

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Broward Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 21 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 22 |

Broward Elementary School

400 W OSBORNE AVE, Tampa, FL 33603

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Angela Livingston

Start Date for this Principal: 6/22/2020

| | |
|--|---|
| 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) | 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* Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: D (36%) 2017-18: C (41%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: D (38%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | CS&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 Hillsborough 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

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 22 |

Broward Elementary School

400 W OSBORNE AVE, Tampa, FL 33603

[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 | 97% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 94% |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

At Broward Elementary we create a loving community where all staff and scholars show INTEGRITY, have COURAGE, use our KNOWLEDGE, and DREAM to succeed!

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Broward Elementary we create a loving community where all staff and scholars show INTEGRITY, have COURAGE, use our KNOWLEDGE, and DREAM to succeed!

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 |
|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| Livingston, Angela | Principal | Duties and responsibilities includes building capacity in team members through support of their roles and responsibilities while also serving as an instructional facilitator to impact student achievement and teacher effectiveness. Leadership Team members include: Mary Bishop- Math Coach Sharon Stewart- Reading Coach Leah Negron- Science Coach/Gifted |
| Ambrose, Sharon | Assistant Principal | |
| Murray, Courtney | Teacher, ESE | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/22/2020, Angela Livingston

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.*

1

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

20

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) | 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* Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: D (36%) 2017-18: C (41%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: D (38%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | CS&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 | 42 | 40 | 47 | 40 | 52 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 263 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 14 | 7 | 16 | 12 | 17 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 | |
| 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 | 4 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | |

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 | |
| 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

Thursday 10/29/2020

Prior Year - As Reported
The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 71 | 64 | 78 | 70 | 51 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 398 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 25 | 15 | 16 | 18 | 7 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |
| Level 1 on statewide 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 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |

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 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

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 | 71 | 64 | 78 | 70 | 51 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 398 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 25 | 15 | 16 | 18 | 7 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |
| Level 1 on statewide 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 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |

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 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

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 | 23% | 52% | 57% | 26% | 52% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 42% | 55% | 58% | 57% | 55% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 58% | 50% | 53% | 71% | 51% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 25% | 54% | 63% | 35% | 53% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 34% | 57% | 62% | 49% | 54% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 52% | 46% | 51% | 48% | 46% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 21% | 50% | 53% | 34% | 48% | 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 | 20% | 52% | -32% | 58% | -38% |
| | 2018 | 15% | 53% | -38% | 57% | -42% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 24% | 55% | -31% | 58% | -34% |
| | 2018 | 28% | 55% | -27% | 56% | -28% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 28% | 54% | -26% | 56% | -28% |
| | 2018 | 33% | 51% | -18% | 55% | -22% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 30% | 54% | -24% | 62% | -32% |
| | 2018 | 30% | 55% | -25% | 62% | -32% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 22% | 57% | -35% | 64% | -42% |
| | 2018 | 22% | 57% | -35% | 62% | -40% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -8% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 16% | 54% | -38% | 60% | -44% |
| | 2018 | 19% | 54% | -35% | 61% | -42% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -6% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 21% | 51% | -30% | 53% | -32% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 29% | 52% | -23% | 55% | -26% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -8% | | | | |
| 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 | 42 | 55 | 21 | 54 | 62 | 10 | | | | |
| ELL | 22 | 57 | | 31 | 50 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 18 | 38 | 55 | 19 | 34 | 53 | 9 | | | | |
| HSP | 28 | 59 | | 33 | 33 | | 30 | | | | |
| FRL | 21 | 40 | 56 | 24 | 33 | 50 | 20 | | | | |
| 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 | 12 | 34 | 50 | 21 | 45 | 50 | 18 | | | | |
| ELL | 35 | 88 | | 45 | 71 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 19 | 43 | 42 | 17 | 34 | 63 | 17 | | | | |
| HSP | 33 | 66 | | 31 | 43 | | 38 | | | | |
| FRL | 27 | 53 | 56 | 25 | 39 | 54 | 29 | | | | |
| 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 | 14 | 61 | | 29 | 50 | 30 | 40 | | | | |
| ELL | 20 | 33 | | 19 | 31 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 17 | 55 | 68 | 29 | 45 | 48 | 29 | | | | |
| HSP | 36 | 52 | | 41 | 54 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 45 | | | 55 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 25 | 56 | 71 | 35 | 48 | 48 | 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) | CS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 38 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 45 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 300 |
| 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 | 41 |
| 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 | 32 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 38 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 36 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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.

All FSA Content Areas:

ELA, Math, & Science Achievement Components decreased in 2018-2019 to 25% or lower (ELA- 23%, Math- 25%, Science- 21%).

Percentage of students making learning gains decreased: ELA (42%); Math (34%)

ELA components (achievement and learning gains) have lowest performance (out of all the content areas) over past three years. Our lowest 25% ELA gains fluctuated between 48-71% over the past three years.

Contributing factors include: lack of rigorous tasks, teacher understanding/application of standards, student understanding of tasks/standards, student application of learning, student attendance, consistent progress monitoring by all stakeholders, teacher vacancies, prior year standards not mastered.

ATTENDANCE:

Daily average school attendance (PreK-5th) increased 1.3% from 90.9% (2017-18) to

92.2% (2018-19) to 94.9% (2019-2020). Daily average school attendance fluctuated between 90-94% over past three years. Monthly daily average school attendance fell between 1-3% below our district and all elementary schools (2019-20).

Students with 10+ absences: 2019-20- 32.5% (107/329) (51.9%- 2018-19)
 5-9 absences 2019-20- 32.5% (107/329) (24%- 2018-19)
 0-4 absences 2019-20- 34.9% (115/329) (24%- 2018-19)

Grade Level Data: (2019-20 Totals: 30.3% - 100/329 students)
 PreK: 35% (7/20) (54.5%- 2018-2019)
 K: 32.2% (20/62) (60.5%- 2018-19)
 1st: 37.7% (20/53) (53% - 2018-19)
 2nd: 25% (11/44) (47.4%- 2018-19)
 3rd: 31% (20/64) (52.8%- 2018-19)
 4th: 22.7% (10/44) (37.2%- 2018-19)
 5th: 28.5% (12/42) (66.6%- 2018-19)

Subgroup Data:

Lowest 25% ELA: 34.7% (8/23) (64.8%-2018-19)
 Lowest 25% Math: 20% (5/25) (64.8%-2018-19)
 ESE: 34.2% (13/38) (52.2%-2018-19)
 ELL (All Statuses): 22% (2/9) (34.3%-2018-19)
 Free/Reduced Lunch: 30.8% (42/136) (52.6%-2018-19)
 Hispanic: 18.5% (5/27) (45%-2018-19)
 Black: 33.9%.(38/112) (55.1%- 2018-19)

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

FSSA Science Achievement decreased 12% from 33% (2017-18) to 21% (2018-19).

FSA ELA learning gains decreased 12% from 54% (2017-18) to 42% (2018-19).

Our Math learning gains have decreased 10% when we look at trend data over the past three years. Our lowest 25% Math gains have held pretty consistent in the low 50% range over the past three years.

Contributing factors include: prior year standards not mastered, lack of rigorous tasks, teacher understanding/application of standards, student understanding of tasks/standards, student application of learning, student attendance, consistent progress monitoring by all stakeholders, teacher vacancies.

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.

Math Achievement -38% gap (school 25%, state 63%).
 ELA Achievement - 34% gap (school 23%, state 57%).
 Science Achievement - 32% gap (school 21%, state 53%).

Contributing factors include: prior year(s) standards not mastered, lack of rigorous tasks, teacher understanding/application of standards, student understanding of tasks/standards, student application of learning, student attendance, consistent progress monitoring by all stakeholders, teacher vacancies.

Trends: Achievement percentages continue to lag behind 25% or more when compared with the state. However, Lowest 25th Percentile percentages in both ELA and Math are above the state:
 ELA - 5% more than state (school 58%, state 53%)
 Math - 1% more than state (school 52%, state 51%)

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

ELA, MATH, SCIENCE:

The Lowest 25th Percentile subgroup in ELA increased 1% (57%-58%) and in Math remained the same (52%). Some actions included: identifying lowest 25th percentile students, progress monitoring, interventions/supports, planning PLCs.

ATTENDANCE:

Daily average school attendance (PreK-5th) increased 1.3% from 90.9% (2017-18) to 92.2% (2018-19) to 94.9% (2019-2020). Daily average school attendance fluctuated between 90-94% over past three years. Monthly daily average school attendance fell between 1-3% below our district and all elementary schools (2019-20).

Some actions included: daily average attendance discussed daily on morning show by school principal and displayed in main entrance hallway, classroom incentives provided by the teacher to promote daily attendance, students targeted for tiered interventions by school social worker, monthly "Pop Up" attendance celebrations with incentives for students with perfect attendance, parent conferences and letters to remind of attendance concerns, referral to community agencies for additional support for the entire families.

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

ELA, MATH, & SCIENCE-

Increase the number of students who are proficient and who are making year learning gains

ATTENDANCE-

Decrease the number of students with 10 or more days of absences

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

1. Increase proficiency for all students in ELA, Math, and Science
2. Increase learning gains for all students in ELA and Math
3. Increase bottom quartile gains for all BQ students in all ESSA subgroups in ELA and Math
4. Decrease the number of all students with excessive absences (10 or more)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus
Description
and
Rationale:**

Through our work with Learning Sciences International (LSI) in 2019-20, we observed teachers lacked understanding and knowledge to thoroughly plan rigorous, standards-aligned appropriate taxonomy level tasks with success criteria which required students to collaborate, engage, and take responsibility for their own learning. Our teachers were over-scaffolding, not providing rigorous standards-aligned appropriate taxonomy level tasks or collaborative structures to allow students to struggle, take ownership of their learning and mastery of the success criteria (especially for our BQ students and ESSA subgroups).

Furthermore, our 2018-19 FSA data and 2019-2020 school and district assessment data showed an urgent need to increase the number of students who were proficient and making adequate learning gains in ELA, Math, and Science. In 2018-19 we participated in Visible Learning coaching sessions with teacher implementation. Analysis of student data revealed that teachers lacked clarity of instruction, and students lacked an understanding of learning intentions and their success criteria needed for high achievement. Teacher clarity and student understanding of learning intentions and their success criteria became our focus during the 2019-2020 school year.

By October 2020, at least 75% (12/16 returning) and 50% (4/8 new) teachers will provide opportunities for scholars to engage in standards-aligned tasks with appropriate level taxonomy and success criteria in ELA, Math, and Science evidenced by learning walk data (for both virtual and face-to-face instruction).

**Measurable
Outcome:**

By December 2020, at least 100% (16/16 returning) and 75% (6/8 new) teachers will provide opportunities for scholars to engage in standards-aligned tasks with appropriate level taxonomy and success criteria in ELA, Math, and Science evidenced by learning walk data (for both virtual and face-to-face instruction).

By February 2021, at least 100% (16/16 returning) and 100% (8/8 new) teachers will provide opportunities for scholars to engage in standards aligned tasks with appropriate level taxonomy and success criteria in ELA, Math, and Science evidenced by learning walk data (for both virtual and face-to-face instruction).

**Person
responsible
for
monitoring
outcome:**

Angela Livingston (angela.livingston@hcps.net)

Standards-based planning in ELA, Math, and Science with a focus on using appropriate taxonomy to create the learning task and success criteria.

Collaborate structures will be used in learning tasks in ELA, Math, and Science to engage all scholars in discussion, collaboration, and autonomy and responsibility for their learning.

**Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

During 2020-21, we will continue with common standards-based planning PLCs to strengthen teacher instructional practice focused around standards-aligned tasks with appropriate taxonomy and success criteria. This strengthens our LSI work with academic teaming (collaborative) structures and supports our internalization of the EL Curriculum implementation model expanding from grades 1-5. It provides opportunities to utilize technology and supplemental resources (including Nearpod, Flipgrid, Zoom, Flocabulary, i-Ready, Really Great Reading, Reading A-Z, Achieve 3000, and SIPPS) to increase student achievement and learning gains. To further support our teachers and students we will provide additional summer opportunities for students in grades K-3 to help reduce the

impact of instructional loss and job-embedded professional learning centered around internalizing standards-based planning with a focus on using appropriate taxonomy to create learning task and success criteria.

**Rationale
for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

Combining our new learning with our LSI work in 2019-2020 and implementation of instructional moves with teaming (collaborative) structures to allow scholars to discuss and share their thinking, we saw evidence of more student ownership and authentic engagement in their learning and less teacher scaffolding. Data trends also showed more learning tasks at higher cognitive levels in ELA, Math, and Science. We will use our standards-based planning PLCS to embed collaborative structures learned during our LSI work into standards-aligned with appropriate taxonomy (using Marzano's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives) and complex text and resources (including EL curriculum and Nearpod) and success criteria to engage students in the learning..

Action Steps to Implement

Re-evaluate Planning & Data PLCs to Strengthen Teacher Instructional Practice

1. Adjust our master schedule for common planning PLCs with coaches for all K-5 teachers in ELA, Math, and Science.
2. Refine our structures and expectations of content planning and data analysis PLCs- protocols and expectations will be created and communicated to all staff during initial PLCs in August 2020; roles and responsibilities will be defined with all staff during initial PLCs in August 2020.
3. Teachers and coaches will use instructional resources (including Marzano's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, LSI Standard Tracker, EL Curriculum, etc.) to create standards-aligned tasks with appropriate level taxonomy success criteria in ELA, Math, and Science for small and whole group instruction.
4. Teachers and coaches will embed collaborative structures within learning tasks.

Monitoring:

- Admin and coaches will conduct learning walks to collect individual and teacher data trends with look-for evidence of providing standards-aligned tasks with appropriate taxonomy and success criteria and provide feedback to teachers.
- Admin and coaches will conduct learning walks to look for evidence of teachers providing opportunities for students to participate in collaborative structures during high taxonomy standards-aligned tasks with appropriate taxonomy and success criteria and provide feedback.
- Admin and coaches will attend weekly PLCs to monitor implementation of instructional planning.

Person Responsible Angela Livingston (angela.livingston@hcps.net)

Analyze and Monitor Student Data to Strengthen Teacher Instructional Practice

1. During planning PLCS, teachers and coaches will develop a common standard aligned task with appropriate taxonomy in ELA, Math, and Science that will be given to scholars to monitor progress towards mastery.
2. Teachers will bring student work to planning (focusing on our BQ scholars and ESSA subgroups- Black/African-American, Econ. Disadvantaged, Hispanic and SWD) and data PLCs aligned with planned task and success criteria. Data will be tracked and ongoing interventions will be put in place for BQ and ESSA subgroups to meet their individual needs utilizing the supports/resources we have.
3. Teachers and coaches will analyze student work (focusing on our BQ and ESSA subgroups- Black/African-American, Econ. Disadvantaged, Hispanic and SWD) to identify trends, opportunities to adjust their instructional practice, and actionable next steps for implementation. This will include to provide support for teacher practice and student remediation and enrichment needs maximizing the supports/resources we have to meet the individual needs utilizing the supports/resources we have targeting our BQ and ESSA subgroups- Black/African-American, Econ. Disadvantaged, Hispanic and SWD).

Monitoring:

- Admin and coaches will conduct learning walks to collect individual and teacher trend data with look-for

evidence of providing standards-aligned tasks with appropriate taxonomy and success criteria and provide feedback to teachers.

- Admin and coaches will conduct learning walks to collect scholar work data with look-for evidence of participating in collaborative structures during high taxonomy standards-aligned tasks with appropriate taxonomy and success criteria and provide feedback to scholars.
- Admin and coaches will also monitor implementation of next steps.

Person Responsible Angela Livingston (angela.livingston@hcps.net)

Participate in ongoing professional Learning in ELA, Math & Science to Strengthen Teacher Instructional Practice

1. Leadership team and staff leaders will develop criteria for look fors (both teacher and scholar) centered around standards aligned instruction with appropriate taxonomy level task and success criteria.
2. Leadership team will conduct learning walks to collect data on implementation of standards aligned instruction planned during PLCs and scholar learning outcomes as a result of professional learning. Trend data will be discussed with teachers (schoolwide, content, and grade level) by admin and coaches. individual feedback will be communicated to teachers by admin and coaches.
3. Professional Learning (schoolwide, content, and teacher specific) will be provided through ILT and afterschool sessions based on learning walk trends and student outcome data differentiated to meet the needs of teachers.

Monitoring:

- Admin and coaches will attend professional learning sessions to monitor implementation.
- Admin and coaches will conduct learning walks on identified look-for evidence to collect individual and trend data for any additional support or needs of teachers and/or scholars and provide feedback.

Person Responsible Angela Livingston (angela.livingston@hcps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Our 2019-20 attendance data continues to show a critical need to decrease the number of students with 10 or more absences.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

We increased our daily attendance average (PreK-5th) from 4% from 90.9% (2017-18) to 92.2% (2018-19) to 94.9% (2019-2020) with a 2.7% increase during the past school year. Our school daily attendance average fluctuated between 90-94% over past three years. During the 2019-20 school year, our monthly daily average school attendance fell between 1-3% below our district and all elementary schools.

We decreased the number of students with 10 or more absences by 19.4% from 51.9% (2018-2019) to 32.5% (2019-20). The number of students with 5-9 absences increased 8.5% from 24% (2018-19) to 32.5% (2019-20) and 10.9% for students with 0-4 absences from 24% (2018-19) to 34.9% (2019-20).

While we exceeded our goal to decrease the number of students with 10 or more absences by 5% with a 19.4% decrease. Our attendance data continues to show a critical need to continue to decrease students with 10 or more absences.

Measurable Outcome:

Attendance interventions will be provided to decrease the number of students (PreK-5th grade) with 10 or more absences by 20% to increase student achievement and enhance student culture.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Angela Livingston (angela.livingston@hcps.net)

Ongoing collection and analysis of individual student attendance data, tiered interventions, parent conferences/home visits, and student incentive program.

Evidence-based Strategy:

Current research shows positive and statistically significant relationships between student attendance and academic achievement. Research shows that missing 10 percent of the school year, or about 18 days (two days a month) in most school districts, negatively affects a student's academic performance. Research suggests the reasons for chronic absenteeism are as varied as the challenges our students and families face—including poor health, limited transportation, and a lack of safety — which can be particularly acute in disadvantaged communities and areas of poverty. The very students who tend to face significant challenges and need the most educational supports are often missing the most school.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Based on our 2019-2020 attendance data we decreased the number of students with 10 or more absences by to 19% from 52% to 32% which still significantly impacts their academic performance. As a result, teachers will identify students based on our Early Warning Systems Key Performance Indicator data to create an intervention and success plan to increase individual student attendance. Our social worker will closely support teachers, students, and families and provide any additional tiers of support needed.

Our aim is for teachers and all stakeholders to motivate and engage students and parents to have a desire to attend school to impact our school culture and student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Collect, Track, Monitor, and Analyze Attendance Data to Decrease Student Absences

1. Refine structures and procedures for tracking and communicating of daily attendance data (schoolwide,

homeroom, and student) by utilizing:

- Student planners, morning show announcements, student data conferences, award ceremonies, and hallway/classroom data displays.

2. Provide student incentives and celebrations to promote daily attendance, student engagement and overall student culture through:

- Attendance celebrations, attendance PAWS bucks, attendance House points, attendance prizes.

3.. The PSLT Team will identify and monitor fidelity of attendance data and interventions and supports during weekly meetings and teacher MTSS rotations.

- Interventions and supports can include classroom interventions, Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, parent conference, home visits, and utilizing community and agency supports by using Title I and district parent engagement initiatives to remove barriers impacting student attendance..

Person Responsible Angela Livingston (angela.livingston@hcps.net)

Professional Learning Opportunities to Decrease Student Absences

1. Provide job-embedded professional learning opportunities (PLCs, book studies, etc.) centered around issues impacting student attendance including:

- Equity, poverty, culturally responsive teaching

2. Strengthen professional learning centered around SEL strategies and relationships with scholars using models from our partners Frameworks of Tampa Bay and Restorative Practices initiatives from our district. to connect better with scholars with chronic absences.

3. Offer workshops for staff and parents to equip them with strategies to decrease absences while providing Mindfulness resources and fun, engaging attendance challenges.

Person Responsible Angela Livingston (angela.livingston@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We will continue to enhance our schoolwide behavior program utilizing our Ron Clark Academy inspired House System and engagement strategies, Foundations, AVID organizational strategies, and SEL (partnership with Frameworks). Through these programs and strategies we will provide effective procedures, student incentives, student celebrations, mental health preventive measures, and other resources that support and enhance schoolwide behavior and overall school culture.

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.

Broward staff takes pride in showing genuine care for all stakeholders to promote positive relationships and open communication to ensure our scholars succeed. With our scholars being the priority, all learning, celebrations, and family events are focused on meeting their needs and being sensitive to help remove barriers for them. We utilize all resources and supports onsite and through our community partnerships to enhance the quality of every scholars' overall success. We utilize the strategies learned from participating in the Parent Teacher Home Visit Project Training (PTHVP) implementing through our Office of Parent & Family Engagement.

Students are engaged in SEL programs based on their needs and through our partnership with Frameworks of Tampa Bay, SEL has become a part of the fabric of our school's culture. We utilize Restorative Practices and Mindfulness activities to help strengthen our mental and social needs.

Our House System is a fun, exciting, and proven way to create a positive climate and culture for students and staff. It has helped us to build character, relationships, and school spirit which makes Broward a great place to learn and belong.

We have support from many of our community agencies, business partners, and faith-based organizations which engages all stakeholders effectively in our school events and daily learning. We reflect and get feedback from stakeholders to keep the pulse of our school culture. Our staff engage in many activities and support each other which helps to create a family-like atmosphere and strong staff culture.

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: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction | | | | \$135,602.46 |
|---|----------|---|---|----------------|-----|--------------|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 6400 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 0441 - Broward Elementary School | UniSIG | 0.4 | \$27,841.72 |
| | | | Notes: Reading Coach-Main Salary Less Indirect Cost Provide coaching support to K-5 teachers to build teacher capacity and to improve reading instruction through facilitating planning PLCs and side-by-side coaching. Conducts walkthroughs and provides feedback to teachers. Provides small group instruction/intervention to approximately 75 Tier 2 & 3 | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|------|--------------------------------|---|--------|-----|-------------|
| | | | <i>students (gr. 3-5). Develops and conducts professional learning with teacher leaders to train K-5 and resource teachers. Conducts data conferences with teachers and a key member of the leadership team. Promotes reading outreach and schoolwide initiatives with literacy team members.</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 210-Retirement | 0441 - Broward Elementary School | UniSIG | 0.4 | \$2,358.19 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Reading Coach-Retirement 8.47%</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 220-Social Security | 0441 - Broward Elementary School | UniSIG | 0.4 | \$1,726.19 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Reading Coach-FICA 6.2%</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 240-Workers Compensation | 0441 - Broward Elementary School | UniSIG | 0.4 | \$141.99 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Reading Coach-Workers Comp .51%</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 231-Health and Hospitalization | 0441 - Broward Elementary School | UniSIG | 0.4 | \$5,289.93 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Reading Coach-Health Ins 19.00% Less Indirect Cost</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 220-Social Security | 0441 - Broward Elementary School | UniSIG | 0.4 | \$403.70 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Reading Coach-Medicare 1.45% Less Indirect Cost</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 0441 - Broward Elementary School | UniSIG | 1.0 | \$66,200.11 |
| | | | <i>Notes: RTI Teacher Less Indirect Cost</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 210-Retirement | 0441 - Broward Elementary School | UniSIG | 1.0 | \$5,607.15 |
| | | | <i>Notes: RTI Teacher Retirement 8.47% Less Indirect Cost</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 220-Social Security | 0441 - Broward Elementary School | UniSIG | 1.0 | \$4,104.41 |
| | | | <i>Notes: RTI Teacher FICA 6.2% Less Indirect Cost</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 220-Social Security | 0441 - Broward Elementary School | UniSIG | 1.0 | \$959.90 |
| | | | <i>Notes: RTI Teacher Medicare 1.45% Less Indirect Cost</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 240-Workers Compensation | 0441 - Broward Elementary School | UniSIG | 1.0 | \$337.62 |
| | | | <i>Notes: RTI Teacher Workers Comp .51% Less Indirect Cost</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 231-Health and Hospitalization | 0441 - Broward Elementary School | UniSIG | 1.0 | \$12,578.02 |
| | | | <i>Notes: RTI Teacher Health Ins 19.0% Less Indirect Cost</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 0441 - Broward Elementary School | UniSIG | | \$7,667.95 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Purchase consumable supplies: pencils, glue, notebooks, copy paper, markers, chart paper, pens, ink, file folders, flashcards, to support K-5 teachers and 400 students in all academic areas.</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 520-Textbooks | 0441 - Broward Elementary School | UniSIG | | \$385.58 |

| | | | |
|--------|--------|---|--------------|
| | | Notes: The school will purchase a set of Sunshine State Young Readers for K-5 students. 1 set of of K-2 at 192.00 and 1 set of 3-5 at a cost of 129.00. The materials will be used to support guided reading. | |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$139,887.50 |