Park Lakes Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Park Lakes Elementary School

3925 N STATE ROAD 7, Lauderdale Lakes, FL 33319

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Rhonda Parris   Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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: B (58%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (42%)
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	
* 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

Park Lakes Elementary School

3925 N STATE ROAD 7, Lauderdale Lakes, FL 33319

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	81%

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

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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.

Park Lakes Elementary is committed to motivate all students to develop their potential, become life-long learners and be contributing members of our community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our goal is to offer all students an opportunity to excel in academics and social-emotional learning through real-world literacy and state-of-the-art teaching. In collaboration with parents, community, and stakeholders; our scholars will become global citizens for College and Career Readiness.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Parris, Rhonda	Principal	The school principal oversees the daily activities and operations within a school. Their main duties include disciplining or advising students, approving Teachers' curriculums, and ensuring the school environment is safe for all students and staff members.
Johnson, Wendell	Assistant Principal	The assistant principals deal with the issues of school management, student activities and services, community relations, personnel, and curriculum instruction. Mr. Johnson coordinates with the principal to assist in defining and enforcing school policies and guidelines for students, staff, and faculty.
Glasford, Terri	Assistant Principal	The assistant principals deal with the issues of school management, student activities and services, community relations, personnel, and curriculum instruction. Mrs. Glasford's coordinates with the principals and to assist in defining and enforcing school policies and guidelines for students, staff, and faculty.
Powell, Nelsha	Instructional Coach	Ms. Powell works with educators to identify issues with students or curriculum, set goals, and solve problems. Collaborate with educators and school administrators to develop curriculum and lesson plans. She also helps teachers conduct student assessments and analyze student work.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/1/2017, Rhonda Parris

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.*

7

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

56

Total number of students enrolled at the school

952

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	163	148	162	164	182	164	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	983
Attendance below 90 percent	55	54	45	50	63	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	316
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	15	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	12	25	21	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60

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	2	8	14	23	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71

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	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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

Monday 10/4/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	

2020-21 - 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	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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				53%	59%	57%	45%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				64%	60%	58%	60%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				64%	54%	53%	60%	51%	48%
Math Achievement				61%	65%	63%	47%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				73%	66%	62%	58%	60%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55%	53%	51%	47%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				35%	46%	53%	32%	49%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	47%	60%	-13%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	54%	62%	-8%	58%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2021					
	2019	46%	59%	-13%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	55%	65%	-10%	62%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	63%	67%	-4%	64%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2021					
	2019	55%	64%	-9%	60%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	34%	49%	-15%	53%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Park Lakes Elementary will use i-Ready as a progress monitoring tool for grades Kindergarten through Fifth Grades.

Grade 1			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36	29.2	36
	Economically Disadvantaged	36.5	33.1	37.8
	Students With Disabilities	30.8	23.1	53.9
	English Language Learners	25.7	7.5	12.5
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	22.7	17	24.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	26.6	18.9	25.7
	Students With Disabilities	21.4	36.2	28.5
	English Language Learners	13.5	5.1	7.7

Grade 2			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	28.4	27.8	35.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	27.1.	28.8	35.5
	Students With Disabilities	23.8	25	26
	English Language Learners	18.6	19.4	28.6
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15.7	18.6	23.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	14.9	14.9	24.3
	Students With Disabilities	10	11.2	10.6
	English Language Learners	12.7	15.7	23

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30.1	38	39.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	32.8	41.3	40.3
	Students With Disabilities	20	20	10
	English Language Learners	13.67	11.9	22.3
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	8.7	16.9	26.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	7.6	18.2	26
	Students With Disabilities	10	10	20
	English Language Learners	4.8	9.3	23.3

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16.9	20.3	25
	Economically Disadvantaged	16.7	20.9	27.2
	Students With Disabilities	6.4	10	11.1
	English Language Learners	6.06	8.6	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12.9	19	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	13.4	19.2	0
	Students With Disabilities	3.1	3.2	0
	English Language Learners	3.1	9.1	0

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21.5	31.6	31.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	32.5	35.7	32.3
	Students With Disabilities	23.1	15.3	5.9
	English Language Learners	3.1	12.5	7.1
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23.4	33.1	34.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	28.1	36.9	35.3
	Students With Disabilities	20	11.5	18.8
	English Language Learners	21.1	20.5	12.5
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			33
	Economically Disadvantaged			35
	Students With Disabilities			11
	English Language Learners			12

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	30	37	27	28	37	42	16				
ELL	48	63	71	36	37	47	33				
BLK	47	57	68	35	27	29	32				
HSP	46	76		42	43		39				
FRL	48	58	68	36	30	32	35				
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	26	55	53	30	56	38	5				
ELL	53	68	69	64	78	55	38				
BLK	54	65	64	61	73	55	33				
HSP	43	61	67	58	77	60	41				
FRL	52	64	65	60	73	55	34				

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	51	65	19	43	42	25				
ELL	35	57	54	42	60	47	12				
BLK	46	63	64	46	57	50	29				
HSP	38	48	33	51	63		44				
FRL	45	60	60	47	59	47	33				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	308
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	93%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	

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%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	42
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

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%	

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%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

According to the 2021 Florida Standards Assessment data, the overall reading proficiency was 34% and the school's goal is 50%. When the ELA data was disaggregated, the Reporting Categories/ Subskills areas declined in percentages for Craft and Structure (54% in 2019 to 42% in 2021), Integration of Knowledge (42% in 2019 to 37% in 2021), Language and Editing Tasks (81% in 2019 to 64% in 2021). In addition, grades 3-5 Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup of students (Lowest 25%) displayed deficiency on the ELA Reporting Categories/Subskills of Key Ideas and Details, Craft and Structure, and Integration of Knowledge. These critical areas fell below the 50% proficiency goal within each domain.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on progress monitoring and the third-grade 2019 Florida Standards Assessment, the greatest needs for improvement are the ELA Reporting Categories/Subskills of Key Ideas and Details (43% proficient) and Integration of Knowledge and Ideas (42% proficient). The school's goal is to achieve 50% or higher in each ELA Reporting Category/Subskill.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The contributing factors to this need for improvement are students who are reading one to two years below grade level. These students exhibit weaknesses in fluency and comprehension, which impede their ability to comprehend complex text as tested on the 2019 Florida Standards Assessment. With this in mind, a new plan of action was developed to address these needs for improvement. Students receive daily small group differentiated instruction focusing on specific standards within Key Ideas and Details along with standards within Integration of Knowledge and Ideas. Furthermore, teachers utilize i-Ready to assign 3-4 differentiated reading lessons to remediate and reteach students' areas of weaknesses.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based on the third-grade 2019 Florida Standards Assessment and progress monitoring, the ELA Reporting Category that showed the most improvement is Language and Editing Tasks at 81% proficient. Although the proficiency decreased in Language and Editing Tasks at 81% in 2019 and 64% in 2021, these data components remain the most improved in ELA.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The contributing factors to this improvement were daily exposure to grammar and editing lessons. Students receive an allotted amount of time every day during the ELA block to practice and enrich their knowledge of language and editing. Teachers teach language standards explicitly and implicitly for a minimum of fifteen minutes. In turn, students then apply the knowledge learned through Daily Paragraph Editing tasks and authentic writing activities.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

According to Park Lakes Elementary 3rd grade FSA ELA data, the area of concern is in the subcategory of Integration of Knowledge (37%). To accelerate learning in this area students complete

ELA embedded performance tasks that increase student collaboration and student time in authentic texts. Students build stamina throughout the day by reading from varieties of genres and comparing and contrasting information from two pieces of text. Students are exposed to different Lexile levels increasing the complexity of the text. Teachers use guided reading to individualize support to increase fluency and comprehension. Furthermore, iReady technology is used to accelerate students. Teachers assign and monitor standards-based lessons to accelerate learning in their classrooms.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, the professional development opportunities provided at the school to support teachers and leaders are Professional Learning Communities (PLC) and Professional Planning Days (PPD), which are days specified for teachers to plan for their students. Teachers received iReady training while leaders support by monitoring the student data. iReady lesson paths are adjusted to meet the needs of the students and the needs of the class. Additional support was granted, through Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief Funds (ESSER) funds for small group instruction to decrease the amount of learning loss.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

The additional services that will be implemented to ensure the sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond are incorporating instructional reading strategies and assisting teachers with pedagogy. The instructional reading strategies and assisting teachers with pedagogy are described more in-depth below:

Instructional Strategies

- Close Reading

- Reading Comprehension Strategies

*Predict, Visualize, Ask Questions, Make Connection, Infer, & Summarize

- Accountable Talk with Academic Vocabulary & Language

- Deeper Dive in B.E.S.T. Standards

Teacher Pedagogy

- Analyze and Evaluate Student Data to Inform Instruction

- Planning for Academic Success

- Differentiated Instruction in Small Group

- Provide Authentic Real-Time Feedback

- High Expectations for All Learners

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The data reviewed showed ELA proficiency in grades 3-5 has had a steady increase from 45% to 53% in 2019 and a decrease to 47% in 2021. However, during the 2020-2021 school year, due to virtual third-grade students that were not present during live Teams instruction, proficiency fell below 50% or higher in ELA. In addition, the data shows a three-year trend of the subgroup SWD students in grades 3-5 ELA significantly remained below 50% in ELA achievement through 2021.
Measurable Outcome:	By May 2022, students who fell below 50% proficiency in ELA who are now present for face-to-face instruction will show an increase in proficiency resulting in overall proficiency of over 50% proficiency in grades 3-5. By May 2022, students in grades 3-5 SWD subgroup will show at least a 10 percentage points increase on the EOY summative assessment
Monitoring:	Students will be monitored through various assessments including ongoing Cold Read Assessments, a Mock Assessment, iReady, District ELA Assessments, student work samples, and select students with BAS/ORR.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jaqueline McKinnis (jaqueline.mckinnis@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will model what good readers do before, during, and after reading such as creating a purpose for reading, asking questions, finding evidence from the text, and modeling fluent reading. Standards-based lessons will be taught using resources from Elementary Learning, CPALMS, district/cadre resources, and Professional books related to Balanced Literacy and the Reading Strategies Book by Jennifer Serravallo. Interactive Read Aloud and/or Close Reading will be implemented daily with Think-Alouds. Research-based small group instruction will take place daily focusing on ELA standards and comprehension strategies. Comprehension strategies include questioning, visualizing, previewing text, making connections, predicting, making inferences, summarizing, and self-monitoring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for selecting evidence-based strategies was based on research-based strategies for improving reading comprehension. These strategies will support the learners in increasing comprehension knowledge to be successful learners.
Action Steps to Implement	

· Monitor Attendance: Guidance Counselor/ School Social Worker

· Push in Support: ESSER Teachers/ Literacy Coach

· ELO Camps: Literacy Coach

· ELA team planning: Lead Teacher/ Literacy Coach

· iReady: Classroom Teacher/ Leadership Team

· Standard Aligned Resources: Literacy Coach/ Classroom Teacher

· Incentives for student success: Administration/ Literacy Coach/ Teacher

Person Responsible   Terri Glasford (terri.glasford@browardschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

The school culture and environment will be monitored by the school's discipline committee. The committee will meet monthly to discuss the recent student offenders and follow up on supports and services for students to address behavior concerns and student social-emotional health.

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.

Park Lakes Elementary School's leadership team builds a positive school culture and learning environment by engaging parents in our school culture which provides a platform for feedback on schoolwide and classroom activities. The leadership team moves beyond parent-teacher meetings and organizes workshops where teachers and parents can discuss homework, study skills, and tests. Involving parents in school activities is a meaningful way to foster positive feelings between the school and the stakeholders. We generate vibrant communication through our newsletters and parent links in an effort to avoid misunderstandings and feelings of mistrust with our parents. In addition to this, we ask parents to be on event committees or to participate in school-wide events. In addition to this, we have also established a "Parent University" in which we have developed educational programs for parents that help involve them in their children's schooling, therefore building a more positive atmosphere at Park Lakes Elementary School.

The "Positive Culture and Environment," at Park Lakes Elementary starts by celebrating student personal achievements and good behavior. We participate in three district initiatives the "Rethink ED", "Sanford Harmony," and "Start with Hello/Save the Promise," programs to help the students at Park Lakes Elementary School feel that they are cared for individually. We acknowledge students and staff who participate in building a positive school culture on the campus. The leadership team provides positive reinforcement for staff members who meet the academic goals of the school during the day or week. Moreover, we encourage staff, students, and stakeholders by giving them specific compliments which highlight what each individual has done well at Park Lakes Elementary School to maintain the positive

culture and environment.

<div style="background-color:#a0bde8;padding:8px">Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.</div>

The stakeholders at Park Lakes Elementary School are the individuals that are invested in the welfare and success of all our students. The stakeholders at our school are administrators, staff members, students, parents, families, community members, local business leaders, and elected officials. A stakeholder's primary role is to assist Park Lakes Elementary School in meeting its strategic academic objectives for all scholars. We conduct an annual "Partners Breakfast," for partner stakeholders which allows them to donate necessary materials and resources that assist in delivering quality teaching and learning that promote equity and engages all students. Additionally, we have two stakeholder partnerships the "Pink Girls," and "5000 Role Models of excellence," to encourage cooperative student group work activities that foster positive and supportive relationships with the school and community. The leadership team communicates and collaborates with stakeholders at the school and has built a positive culture on the campus. Park Lakes Elementary School has promoted a healthy relationship between all their stakeholders working together harmoniously and creating a positive learning environment for the scholars.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$5,280.91
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	3336	500-Materials and Supplies	3761 - Park Lakes Elementary School	Title, I Part A	295.0	$950.28
			Notes: Heggerty Phonemic Awareness			
	3336	500-Materials and Supplies	3761 - Park Lakes Elementary School	Title, I Part A	166.0	$1,113.00
			Notes: School Specialty Instruction and Intervention			
	3336	530-Periodicals	3761 - Park Lakes Elementary School	Title, I Part A	75.0	$700.43
			Notes: Scholastic Classroom Magazines			
	3336	500-Materials and Supplies	3761 - Park Lakes Elementary School	Title, I Part A	160.0	$1,944.80
			Notes: Curriculum Associates			
	3336	529-Technology-Related Textbooks	3761 - Park Lakes Elementary School	Title, I Part A	351.0	$572.40
			Notes: Top Score			
					Total:	$5,280.91