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**Second Semester 18 Week Report- January 2022 through June 2022**

**Due to the ongoing worldwide Covid-19 Pandemic, DeKalb Preparatory Academy continues to operate with the interest of safety and security for the students, parents, staff, and stakeholders for the First Semester. Google Classroom remains our primary platform for instructional delivery. Each student in grades K-8, was provided a one-to-one device to ensure access to daily instruction. The K-5 and 6-8 AVC teachers continued to provide AVC instruction during specials and connections. Because each scholar was issued an electronic device, homeroom and AVC teachers were able to fully implement PBL/AVC.**

**The leadership team and Governing Board monitored the community transmission of the virus on a monthly basis. Once the community spread and positivity rate fell within the moderate levels, a decision was made to return to full-time in-person instruction. However, parents were given the opportunity to choose for their students to remain virtual or come to school for in-person instruction beginning August 2021. Eighty percent of our parents (441) decided that their students would return for in-person instruction. The remaining twenty percent of parents (109) chose for their students to remain virtual.**

**All students were required to return to Face to Face instruction on February 7, 2022. DeKalb Preparatory Academy continued to implement the CDC guidelines/recommendations to ensure that all students and staff remained safe and healthy.**

**THE AUDIO VIDEO COMMUNICATION PROGRAM**

**AUDIO VIDEO COMMUNICATION PROGRAM INFORMATION**

**Goal Statement:** The Dekalb Preparatory Academy board will conduct a program evaluation of the Audio-video Communications (AVC) program each 18 weeks to ensure that the program is fully implemented within budget, that students are engaged and performing academically as a result of the AVC program and that faculty and students will report high levels of satisfaction with the AVC experience.

**Audio-Video Communication Program Information**

The curriculum is centered on Project Based Learning (PBL) with the infusion of Audio Video Communications (AVC) and a technological emphasis. PBL instructional strategies produce positive learning outcomes and increased academic achievement for African American and/or low-income students, which constitutes the majority of the DPA student body. The implementation of PBL challenges students to think critically, read and write across the curriculum, solve real-world problems, answer complex questions, and take an active role in their learning, classrooms, and communities.

The implementation of the AVC curriculum promotes reading across the curriculum. The standards’ content develops both academic and personal interests in students. As students read, they develop both content and contextual vocabulary. They also build good habits for reading, researching, and learning. The Reading Across the Curriculum standard focuses on the academic and personal skills students acquire as they read in all areas of learning.

In addition, Audio Video Communication promotes writing across the curriculum. Students are required to write clear, coherent text. The writing shows consideration of the audience and purpose. The student progresses through the stages of the writing process (e.g., prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing successive versions). Thus, the Audio Video Communication curriculum requires students to utilize the rules of Standard English.

Lastly, Audio Video Communication strengthens our students to become better mathematicians by developing critical thinkers to solve real-world problems. Specifically, students will learn how productivity, economic growth and future standards of living are influenced by investment in factories, machinery, new technology and the health, education and training of people, thus enhancing mathematical skills.

| **Indicator** | **Outcome Measurement Tool** | **DPA GMAS Targets** | | | | | **Goals** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Academic Achievement | CCRPI | Core Content | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |  |
| **ELA** | 73.5 | 76.8 | 80.1 | 80.1 | -By June 2019, 74% of students in grades 3-8 will be able to score proficient or above on the GMAS in ELA |
| -By June 2020, 77% of students in grades 3-8 will be able to score proficient or above on the GMAS in ELA |
| -By June 2022, 80% of students in grades 3-8 will be able to score proficient or above on the GMAS in ELA |
| Academic Achievement | CCRPI | **Math** | 75.8 | 78.8 | 81.8 | 81.8 | -By June 2019, 76% of students in grades 3-8 will be able to score proficient or above on the GMAS in Math |
| -By June 2020, 79% of students in grades 3-8 will be able to score proficient or above on the GMAS in Math |
| -By June 2022, 82% of students in grades 3-8 will be able to score proficient or above on the GMAS in Math |
| Academic Achievement | CCRPI | Science | 71.8 | 75.4 | 79.0 | 79.0 | -By June 2019, 72% of students in grades 3-8 will be able to score proficient or above on the GMAS in Science |
| - By June 2020 76% of students in grades 3-8 will be able to score proficient or above on the GMAS in Science |
| -By June 2022, 79% of students in grades 5 and 8 will be able to score proficient or above on the GMAS in Science |
| CCRPI | Social Studies | 73.3 | 76.7 | 80.1 | 80.1 | -By June 2019, 74% of students in grades 3-8 will be able to score proficient or above on the GMAS in Social Studies |
| - By June 2020, 77% of students in grades 3-8 will be able to score proficient or above on the GMAS in Social Studies. |
| - By June 2022 80% of students in grade 8 will be able to score proficient or above on the GMAS in Social Studies |

Due to the continuous interruptions of the global pandemic, based upon preliminary, unreleased data, DeKalb Preparatory Academy did not obtain its projected goals in the core academic areas on the 2022 Georgia Milestones Assessment System.

2019 Grade Level Performance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | English/ Language Arts | | | Mathematics | | | Science | | | Social Studies | | |
|  | DPA | DCSD | STATE | DPA | DCSD | STATE | DPA | DCSD | STATE | DPA | DCSD | STATE |
| 3rd | 77% | 61% | 71% | 86% | 72% | 82% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th | 49% | 65% | 75% | 61% | 70% | 82% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5th | 72% | 68% | 76% | 60% | 64% | 76% | 53% | 60% | 70% | 54% | 66% | 78% |
| 6th | 72% | 63% | 74% | 67% | 63% | 78% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7th | 70% | 59% | 72% | 74% | 64% | 78% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8th | 80% | 73% | 80% | 62% | 63% | 73% | 57% | 54% | 62% | 60% | 76% | 78% |
| AVG | 70% |  |  | 68% |  |  | 55% |  |  | 57% |  |  |

2019 CCRPI DATA COMPARISON

* Audio Video Communication allowed our students to process skills across all disciplinary domains, extending even to the area of personal learning. Although we did not meet our highly-projected goals for 2019 for students in grades 3-8th of 74% in English Language Arts, 76% in Mathematics, 72% in Science, and 74% in Science, the MAP data in the next section of this report will show gains in student growth.
* We outperformed Dekalb County Schools in the area of English/ Language Arts in the following grades: 3rd, 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th.
* We outperformed Dekalb County Schools in the area of Mathematics in the following grades: 3rd, 6th, and 7th.
* We outperformed Dekalb County Schools in the area of Science in 8th Grade.
* We outperformed the State of Georgia in 3rd Grade English/Language Arts and Mathematics.
* We met the State of Georgia in the 8th Grade English/Language Arts
* Overall CCRPI performance increased from 59.4% to 69.2% which was a 9.8% increase.
* Elementary School CCRPI score increased from 57.5% to 67% which was an 8.2% increase.
* Middle School CCRPI score increased from 64.1% to 73.9% which was a 9.8% increase.
* CCRPI Content Mastery increased in Elementary School from 46.8% to 47% which was a +.2% increase and increased in Middle School from 44.8% to 48.8% which was a 4% increase.
* CCRPI Progress increased in Elementary School from 69.2% to 77.9% which was an 8.2% increase and increased in Middle School from 79.9% to 83.9% which was a 4% increase.
* CCRPI Closing the Gaps increased in Elementary School from 29.2% to 67.9% which was a 38.7% increase and increased in Middle School from 45.8% to 89.3% which was a 43.5% increase.
* CCRPI Readiness increased in Elementary School from 74.1% to 77% which was a 2.9% increase and increased in Middle School from 79.1% to 82.4% which was a 3.3% increase.

**2021 Grade Level Performance (CCRPI Data not Calculated)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | English/ Language Arts | | | Mathematics | | | Science | | | Social Studies | | |
|  | DPA | DCSD | STATE | DPA | DCSD | STATE | DPA | DCSD | STATE | DPA | DCSD | STATE |
| 3rd | 66% | 46% | 62% | 56% | 52% | 76% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th | 100% | 54% | 68% | 51% | 50% | 75% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5th | 47% | 58% | 74% | 27% | 41% | 68% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6th | 60% | 53% | 69% | 54% | 42% | 69% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7th | 46% | 51% | 69% | 46% | 52% | 75% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8th | 77% | 60% | 74% | 55% | 45% | 67% | 55% | 35% | 54% | 55% | 49% | 73% |
| AVG | 66% | 54% | 69% | 48% | 47% | 72% | 55% | 35% | 54% | 55% | 49% | 73% |

\*\*A total of 73 students tested school-wide\*\*

2021 CCRPI DATA COMPARISON

* Audio Video Communication allowed our students to process skills across all disciplinary domains, extending even to the area of personal learning. Although we did not meet our highly projected goals for 2021 for students in grades 3-8th of 80.1% in English Language Arts, 81.8% in Mathematics, 79% in Science, and 80.1% in Social Studies, the MAP data in the next section of this report will show gains in student growth. (See DPA GMAS Target Chart.)
* We outperformed Dekalb County Schools in the area of English/ Language Arts in the following grades: 3rd, 4th, 6th, and 8th.
* We outperformed Dekalb County Schools in the area of Mathematics in the following grades: 3rd, 4th, 6th, and 8th.
* We outperformed Dekalb County Schools and the State in the area of Science in 8th Grade.
* We outperformed the State of Georgia in 3rd, 4th, and 8th Grade English/Language Arts.
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**2021-2022 MAP PERFORMANCE**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Reading** | | | | **Mathematics** | | | | **Language Usage** | | | | **Science** | | | |
|  | Fall  21-22 Mean RIT | Winter  21-22 Mean RIT | Spring  21-22  Mean RTI | +/- | Fall  21-22 Mean RIT | Winter  21-22 Mean RIT | Spring  21-22  Mean RIT | +/- | Fall 21-22 Mean RIT | Winter  21-22 Mean RIT | Spring  21-22  Mean RIT | +/- | Fall  21-22 Mean RIT | Winter  21-22 Mean RIT | Spring  21-22  Mean RIT | +/- |
| K | 137.2 | 148.3 | 151.8 | +14.6 | 139.6 | 150.6 | 154 | 14.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1st | 155.2 | 160.9 | 164.7 | +9.5 | 158.4 | 167.7 | 171.3 | +12.9 |  |  | N/A | | |  |  |  |
| 2nd | 170.3 | 175.9 | 181.6 | +11.3 | 172 | 178.1 | 180.2 | +8.2 | 170.6 | 178.3 | 182.5 | +11.9 |  |  |  |  |
| 3rd | 184.5 | 189.9 | 195.1 | +10.6 | 180.8 | 188.5 | 194.3 | +13.5 | 184.3 | 187.6 | 194.8 | +10.5 | 184.5 | 186.3 | 191.4 | +6.9 |
| 4th | 189.1 | 197 | 198 | +8.9 | 189.5 | 195.7 | 199.3 | +9.8 | 189.9 | 195.7 | 196.7 | +6.8 | 188.4 | 194.9 | 195.4 | +7 |
| 5th | 200.1 | 207.4 | 210.1 | +10 | 200.3 | 206.6 | 211.3 | +11 | 201.2 | 208.4 | 210.3 | +9.1 | 197.9 | 204.5 | 205.5 | +7.6 |
| 6th | 205.5 | 207.4 | 208.3 | +2.8 | 204.7 | 207.2 | 209 | +4.3 | 205 | 207.4 | 207.2 | +2.2 | 199.1 | 201.7 | 200.4 | +1.3 |
| 7th | 206.9 | 208.9 | 210.8 | +3.9 | 206.2 | 210 | 213.7 | +7.5 | 206 | 209.3 | 211.8 | +5.8 | 200 | 204 | 202.7 | +2.7 |
| 8th | 213 | 214.5 | 213.5 | +.5 | 213.2 | 218 | 219.7 | +6.5 | 210.6 | 213.6 | 212.5 | +1.9 | 203.6 | 208.5 | 206.3 | 0 |

**· Based upon the Spring 2022 MAP RIT data, students showed growth in all core academic areas from Fall 2021 to Spring 2022 with the exception of 8th grade Science.**

**· The gains that are noted are attributed to the implementation of Project Based Learning and Audio Video Communications. Students were required to utilize critical thinking skills across the curriculum to research and solve community-based issues utilizing priority standards.**  **Students were also required to write clear, coherent text during performance-based assessments to convey their understanding of the writing process. The writings demonstrated considerations of the audience and purpose. The student progressed through the stages of the writing process (e.g., prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing successive versions). Thus, the Audio Video Communication curriculum requires students to utilize the rules of Standard English.**
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**Dekalb Preparatory Academy’s AVC Program Evaluation**

***AVC Program Budget & Cost Benefit Analysis***

For the 2018-2019 school an $214, 414.12 yielding an additional 64% investment in the instructional program. These increases enable the school to invest in current technology that provides students the ability to create, edit, and produce products for Project Based Learning. Additionally, it allows the school to invest in the teachers with additional professional development from external vendors that provide best practices for teaching the standards, creating rigorous lessons, and improving classroom pedagogy.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2017-2018  CCRPI DATA | | | 2018-2019  CCRPI DATA | | Instruction | 2017-2018  Base Figures | | 2018-2019  Last Year’s Budget | | | 2019-2020  Current Budget |
| Content  Mastery | ES | MS | ES | MS |
| Overall Score | 57.5% | 64.1% | 67% | 73.9% |  | ES | MS | ES | MS | |  |
| ELA | 48.31% | 51.04% | 49.42% | 58.4% | Textbooks | $70,000 | $50,000 | $42,200.06 | $54,565.29 | | $80,000 |
| Math | 49.15% | 45.49% | 53.52% | 45.03% | Classroom Supplies ***(PBL Materials)*** | $57,480 | $38,320 | $35,870.05 | $46,380.49 | | $115,000 |
| Science | 32.76% | 32.99% | 37.93% | 39.42% | Computers | $0 | $0 | $16,880.02 | $21,826.11 | | $40,000 |
| Social Studies | 49.14% | 35.87% | 28.95% | 40.57% | Software ***(Instructional Software and AVC***) | $7,500 | $7,500 | $25,320.03 | $32,739.17 | | $60,000 |
|  | | |  | | Field Trips | $10,000 | $10,000 | $24,898.03 | $32,193.52 | | $64,000 |
|  | | **Instructional** Equipment ***(AVC Equipment)*** | $0 | $0 | $42,200.06 | $54,565.29- | | $100,000 |
|  | | Tutors | $4,000 | $2,000 | $10.000 | $10,000 | | $35,000 |
|  | | Substitutes | $30,000 | $30,000 | $35,000 | $35,000 | | $100,000 |
|  | | Teacher Salary ***(2) AVC Teachers)*** | $40,535 | $40,535 | $40,535 | $52,108. | | $119,677 |
|  | | **Total Instruction** | **$219,512** | **$178,355** | **$272,903.25** | | **$339,377.87** | **$713,677** |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Unit Cost Per Student | Number of Students Impacted | Total $’s Expended | Benefits to Stakeholders |
| Project Based Learning/ Audio Video Communications | $247.89 | 505 | $125,184.82 | + |
| Costs | | Benefits | |
| **Start Up Costs**: Audio / Video Technical Equipment  **Salaries:** 2 AVC Instructors (1 Elementary School / 1 Middle School)  **Professional Development:** Time, resources, and training allocated for systemic staff professional development to provide quality instruction to students. (Registration)  **Travel Costs:** Resources allocated for out of town professional development for administration and teachers.  **Recurring Costs** | | **Student Academic Returns:** Student Content Mastery in Science improved in Elementary School by 5.17%. and 6.43% in Middle School. Content Mastery in Middle School Social Studies improved by 5.7%. 8th Grade outperformed Dekalb County School District in Science.  **Classroom Academic Returns:** PBL challenges students to think critically, solve real-world problems, answer complex questions, and take an active role in their learning, classrooms, and communities. Students deepen their content knowledge beyond memorization to application. | |
| EnVision Math | Unit Cost Per Student | Number of Students Impacted | Total $’s Expended | Benefits to Stakeholders |
| $113.27 | 505 | $57,201.08 | + |
| Costs | | Benefits | |
| **Start Up Costs**: Purchasing Text and Materials  **Professional Development:** Time, resources, and training allocated for systemic staff professional development to provide quality instruction to students on the mathematics textbook series.  **Upfront Costs** | | **Student Academic Returns:** Student Content Mastery in Mathematics improved in Elementary School by 4.37%. 3rd Grade Outperformed the State of Georgia in Mathematics. 6th and 7th Grade outperformed Dekalb County School District.  **Classroom Academic Returns:** Novice and Expert teachers receive training and a comprehensive framework to provide quality Mathematics instruction with a resource to encourage conceptual understanding and problem-based instruction. | |
|  | Unit Cost Per Student | Number of Students Impacted | Total $’s Expended | Benefits to Stakeholders |
| Reading Street (3rd -5th) | $591.98 | 171 | $101,228.71 | + |
| Costs | | Benefits | |
| **Start Up Costs**: Purchasing the reading series text/ materials and supplies.  **Professional Development:** Time, resources, and training allocated for systemic staff professional development to provide quality instruction to students in grades 3rd-5th in literacy on the new Reading Street program.  **Upfront Costs** | | **Student Academic Returns:** Student Content Mastery improved in Elementary School by 1.11%. Grades 3rd and 5th outperformed Dekalb County School District in English/Language Arts. 3rd Grade Outperformed the State of Georgia in English/Language Arts  **Classroom Academic Returns:** Novice teachers receive training and a comprehensive framework to provide quality English/Language Arts Instruction to students. Scripted Reading Program with built in interventions for students and differentiated instruction. | |
| Summer Bridge Program (Rising 3rd and 6th Graders) | Unit Cost Per Student | Number of Students Impacted | Total $’s Expended | Benefits to Stakeholders |
| $542.36 | 19 | $10,304.78 | - |
| Costs | | Benefits | |
| **Start Up Costs**: Meal Costs  **Salaries:** Teacher and Paraprofessional Salaries (1 Elementary School / 1 Middle School /1 Paraprofessional)  **Administrative Overhead:** Salary for administrators on duty outside of their scheduled calendar days.  **Recurring Costs** | | **Student Academic Returns:** 14/19 =74% students demonstrated growth in the area of English / Language Arts and 16/19 = 84% demonstrated growth in the area of Mathematics that participated in the Summer Bridge program.  **Instructional Returns:** Students are introduced to the curriculum that they will be taught the next year as rising 3rd and 6th grade students. | |

**AVC SURVEY RESULTS**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **AVC SURVEY (Teachers)** | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither Agree or Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Q1. Are you comfortable with using Audio/Video Technology in the class? Why? Why not? | 33% | 57% | 5% | 5% | 0% |
| Q2. Do you feel like you have the AVC resources to help in assisting you with teaching? Why or why not? | 31% | 38% | 10% | 14% | 5% |
| Q3. Do you understand the AVC standard and how they are used in Project-Based Learning? Why or why not? | 245 | 35% | 25% | 10% | 5% |
| Q4. Do you think that you need additional professional development on Audio/Video Technology? Why or why not? | 23% | 52% | 19% | 5% | 0% |
| Q5. Do you like incorporating AVC in the current curriculum? Why or why not? | 10% | 67% | 19% | 0% | 5% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **STUDENT AVC SURVEY (3-8)** | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither Agree or Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Q1. I know and understand Audio/Video Technology | 24% | 57% | 17% | 1% | .65% |
| Q2. I feel like I have the proper tools to assist me in learning AVC. | 26% | 46% | 18% | 8% | 3% |
| Q3. I know how to identify my AVC standards into my Project Based Learning end project. | 25% | 47% | 24% | 4% | .65% |
| Q4. My teacher uses AVC in our class. | 24% | 41% | 16% | 11% | 7% |
| Q5. I enjoy having AVC incorporated into my curriculum/lessons. | 50% | 34% | 13% | 3% | .65% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **STUDENT AVC SURVEY (K-2)** | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither Agree or Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Q1. I know and understand Audio/Video Technology | 56% | 14% | 10% | 6% | 14% |
| Q2. I feel like I have the proper tools to assist me in learning AVC. | 48% | 25% | 14% | 6% | 8% |
| Q3. I know how to identify my AVC standards into my Project Based Learning end project. | 39% | 16% | 22% | 8% | 16% |
| Q4. My teacher uses AVC in our class. | 47% | 11% | 9% | 2% | 31% |
| Q5. I enjoy having AVC incorporated into my curriculum/lessons. | 76% | 8% | 3% | 6% | 6% |