Gulfstream Academy Of Hallandale Beach

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Gulfstream Academy Of Hallandale Beach

1000 S W 3RD ST, Hallandale Beach, FL 33009

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Carlton Campbell

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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: B (56%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: C (53%) 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.](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.

Table of Contents

Gulfstream Academy Of Hallandale Beach

1000 S W 3RD ST, Hallandale Beach, FL 33009

[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)
Combination School KG-8	Yes	80%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	90%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	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.

Our mission is to empower students in mathematics, reading, writing, and science academically with critical thinking skills and problem-solving skills. We promote social, emotional and physical development through positive self-imaging and wise decision-making skills.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Chase Perfection, Catch Excellence!

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
Freeman, Tarshe	Principal	The principal is responsible for the academics of the entire school. The principal works closely with the assistant principals and coaches to overseer and approve the curriculum plan and assessments for the year. The principal meets regularly with all support staff, assistant principals, and teachers to ensure everyone in the school is on the same page. The principal attends School Advisory Council meetings where he takes input from all stakeholders to assist us in achieving the goals of the school.
Fitzpatrick, Chandra	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal that is over ELA for grades 4-8. The assistant principal works closely with the reading coach to plan out the curriculum and assessments for the year. The assistant principal is responsible for doing ELA observations and data chats with the teachers. The assistant principal attends School Advisory Council meetings and assists in planning curriculum nights for parents.
Boyce, Candy	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal that is over ELA and Math for grades K-3. The assistant principal works closely with the reading and math coaches to plan out the curriculum and assessments for the year. The assistant principal is responsible for doing ELA , Math observations and data chats with the teachers. The assistant principal attends School Advisory Council meetings and assists in planning curriculum nights for parents.
Castillo, Maximo	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal that is over Math for grades 4-8. The assistant principal works closely with the math coach to plan out the curriculum and assessments for the year. The assistant principal is responsible for doing math observations and data chats with the teachers. The assistant principal attends School Advisory Council meetings and assists in planning curriculum nights for parents.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Carlton Campbell

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.*
1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
102

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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: B (56%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: C (53%) 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	157	177	183	174	188	204	166	214	209	0	0	0	0	1672
Attendance below 90 percent	28	23	22	26	27	24	9	22	23	0	0	0	0	204
One or more suspensions	0	5	0	7	5	1	34	51	77	0	0	0	0	180
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	9	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	8	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	30	30	29	48	37	0	0	0	0	200
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	27	30	31	29	48	37	0	0	0	0	202

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	6	2	33	17	20	29	45	51	0	0	0	0	203

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	1	27	21	24	8	12	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	101
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	5	4	3	6	4	0	0	0	0	24

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/15/2020

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	156	177	183	174	187	204	166	214	208	0	0	0	0	1669
Attendance below 90 percent	17	13	12	15	14	12	5	10	11	0	0	0	0	109
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	4	3	1	21	24	37	0	0	0	0	93
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	8	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	34	35	32	37	49	40	0	0	0	0	227

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	3	2	18	8	6	18	21	26	0	0	0	0	102

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	1	15	13	14	2	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	51
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	3	2	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	13

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	156	177	183	174	187	204	166	214	208	0	0	0	0	1669
Attendance below 90 percent	17	13	12	15	14	12	5	10	11	0	0	0	0	109
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	4	3	1	21	24	37	0	0	0	0	93
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	8	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	34	35	32	37	49	40	0	0	0	0	227

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	3	2	18	8	6	18	21	26	0	0	0	0	102

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	1	15	13	14	2	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	51
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	3	2	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	13

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	48%	58%	61%	42%	53%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	58%	59%	52%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	52%	54%	47%	50%	51%
Math Achievement	53%	58%	62%	49%	53%	58%
Math Learning Gains	62%	58%	59%	56%	53%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	51%	52%	47%	47%	50%
Science Achievement	40%	51%	56%	38%	46%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	72%	74%	78%	65%	71%	75%

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	50%	60%	-10%	58%	-8%
	2018	45%	59%	-14%	57%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	44%	62%	-18%	58%	-14%
	2018	51%	58%	-7%	56%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	48%	59%	-11%	56%	-8%
	2018	39%	56%	-17%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
06	2019	47%	57%	-10%	54%	-7%
	2018	34%	54%	-20%	52%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
07	2019	38%	55%	-17%	52%	-14%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	38%	54%	-16%	51%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	48%	59%	-11%	56%	-8%
	2018	51%	60%	-9%	58%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	51%	65%	-14%	62%	-11%
	2018	49%	63%	-14%	62%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	55%	67%	-12%	64%	-9%
	2018	50%	63%	-13%	62%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	65%	64%	1%	60%	5%
	2018	57%	62%	-5%	61%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
06	2019	50%	58%	-8%	55%	-5%
	2018	31%	55%	-24%	52%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
07	2019	35%	53%	-18%	54%	-19%
	2018	34%	54%	-20%	54%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	35%	45%	-10%	46%	-11%
	2018	29%	47%	-18%	45%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	33%	49%	-16%	53%	-20%
	2018	40%	51%	-11%	55%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	18%	43%	-25%	48%	-30%
	2018	23%	45%	-22%	50%	-27%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-22%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	96%	67%	29%	67%	29%
2018	95%	62%	33%	65%	30%
Compare		1%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	68%	71%	-3%	71%	-3%
2018	64%	70%	-6%	71%	-7%
Compare		4%			

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	78%	61%	17%	61%	17%
2018	85%	63%	22%	62%	23%
Compare		-7%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	56%	44%	57%	43%
2018	82%	51%	31%	56%	26%
Compare		18%			

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	18	38	39	23	45	44	13	46			
ELL	45	61	55	52	64	45	34	64	50		

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
ASN	77	75		77	75						
BLK	38	52	52	46	56	50	25	64	60		
HSP	55	63	49	58	65	50	48	77	75		
MUL	47	56		53	67						
WHT	55	60	50	60	65	53	51	89	92		
FRL	47	57	51	52	61	50	38	71	72		

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	18	40	46	22	42	43	24	38	60		
ELL	33	55	58	39	58	63	14	38			
ASN	57	64		67	50						
BLK	38	48	40	38	50	57	35	57	74		
HSP	51	58	64	51	56	65	52	71	83		
MUL	50	70		39	37		70				
WHT	56	58	61	58	63	63	53	86	89		
FRL	45	54	54	46	54	61	45	63	78		

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	16	41	38	23	44	34	20	37			
ELL	31	50	44	37	56	51	18	40			
ASN	70			90							
BLK	34	46	46	39	49	43	28	61	79		
HSP	47	56	48	56	62	51	43	66	83		
MUL	52	42		44	50						
WHT	51	61	42	53	56	40	57	72	82		
FRL	40	51	48	47	55	46	36	63	79		

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	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	61
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	567
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	53
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	76
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	50
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60
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	56
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	64
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	56
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.

Students with disabilities did not meet the criteria of 41%. Students with disabilities had 38% learning gains and 39% learning gains in the lower quartile in ELA in 2019. This was a drop, in 2018 students disabilities has 40% learning gains and 58% learning gains in the lower quartile.

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

The students with disabilities showed the largest decline. Factors that contributed to this decline were helping the teachers to balance working at grade level and below grade level and being able to differentiated the learning in the classroom.

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 biggest gap between our school data and the state data was in the area of students of students with disabilities the state average was 41% in learning gains and our school was at 38%. The drop resulted in helping new teachers learn how to balance instruction between grade level and remediation to assist in filling in the gaps in learning the students with disabilities may have.

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

ELL students in ELA learning gains moved from 55% in 2018 to 61% in 2019. In math, ELL students had 58% learning gains in 2018 and 64% learning gains in 2019. ELL students were enrolled in ELL tutoring after school, that was specific to ELLS, as well as, after tutoring with all other students.

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

As we reflect on the early warning systems data , we noticed that as the grade level goes up the amount of students with early warning indicators increase as well as the number of students scoring level 1 on the FSA. We will be working as a school to put supports in place to help students to increase their level of learning and understanding of grad elevel material.

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

1. Increase all over students gains in ELA and MATH
2. Increase student proficiency
3. Increase intervention time with students that are below grade level in the middle grades
4. Increase student proficiency in grade K-2
5. Closely progress monitor all students in all subject areas

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus for improving literacy was chosen because when students with disabilities increase earning gains in reading it shows that we are filling gaps that the students have in their learning. Increasing their learning gains in reading will impact learning in all content learning areas.
Measurable Outcome:	By June 2021, 45% of the students with disabilities in grades 3-8 will demonstrate learning gains in ELA on the FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will be using multiple programs and paper based assessments to be able to test student's literacy knowledge and comprehension as it is being taught.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We will be using i-Ready, paper based and computer based programs to assist us in accomplishing our goal. We will also be using iReady to remediate, enrich and progress monitor how ell our students are mocing towards the goal we have set.

Action Steps to Implement

1. We will have Professional Development to help instruct the teachers on how to use the resources that are part of the strategies we are implementing.
2. The teacher will be part of Professional Learning Communities so that they are able to collaborate with one another on ways to help their students improve.
3. the students will be using the iReady, other resources and assessments to gauge their understanding of literacy.
4. The teachers will give remediation to those students who are still not performing at the correct level.
5. We will then reassess the students every 6 weeks to determine if we have moved towards our goal.

Person Responsible Tarshe Freeman (tarshe.t.freeman@browardschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus for improving literacy was chosen because when students increase closer to proficiency in ELA it will impact all other content areas as well.
Measurable Outcome:	By June 2021, 53% of students in grades 3-8 will demonstrate proficiency in ELA on the FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will be using multiple programs and paper based and computer based assessments to be able to test student's literacy knowledge and comprehension as it is being taught.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We will be using iReady, paper based and computer based programs to assist us in accomplishing our goal. We will also be using iReady to remediate, enrich and progress monitor how ell our students are moving towards the goal we have set.

Action Steps to Implement

1. We will have Professional Development to help instruct the teachers on how to use the resources that are part of the strategies we are planning.
2. The teachers will be using the iReady, other resources and assessments to gauge their understanding of literacy.
3. The teachers will be part of Professional Learning Communities so that they are able to collaborate with one another on ways to help their students improve.
4. The teachers will give remediation to those students who are still not performing at the correct level.
5. We will the reassess the students every 6 weeks to determine if we have moved towards our goal.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Through our ability to focus on student literacy proficiency, we will be able to address the students with disabilities and all student improvement, because if we can increase student literacy understanding it will increase their understanding in other subjects.

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.

Gulfstream Academy of Hallandale Beach K-8 address building a positive culture and environment by having monthly parent nights to provide parents with various curriculum strategies/resources to increase their child's academic achievement levels.

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				$27,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	100-Salaries	0131 - Gulfstream Academy Of Hallandale Beach	Title, I Part A		$12,000.00
			Notes: The salaries will be used for teachers offering extended learning opportunities on their planning, after school, or Saturday.			
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0131 - Gulfstream Academy Of Hallandale Beach	Title, I Part A		$15,000.00
			Notes: Money is used to purchase iReady to support students in standard based instruction and support.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$27,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0131 - Gulfstream Academy Of Hallandale Beach	Title, I Part A		$12,000.00
			Notes: The salaries will be used for teachers offering extended learning opportunities on their planning, after school, or Saturday.			
			0131 - Gulfstream Academy Of Hallandale Beach	Title, I Part A		$15,000.00
			Notes: Money is used to purchase iReady to support students in standard based instruction and support.			
					Total:	$54,000.00