **Grade 2** | 183.5 | 195.1 | 178.5 | 190.8 | 179.3 | 187.1 | 184.1 | 181.4 | 188.2 |
| **Grade 3** | 192.4 | 205.4 | 192.8 | 204.5 | 189.5 | 201.1 | 196.2 | 188.9 | 198.2 |
| **Grade 4** | 206.9 | 216.6 | 202.6 | 212.5 | 204.2 | 209.9 | 206.1 | 203.9 | 210.2 |
| **Grade 5** | 214.3 | 224.8 | 215.7 | 219.0 | 208.2 | 215.6 | 214.7 | 212.1 | 216.3 |
| **Grade 6** | 224.8 | 229.4 | 219.3 | 223.7 | 214.0 | 219.4 | 219.6 | 217.3 | 223.2 |
| **Grade 7** | 229.4 | 230.9 | 229.4 | 232.6 | 220.5 | 224.5 | 224.0 | 223.2 | 227.8 |
| **Grade 8** | 228.3 | 233.0 | 231.5 | 238.5 | 233.4 | 236.0 | 228.1 | 228.5 | 231.7 |

*\*The color code alignment shows a common grade level cohort going through the school over the period of time the cohort has existed in LAE. The representation shows continuous progress for cohort groups*

**Table 14**

*Map Historical Data in Reading Achievement*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Reading Growth** | **2018-2019** | | **2019-2020** | | **2020-2021** | | | **2020**  **National** | **2021-2022** | |
|  | *Fall* | *Spring* | *Fall* | *Winter* | | *Fall* | *Winter* | *Mean* | *Fall* | *Winter* |
| **Grade 2** | 183.1 | 192.6 | 176.2 | 188.1 | | 178.3 | 185.6 | 181.2 | 181.1 | 188.8 |
| **Grade 3** | 188.7 | 199.5 | 193.6 | 202.3 | | 188.8 | 197.0 | 193.9 | 189.4 | 194.9 |
| **Grade 4** | 203.6 | 208.9 | 199.2 | 206.6 | | 202.4 | 205.6 | 202.5 | 200.8 | 206.0 |
| **Grade 5** | 211.9 | 213.4 | 211.1 | 215.3 | | 204.2 | 210.8 | 209.1 | 209.8 | 211.7 |
| **Grade 6** | 219.6 | 221.1 | 216.8 | 219.6 | | 212.8 | 217.0 | 213.8 | 212.1 | 215.5 |
| **Grade 7** | 220.8 | 220.1 | 222.3 | 225.7 | | 220.1 | 221.1 | 217.1 | 219.0 | 221.7 |
| **Grade 8** | 218.5 | 223.1 | 223.1 | 224.1 | | 227.1 | 227.4 | 220.52 | 223.5 | 224.4 |

**Table 15**

*2020-2021 DIBELS Data*

The percentages in the table below reflect the percentage of students who are at grade level. Dibbles measures the progress from beginning of the year to the end of the year with the number of students who reach grade level proficiency in each classroom. The results of the data show outstanding progress in each grade level with an average of 14% increase in KG; 30% in grade 1; and 15% in grade 2. The reading growth in primary education in LAE is exciting to see the number of scholars reading at or above grade level and the consistency of progress among teachers in the school. This is a testimony to the reading program, pedagogy and professional development at LAE.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Teachers KG** | **Beginning of the Year** | **End of the Year** |
| 1 | 95% | 100% |
| 2 | 79% | 88% |
| 3 | 77% | 100% |
| 4 | 89% | 96% |
| 5 | 59% | 85% |
| **Teachers Grade 1** | | |
| 1 | 61% | 92% |
| 2 | 55% | 100% |
| 3 | 72% | 91% |
| 4 | 52% | 75% |
| 5 | 58% | 88% |
| **Teachers Grade 2** | | |
| 1 | 67% | 64% |
| 2 | 63% | 82% |
| 3 | 58% | n/a |
| 4 | 67% | 86% |

**Academic Strategic Plan**

1. Academic Root Cause Analysis
   1. Data-informed differentiation of math and ELA instruction
2. Academic Action Plan
   1. Teachers will receive focused In-service Training to analyze the data[[1]](#footnote-1)
   2. Teachers will be provided with time dedicated for guided Data Dives.[[2]](#footnote-2)
   3. Teachers will provide students with small group intervention to reteach or re-mediate math and ELA skills each week of the school year before and after normal school hours of operations.[[3]](#footnote-3)
   4. Teachers will provide students with small group intervention to reteach or re-mediate math skills each week of the school year before and after normal school hours of operations.[[4]](#footnote-4)
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