

Broward County Public Schools

Robert C. Markham Elementary



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Robert C. Markham Elementary

1501 NW 15TH AVE, Pompano Beach, FL 33069

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Shedrick Dukes

Start Date for this Principal: 8/22/2017

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: C (51%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: D (39%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Robert C. Markham Elementary

1501 NW 15TH AVE, Pompano Beach, FL 33069

[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	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	100%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Markham Elementary ensures maximum student progress by developing the whole child in pursuit of academic and social excellence within a safe and secure learning community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Markham Elementary ensures that all scholars receive an individualized approach to an unparalleled quality education through highly engaged collaborative learning, enhanced technology, and global communication in preparation 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
Dukes, Shedrick	Principal	Classroom Observations Supervise School Mission & Operations Alignment of Curriculum & Assessments Budget/School Grants Class Size Reduction (CSR) Faculty/Staff Evaluations Facilities/Construction Management District Updates (PIVOT) Weekly Rtl & Support Staff Meetings SAC/SAF/PTA Weekly Staff Newsletter Partnerships & Chamber of Commerce Monthly Faculty Meetings
Levine, Erica	Assistant Principal	Classroom Observations All Schedules Faculty/Staff Evaluations Monthly Leadership Meetings Communications & Parent Link Safety Team Leader Behavior Support/Discipline Science Contact & Competitions Science Parent Workshops Science Assessments & Analysis Primary Planning K-2 Promotion/Retention Cafeteria & AM/PM Duties
Marshall, Sebrina	Math Coach	Acaletics & Math Blocks Math Parent Workshops (1 per semester) Math IFC Math Assessments & Analysis Student Support Math/Science Planning 3-5 Schoolwide Assessment Schedules SAC Coordinator Math & Science Competitions Weekly Coaches Log
Greenidge, Leanna	Reading Coach	K-5 Power Hour & Balanced Literacy ELA Parent Workshops (1 per semester) ELA Instructional Focus Calendar (IFC) ELA Assessments & Analysis Student Support ELA/Writing Planning 3-5 BAS Facilitator Title I Liaison

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Vocabulary & Spelling Competitions Weekly Coaches Log

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/22/2017, Shedrick Dukes

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

24

Total number of students enrolled at the school

443

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

7

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

7

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	74	78	73	99	72	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	477
Attendance below 90 percent	28	26	25	32	21	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	9	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	2	2	50	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	3	4	2	39	9	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74

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	3	3	0	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 6/25/2021

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	
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	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	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	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	
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				35%	59%	57%	31%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				64%	60%	58%	43%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				73%	54%	53%	53%	51%	48%
Math Achievement				54%	65%	63%	42%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				60%	66%	62%	53%	60%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	53%	51%	54%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				17%	46%	53%	18%	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	33%	60%	-27%	58%	-25%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	43%	62%	-19%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
05	2021					
	2019	20%	59%	-39%	56%	-36%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	57%	65%	-8%	62%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	50%	67%	-17%	64%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
05	2021					
	2019	35%	64%	-29%	60%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	14%	49%	-35%	53%	-39%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady Reading and Math Diagnostics

School City Science CFA1, CFA2 and FSA Science Assessment data was used for 5th grade.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	32%	34%	37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15%	20%	30%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	25%	25%
	English Language Learners	0%	5%	16%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15%	24%	28%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10%	12%	18%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	25%	33%
	English Language Learners	2%	0%	7%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	14%	20%	27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15%	20%	30%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	25%	25%
	English Language Learners	0%	5%	16%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	9%	11%	16%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10%	12%	18%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	25%	33%
	English Language Learners	2%	0%	7%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	20%	20%	34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19%	22%	38%
	Students With Disabilities	8%	23%	15%
	English Language Learners	3%	8%	19%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11%	14%	23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9%	14%	21%
	Students With Disabilities	9%	9%	8%
	English Language Learners	8%	13%	14%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	24%	29%	39%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24%	28%	43%
	Students With Disabilities	14%	11%	25%
	English Language Learners	5%	9%	13%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19%	31%	38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18%	31%	40%
	Students With Disabilities	14%	12%	11%
	English Language Learners	10%	13%	16%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14%	18%	31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15%	15%	29%
	Students With Disabilities	8%	9%	10%
	English Language Learners	8%	17%	29%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24%	25%	32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24%	26%	31%
	Students With Disabilities	9%	20%	8%
	English Language Learners	17%	20%	29%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10/13%	23/29%	5/7%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/15%	20/29%	3/4%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	4/29%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	2/6%	9/27%	3/9%

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	10	14		7	20						
ELL	23	18	7	23	10	20	14				
BLK	25	26		14	5		8				
HSP	21	11	8	22	10	27	12				
FRL	23	21	15	17	7	21	7				
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	9	57	73	23	40	36					
ELL	35	60	67	55	64	57	18				
BLK	36	68	81	55	56	48	21				
HSP	33	58	63	52	65	60	13				
FRL	33	64	76	54	62	56	18				

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		37	40	8	47						
ELL	31	49	55	48	64	72	22				
BLK	28	42	52	35	50	45	12				
HSP	33	44	53	55	61	82	29				
FRL	31	43	51	42	53	53	17				

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	17
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	27
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	136
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	13
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	18
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	18
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	17
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	17
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

The data shows that our Science scores dropped throughout the year and compared to the previous standardized assessment.

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

Science is our area that showed the greatest decline. We continue to emphasize hands-on labs in the primary grades in order to allow students to develop the background knowledge essential to success in the intermediate levels.

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

Students not being able to attend face-to-face instruction was a big hinderance to implementing our plan. In addition, low student attendance and digital engagement were factors. With the return to face-to-face instruction we will need to emphasize cross curricular instruction with Reading and Writing.

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

Although all areas were significantly lower, our ELA learning gains for reading were the highest.

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

We attribute this to being able to provide the reading intervention block.

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

1. Increase Science proficiency in grade 5, by implementing more labs and connecting science to reading and writing lessons.
2. Increase ELA proficiency in grades K-5, by implementing interventions for Tier 3 students
3. Increase SWD proficiency in ELA, by providing additional reading activities and peer learning activities.
4. Increase learning gains in Math lowest quartile, by implementing fluency and daily skills practice.

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.

Professional development will be provided in the following areas:

- University of Florida Literacy Initiative (UFLI) Monthly Learning Communities
- Reading Horizons as a Tier 3 Intervention
- Acaletics Math Training
- Reflex Math Center Practices

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

We will begin to incorporate local tutoring services for students through our after school programs with the YMCA and our 21st Century Community Learning Centers grant. This will allow us to sustain the additional services to targeted students through ongoing partnerships.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In 2019-20 students with Disabilities scored 36% on the Federal Index, which is below the required minimum of 41%. The intent is to increase the proficiency scores of students with disabilities in order to ensure all students make adequate progress.
Measurable Outcome:	By June 2022, Students with Disabilities will score at or above 41% FPPI.
Monitoring:	This goal will be monitored by pulling iReady Diagnostic Reports for SWD in 3rd-5th grades.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Shedrick Dukes (shedrick.dukes@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Increase SWD proficiency by implementing the UFLI small group intervention in the classroom and the addition of Wilson Foundations as a tool for weekly pullout support. The classroom teacher will utilize UFLI and the Educational Support Professional will implement Foundations.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	University of Florida Literacy Initiative (UFLI) is a research based reading intervention that has demonstrated the ability to boost phonemic awareness and fluency. Foundations is a research based program that has demonstrated the same results for students that exhibit significant skills deficiencies. By training all teachers in the UFLI model and providing Foundations as a supplemental program we will be able to target the specific needs of SWD and maintain a portfolio of their progress.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Pre-Assessment in August given by Teachers
2. Weekly intervention labs provided by support personnel
3. Mid-year Assessment given by teachers
4. Tutorials will be provided after school by support staff and community volunteers
5. Modify weekly intervention labs provided by support personnel
6. Post-Assessments in April, prior to the state assessment given by teachers

Person Responsible Erica Levine (erica.levine@browardschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus	In order to increase the proficiency rates of students, teachers must become more effective at implementing higher order learning activities. Students currently scored 24% proficiency on the 2020-21 English Language Arts Florida Standards Assessment.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	By June 2022, 40% of 3rd-5th grade students will score proficient on the English Language Arts Florida Standards Assessment.
Monitoring:	iReady and Benchmark Advance will be utilized to assess student progress. A initial diagnostic will be given by September 2021, a mid-year assessment conducted by January 2022, and an end-of-course diagnostic conducted in March 2022. Data chats will be conducted with each grade level in order to identify target students and areas of weakness in need of focused interventions.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Leanna Greenidge (leanna.greenidge@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The University of Florida Literacy Initiative (UFLI) in conjunction with the district balanced literacy plan will be implemented.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inquiry based learning 2. Standards based instruction 3. Reading content will integrate the science and social studies standards to increase student background knowledge

Action Steps to Implement

1. Weekly Walkthroughs by Instructional Literacy Coaches
2. Literacy coach provides feedback and model lessons, when needed
3. Teachers attend monthly ELA PLC's on UFLI small group instruction strategies
4. Teacher revises instructional strategy, if needed
5. Literacy coach conduct follow-up walkthrough and provide additional feedback

Person Responsible Leanna Greenidge (leanna.greenidge@browardschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

Based on the Safe Schools for Alex report, our school didn't report data to the state in 2019-20. However, data obtained from our district database shows a need to address disruptive behavior. We will monitor this through quarterly district data reports and by providing incentives to students as managed by teachers using ClassDojo.com.

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.

The target for a positive school culture and environment is to continue to increase the level of parent involvement at this school. We have had an upward trend which reflects the increased effort placed upon engaging parents through monthly education-based trainings, School advisory council meetings and student events held in the evenings when parents are more easily accessible. Our goal is to continue to conduct activities, such as Literacy and Math Nights in order to involve all stakeholders in the educational process.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Our stakeholders are staff, students, parents, community and business partners.

Staff assist in obtaining this goal by demonstrating a high level of efficacy and provision of opportunities to celebrate student success.

Students promote a positive culture by demonstrating a willingness to follow the school behavior expectations, which are to 1) Be safe, 2) Be respectful and 3) Be responsible.

Parents support the culture by making sure students get to school everyday, engage with their child at home by following up on homework, reading with them daily, and celebrating their successes.

Community and Business Partners support the culture by volunteering at the school during the day or after school activities, donating incentives and promoting the schools vision to other potential partners.

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				\$23,157.90
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	150-Aides	1671 - Robert C. Markham Elementary	SIG 1003		\$13,972.00
			Notes: MES: Fund 80% of salary and fringe for one paraprofessional to support the implementation of Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) and content area interventions in all grade levels through the use of small group instruction.			

	5100	150-Aides	1671 - Robert C. Markham Elementary	SIG 1003		\$9,185.90
			<i>Notes: Fringe Benefits for 50% Paraprofessional</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$82,401.83
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6300	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	1671 - Robert C. Markham Elementary	SIG 1003		\$37,489.60
			<i>Notes: MES: Fund 80% of one Instructional Coach to support the implementation of Balanced Literacy and hands on learning in all content areas of study</i>			
	6300	200-Employee Benefits	1671 - Robert C. Markham Elementary	SIG 1003		\$14,110.92
			<i>Notes: Instructional Coach Fringe Benefits</i>			
	6400	140-Substitute Teachers	1671 - Robert C. Markham Elementary	SIG 1003		\$15,456.00
			<i>Notes: MES: Fund 80% of salary and fringe for one pool sub to be at the school daily so teachers can attend professional development with no gaps in instruction for students.</i>			
	6400	200-Employee Benefits	1671 - Robert C. Markham Elementary	SIG 1003		\$1,845.31
			<i>Notes: Pool Sub Fringe Benefits</i>			
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	1671 - Robert C. Markham Elementary	SIG 1003		\$11,700.00
			<i>Notes: 15 K-5 Teachers will participate in professional learning on core content instruction</i>			
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	1671 - Robert C. Markham Elementary	SIG 1003		\$1,800.00
			<i>Notes: Instructional Coaches will participate in professional learning on core content instruction</i>			
Total:						\$105,559.73