Hollywood Central Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Hollywood Central Elementary School

1700 MONROE ST, Hollywood, FL 33020

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Delicia Decembert

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2009

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	95%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (41%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

> * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward County School Board.

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.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Hollywood Central Elementary School

1700 MONROE ST, Hollywood, FL 33020

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	68%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	75%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Hollywood Central Elementary school and community is to deliver a quality education to all students by providing a safe, orderly, and caring environment, while offering well planned learning opportunities and stressing high but individualized expectations.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Hollywood Central Elementary School vision statement is aligned to the following guiding principles:
We believe every student has the right to a quality education.
We believe every student can learn, but in different ways and at different times.
We believe a safe, orderly, and caring environment is necessary for learning.
We believe every student has the right to be treated with respect.
We believe every student's achievement will rise to the level of expectation.
We believe quality education results from a partnership that is shared among the home, school, and community.
We believe the ultimate success of democracy is dependent upon the quality of public education.
We believe students should be taught to "learn how to learn."
We believe that to meet the challenges of change, risks must be taken.
We believe that all student and staff should have experiences that develop interpersonal skills and sensitivity in working with others of diverse backgrounds and abilities.

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
Decembert, Delicia	Principal	The job duties and responsibilities of the Principal of Hollywood Central Elementary School (Delicia Decembert) is established for the purpose of promoting and maintaining high student achievement by providing curricular and instructional leadership, maintaining overall school site operations; receiving, distributing and communicating information to enforce school, District and State policies; maintaining a safe school environment; coordinating site activities and communicating information to staff, students, parents, and community members.
Heverly, Kelly	Assistant Principal	The job duties and responsibilities of Assistant Principal (Kelly Heverly) of Hollywood Central Elementary School is to assist the building principal in organizing and fostering a positive, safe environment that is conducive to best meeting the needs of all students, staff, and parents. This includes responsibilities as: leading, directing, counseling, and supervising a variety of personnel and programs; creating effective parent, teacher, child communications, supporting, encouraging, mentoring, and evaluating staff; fostering teamwork between teachers and among staff and parents, and managing budget items.
Eutsey, Lisa	Instructional Coach	The Literacy Coach/Instructional Coach will support K-6 staff in the implementation of the site reading plan and program. The Literacy Coach will work directly with teachers at Hollywood Central by providing classroom-based demonstrations, collaborative and one-on-one support, and facilitating teacher inquiry and related professional development. The Literacy Coach will also focus on enhancing teachers' ability to provide instruction that builds students' sense of engagement in the ownership of learning. Moreover, the Literacy Coach works with administrators and teachers to collect and analyze data, interpret, and use it to guide instructional decisions.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2009, Delicia Decembert

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.*
5

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.*
25

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
32

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	95%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (41%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/25/2020

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	68	78	82	91	72	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	467
Attendance below 90 percent	17	18	18	18	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	0	4	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	34	32	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96

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	2	3	1	11	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	11	5	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	68	78	82	91	72	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	467
Attendance below 90 percent	17	18	18	18	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	0	4	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	34	32	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96

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	2	3	1	11	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	11	5	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	43%	59%	57%	40%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	60%	58%	50%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	54%	53%	38%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	39%	65%	63%	39%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	47%	66%	62%	55%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	53%	51%	54%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	31%	46%	53%	37%	45%	51%

	EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey						
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**						**Total**
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	
	(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	37%	60%	-23%	58%	-21%
	2018	41%	59%	-18%	57%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	44%	62%	-18%	58%	-14%
	2018	39%	58%	-19%	56%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	45%	59%	-14%	56%	-11%
	2018	39%	56%	-17%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	31%	65%	-34%	62%	-31%
	2018	54%	63%	-9%	62%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-23%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	38%	67%	-29%	64%	-26%
	2018	33%	63%	-30%	62%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				
05	2019	44%	64%	-20%	60%	-16%
	2018	46%	62%	-16%	61%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	30%	49%	-19%	53%	-23%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	43%	51%	-8%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison	-13%					
Cohort Comparison						

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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	15	56	57	28	36	9					
ELL	36	61	57	34	49	43	26				
BLK	26	39	50	10	31	25	6				
HSP	37	58	59	40	51	38	23				
WHT	70	76		60	56		65				
FRL	38	55	55	35	48	31	23				

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	19	27		26	9						
ELL	24	54	50	33	45	47	23				
BLK	29	58	64	33	39	10	29				
HSP	33	56	62	39	48	50	43				
WHT	70	64		70	57		68				
FRL	37	55	52	42	46	41	45				

2017 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	32	18	19	37		25				
ELL	27	50	44	26	54	46	12				
BLK	33	36	30	31	57	75	37				
HSP	34	56	56	31	47	40	22				
WHT	50	50		53	68		54				
FRL	36	48	39	36	53	52	33				

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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	75
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	382
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	27
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	67
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	45
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.

After analyzing the data, the data component that showed the subject area which illustrated the lowest performance was Math (39%) and Science Achievement (31%) from the 2018-2019 school year. The contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance is the lack of high quality Tier 1 instruction in mathematics and science standard based instruction. In 2018, the School and District science achievement score at Hollywood Central equated to the same achievement score. However, in 2019, the science achievement score decreased significantly due to the lack of high quality Tier 1 instruction in science standard based instruction.

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

After analyzing the data, the data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year is the area of Math Lowest 25 Percentile of Students. The contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance is the lack of high quality Tier 1 instruction in mathematics standard based instruction from the prior year due to a change of instructional staff in specific grade levels.

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.

After analyzing the data, the data component that showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average is Math Achievement (39%) and Math Learning Gains (47%) from the 2019 school year. The contributing factor(s) that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is the lack of high quality Tier 1 instruction in mathematics standard based instruction and a change of teachers in specific grade levels.

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

After analyzing the data, the data component that showed the most improvement is the ELA Lowest 25th Percentile student group. The new actions Hollywood Central incorporated in this area is by creating an ELA Interventionist position that identifies struggling students at the beginning of the school year who have reading deficiencies in one or more areas in reading. The ELA Interventionist implements high quality standard based instruction and strategies to boost student achievement in the area of ELA while also using evidence and research-based instructional materials.

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

After reflecting on the Early Warning Systems (EWS) from Part 1 (D), the potential areas of concern are: Number of students with attendance below 90% and the number of students in Grades 3-5 who earned a Level 1 in ELA or Math.

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

1. Implementing quality (TIER 1) Standard-Based Instruction in the areas of ELA, Math, and Science.
2. Engaging in productive and effective professional learning communities (PLCs) by implementing coaching tools such as Analyzing Student Work (ASW).
3. Creating a Progress Monitoring Calendar and Standard-Based Mastery Check Database that provides instant student performance data using school wide grade-level formative assessments.
4. Weekly, Monthly, and Daily Classroom Walk-Throughs to determine if strong TIER 1 instruction is taking place in all subject-areas school wide.
5. Instructional Staff will attend professional development in areas that showed the greatest decline from the prior school year.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In analyzing the data, students with disabilities performed well below other subgroups. Focusing on the instructional strategies, standards-based formatives, and consistent progress monitoring will support their learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	By June 2021, students with disabilities subgroup will improve to meet or exceed an FPPI of 40%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Delicia Decembert (delicia.decembert@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Embedded High Quality Instruction-The goal or purpose of this best practice is to use student academic and/or behavior information to better identify students with learning or behavior needs in order to give students the necessary supportive interventions that will maximize their full potential and learning. Implementation of School City/ACALETICS/ Reflex Math/iReady will provide common standards-based formative assessments. Students will participate in walk to reading targeted interventions. School wide PLC focusing on CARE (Curriculum, Assessment, Remediation, and Enrichment) while analyzing grade-level common assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Classroom Teachers can increase student's ELA/Math success throughout the primary and intermediate grades by implementing high-quality instruction which refers to the utilization of both research validated instructional practices and core reading and math programs such as School City/iReady and ACALETICS evidence-based programs. Implementing high-quality instruction allows teachers to rule out inadequate instruction as a reason for poor performance.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Providing all students with differentiated instructional based on each students' learning needs.
2. Ensuring teachers are utilizing effective grouping procedures such as: small groups, paired instruction, independent work, and one-on-one instruction.
3. Monitoring school wide grade level common assessments K-5.
4. Identifying students with disabilities (SWD) that should not be on grade level standards based on previous formative and summative assessments.
5. Ensuring all classroom teachers are given the opportunity to attend professional development that will strengthen TIER 1 instruction in all academic areas.

Person Responsible Delicia Decembert (delicia.decembert@browardschools.com)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In analyzing the data, black students performed well below other subgroups. Focusing on the instructional strategies, standards-based formatives, and consistent progress monitoring will support their learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	By June 2021, the black students group will improve to meet or exceed an FPPI of 40%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Delicia Decembert (delicia.decembert@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Embedded High Quality Instruction-The goal or purpose of this best practice is to use student academic and/or behavior information to better identify students with learning or behavior needs in order to give students the necessary supportive interventions that will maximize their full potential and learning. Implementation of School City/ACALETICS/ Reflex Math/iReady will provide common standards-based formative assessments. Students will participate in walk to reading targeted interventions. School wide PLC focusing on CARE (Curriculum, Assessment, Remediation, and Enrichment) while analyzing grade-level common assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Classroom Teachers can increase student's ELA/Math success throughout the primary and intermediate grades by implementing high-quality instruction which refers to the utilization of both research validated instructional practices and core reading and math programs such as School City/iReady and ACALETICS evidence-based programs. Implementing high-quality instruction allows teachers to rule out inadequate instruction as a reason for poor performance.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Providing all students with differentiated instructional based on each students' learning needs.
2. Ensuring teachers are utilizing effective grouping procedures such as: small groups, paired instruction, independent work, and one-on-one instruction.
3. Monitoring school wide grade level common assessments K-5.
4. Identifying students with disabilities (SWD) that should not be on grade level standards based on previous formative and summative assessments.
5. Ensuring all classroom teachers are given the opportunity to attend professional development that will strengthen TIER 1 instruction in all academic areas.

Person Responsible Delicia Decembert (delicia.decembert@browardschools.com)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	After analyzing Hollywood Central's ELA comparison data, 43% of the student's scored proficient on the FSA. This percentage is well below the District's (59%) and State's proficiency (57%) average based on 2019 School, State, and District Comparisons. Focusing on the instructional strategies, standards-based formatives, and consistent progress monitoring will support ELA learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	By June 2021, Hollywood Central's ELA student proficiency average will increase from a 43% to 54% in order to met or exceed an FPPI of 40%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Embedded High Quality Instruction-The goal or purpose of this best practice is to use student academic and/or behavior information to better identify students with learning or behavior needs in order to give students the necessary supportive interventions that will maximize their full potential and learning. The implementation of iReady will provide remediation for student to be ready to take the quarterly common standards-based formative assessments. Students will participate in walk to read targeted interventions. School wide PLCs will focus on CARE (Curriculum, Assessment, Remediation, and Enrichment) while also analyzing grade-level common assessments performed by students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Classroom Teachers can increase student's ELA's success throughout the primary and intermediate grades by implementing high-quality instruction which refers to the utilization of both research validated instructional practices and core reading programs such as iReady which are considered evidence-based programs. Implementing high-quality instruction allows teachers to rule out inadequate instruction as a reason for poor performance.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Providing all students with differentiated instructional based on each students' learning needs.
2. Ensuring teachers are utilizing effective grouping procedures such as: small groups, paired instruction, independent work, and one-on-one instruction.
3. Monitoring and analyzing ELA school wide grade level common assessments K-5.
4. Identifying students with disabilities (SWD) that should not be on grade level standards based on previous formative and summative assessments.
5. Ensuring all classroom teachers are given the opportunity to attend professional development that will strengthen TIER 1 instruction in all academic areas.

Person Responsible	Delicia Decembert (delicia.decembert@browardschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The School Leadership Team will address the remaining school-wide improvement policies identified earlier in 2.E. of the Needs Assessment/Analysis is by engaging the CPS Team and the Reading Leadership Team quarterly by analyzing HCE's BAS Data, Mld-Year BSA Data, and internal assessments with the purposeful intention to discuss successes and problem-solve the challenges of teachers and students that need reading support by ensuring the K-12 Reading Plan is implemented successfully.

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.

Building a positive environment in individual classrooms and throughout your whole school is a matter of cultivating and maintaining relationships. It takes commitment and consistency from the whole team—administrators, teachers and support staff.
1. Building strong relationships-Teachers need to have time to talk to their students in and out of the classroom. The goal should be for every adult in the building to maintain a high rate of positive interactions with students and to show genuine interest in their lives, their activities, their goals and their struggles.
2. Teach social skills- Behavior should be treated like academics, and students should be taught the skills they need to execute desired behaviors. These behaviors and values include honesty, sensitivity, concern and respect for others, a sense of humor, reliability, and so on. Together as a staff, you should identify the social skills you want your students to have and the step-by-step routines to teach them.
3. Clarify classroom rules- Classroom rules communicate your expectations to your students. They tell students this is the positive environment you deserve. This is the standard of behavior we know you can achieve.
4. Be role models-Observing the actions of others influences how they respond to their environment and cope with unfamiliar situations.

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

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$375.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5200	100-Salaries	0121 - Hollywood Central Elem. School	Title, I Part A	25.0	$375.00
			Notes: Salaries for Teacher to attend Professional Development			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American				$8,540.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	100-Salaries	0121 - Hollywood Central Elem. School	Title, I Part A	10.0	$8,540.00
			Notes: Extended Learning Opportunities for Students in Grades 3, 4, 5			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$0.00
					Total:	$8,915.00