

Broward County Public Schools

Pompano Beach Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

Pompano Beach Elementary School

700 NE 13TH AVE, Pompano Beach, FL 33060

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Shezette Blue Small

Start Date for this Principal: 2/8/2017

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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (45%)
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	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Pompano Beach Elementary School

700 NE 13TH AVE, Pompano Beach, FL 33060

[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	86%
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	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.

Pompano Beach Elementary School strives to inspire a love of learning by meeting each child's academic, social, and emotional needs while challenging all students to become productive citizens in our ever-changing global community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Pompano Beach Elementary our vision is to ensure equity throughout the educational and social environments through the use of diverse quality leadership and instructional approaches to classroom and social experiences.

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
Blue-Small, Shezette	Principal	To provide the leadership and management necessary to administer and supervise all programs, policies and activities of the school to ensure high quality educational experiences and services for the students in a safe and enriching environment.
Odom, Germaine	Assistant Principal	To assist the principal in providing vision and leadership to develop, administer and monitor high quality educational programs that optimize the human and material resources, including time and space, available for a successful and safe school program for students, staff and community.
Foster, Shamelle	Science Coach	The instructional coach will provide personalized support based on identified needs of individual teachers and differentiated supports that foster the growth and development of teachers. In addition, the goal of the coach is to improve and sustain student achievement by promoting a culture for learning to include all stakeholders, by enhancing and refining instruction and intervention, providing targeted instructional coaching and building capacity across the curriculum.
Monroe, Tiffany	Reading Coach	The instructional coach will provide personalized support based on identified needs of individual teachers and differentiated supports that foster the growth and development of teachers. In addition, the goal of the coach is to improve and sustain student achievement by promoting a culture for learning to include all stakeholders, by enhancing and refining instruction and intervention, providing targeted instructional coaching and building capacity across the curriculum.
Parrish, Blanche	Math Coach	The instructional coach will provide personalized support based on identified needs of individual teachers and differentiated supports that foster the growth and development of teachers. In addition, the goal of the coach is to improve and sustain student achievement by promoting a culture for learning to include all stakeholders, by enhancing and refining instruction and intervention, providing targeted instructional coaching and building capacity across the curriculum.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 2/8/2017, Shezette Blue Small

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

5

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

30

Total number of students enrolled at the school

467

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

2

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

3

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	83	73	60	88	79	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	438
Attendance below 90 percent	44	34	32	29	29	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	180
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	1	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	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	8	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	2	0	1	8	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/30/2021

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	71	93	68	86	75	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	443
Attendance below 90 percent	22	14	15	10	16	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
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	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	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	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	71	93	68	86	75	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	443
Attendance below 90 percent	22	14	15	10	16	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
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	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	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	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data 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				37%	59%	57%	30%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				60%	60%	58%	42%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	54%	53%	57%	51%	48%
Math Achievement				50%	65%	63%	42%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				66%	66%	62%	50%	60%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				61%	53%	51%	38%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				31%	46%	53%	44%	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	34%	60%	-26%	58%	-24%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	48%	62%	-14%	58%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				
05	2021					
	2019	23%	59%	-36%	56%	-33%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	51%	65%	-14%	62%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	51%	67%	-16%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2021					
	2019	42%	64%	-22%	60%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	28%	49%	-21%	53%	-25%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

In ELA and Math we currently use iReady to monitor for grades K-5
 In Science we use School City to monitor for grades 3-5

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	58/27	60/27.7	60/44.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/27.5	17/28.3	27/45
	Students With Disabilities	2/28.6	2/25	5/55.6
	English Language Learners	2/15.4	2/15.4	6/42.9
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	72/36.1	71/45	75/69.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/15.5	15/25.5	26/42.6
	Students With Disabilities	7/0	8/12.5	9/44.4
	English Language Learners	2/15.4	2/15.4	2/14.3

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	56/17.9	55/27.3	51/39.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	51/17.6	50/30	47/38.3
	Students With Disabilities	9/22.2	9/33.3	8/50
	English Language Learners	17/0	16/6.3	14/21.4
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	53/7.5	53/13.2	53/37.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	48/8.3	48/14.6	48/35.4
	Students With Disabilities	8/0	9/0	9/11.1
	English Language Learners	16/0	16/0	16/37.5
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	77/29.9	78/41.6	78/50
	Economically Disadvantaged	66/30.3	66/42.4	66/53
	Students With Disabilities	18/16.7	18/22.2	18/33.3
	English Language Learners	8/12.5	8/25	10/10
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	77/11.7	77/20.8	79/29.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	66/12.1	66/21.2	67/28.4
	Students With Disabilities	18/11.1	18/27.8	18/16.7
	English Language Learners	8/0	8/0	10/20

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	69/21.7	69/33.3	72/36.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	59/18.6	59/27.1	62/29
	Students With Disabilities	11/0	11/18.2	12/8.3
	English Language Learners	9/0	9/0	9/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	68/14.7	70/28.6	72/41.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	58/8.6	60/21.7	62/37.1
	Students With Disabilities	11/0	11/18.2	13/23.1
	English Language Learners	9/0	8/0	8/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	46/34.8	49/32.7	48/37.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	40/35	41/34.1	40/37.5
	Students With Disabilities	13/15.4	13/7.7	12/16.7
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/0	1/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	46/34.8	49/32.7	48/37.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	41/24.4	41/26.8	41/56.1
	Students With Disabilities	12/0	13/7.7	12/33.3
	English Language Learners	1/0	1/0	1/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	42/42	44/27.3	51/33
	Economically Disadvantaged	39/46	41/29	48/37
	Students With Disabilities	3/0	3/1	3/0
	English Language Learners	18/44	16/50	20/40
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

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	20	25		11			17				
ELL	30	27		30	27						
BLK	31	39	45	28	19	30	29				
HSP	36			30							
WHT	44			56							
FRL	32	39	43	27	22	17	32				
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	19	49	48	30	56	57	15				
ELL	42	61	53	50	68	62	35				
BLK	32	60	58	48	65	60	31				
HSP	41	59	50	54	68	64	33				
WHT	45	58		45	62						
FRL	37	61	53	51	67	63	31				
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	6	41	53	18	47	38	13				
ELL	14	28	50	37	42	20	36				
BLK	26	44	73	41	49	48	43				
HSP	35	47	36	45	50	23	38				
WHT	39	20		39	53		60				
FRL	30	42	56	43	50	37	43				

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	32
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	28
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	252
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	15
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	28
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	32
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	32
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	
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	50
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	30
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?

After data analysis, it is evident we must engage our ELL student population to increase their proficiency in both ELA and Math. The data indicates the need to support language acquisition so they can effectively engage with grade level content.

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

The need to increase our level of student proficiency and learning gains in ELA and Math are necessary. Progress monitoring data indicates foundational skills need to be strengthened in primary grades, ensuring scholars are prepared to handle the rigor of intermediate standards.

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

In effort to positively impact student achievement and growth, instructional strategies professional development will be conducted to appropriately support teachers in scaffolding ELL students with all content areas.

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

Overall students showed the most growth in math increasing from 36% to 69% as measured by Fall/ Spring iReady assessment.

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

Factors contributing to student improvement were the use of school-wide iReady (ELA & Math) program, teacher trainings (UFLI Small group instructional model), and Extended Learning Opportunities for students in kindergarten through 5th grade.

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

Strategies that will be implemented to accelerate learning are hands-on activities, differentiated instructions across curriculum, the use of technology to enhance lessons and student product.

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.

Collaborative Planning will provide support for teachers and leaders. During the collaborative planning time, teachers plan how to effectively

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

Teachers will participate in Professional Learning Communities (PLC) to continuously analyze data and share best practices to positively impact student achievement and growth.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Teachers continue to need professional development on delivering high quality instruction in order to increase student achievement and learning, implementation of rigorous standard-based lessons and activities, and technology integration as evident by data collected on the iReady AP1 ELA assessment. The data shows 19% of the overall student population is proficient in ELA.

Measurable Outcome: By December 2021, 50% of students will be classified as Tier 1 and/or 2 on the iReady ELA AP2 Diagnostic Assessment.

Monitoring: iReady ELA AP1 data will be analyzed by teachers and the leadership team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Shezette Blue-Small (blue-small@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will receive professional learning courses from the the implementation of the uncommon lesson plans, which include explicit standards-based instruction to increase achievement in ELA, Math, and Science.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This specific strategy was selected due to the Professional Learning and Growth (TPLG) Department because these courses for each content area will take place via Microsoft TEAMS throughout the school year. Teachers will then be able to analyze and determine the standards they need to address and delve deeper with their students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Leadership team will collect, monitor, and analyze student data to identify areas of gaps pertaining to standards. Based on this information teachers will receive professional learning training from the Elementary Learning Department, TPLG Department, and/or Cadre 8 Instructional Facilitators.
2. Based on areas of weakness, the leadership team will collaborate with teachers to implement research-based strategies and interventions needed to address areas of weakness continuing to develop strengths.
3. SchoolCity, iReady, and PBES data charts will be used to monitor student achievement and learning gains. This will drive team and/or individual data chats, and instructional goals/steps in the classroom.

Person Responsible: Shezette Blue-Small (blue-small@browardschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on 2020/2021 FSA ELA data, 64% of our third graders, 66% of our fourth graders and 71% of our fifth graders did not meet proficiency.

Measurable Outcome: By June 2022, 45% of our third through fifth graders will be proficient in ELA as measured by FSA.

Monitoring: The area of focus will be monitored using iReady Diagnostic assessments (Beginning, Middle and End) as well as Common Formative Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Shezette Blue-Small (blue-small@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Evidence-based resources and materials will be used to address ELA standards in grades 3 through 5. iReady LAFS as well as Benchmark Advance lessons and student consumable books will be utilized in the classroom to teach and assess each standard. ESSER teachers will provide support in the form of a push-in model to remediate, reteach and enrich standards in a small group setting.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Historical data has shown that use of iReady LAF resources and materials yield academic success. The technology component of iReady provides teachers and students with immediate feedback on how each student is progressing with lessons and attaining growth towards proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

Common Formative Assessments will be analyze after each three week instructional cycle to determine our progress in achieving our goal of 45% proficiency in ELA. Additionally, after each iReady diagnostic, data chats will be hosted with both teachers and students to set goals and action steps to achieve them.

Person Responsible Tiffany Monroe (tiffany.monroe@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.

To address the school-wide improvement area of focus, the leadership team will track & monitor students attendance and behavior referrals using DMS and we will implement a reward system for students, teachers and parents.

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.

To promote a positive culture throughout our school, we embrace strategies learned at Ron Clark Academy (Door greetings, morning minute of reflection, Scan the room, Respect first, Teams/Houses, Engage & Enrich). We also stress the importance of respecting everyone who is a part of the Pompano Beach Elementary family. Students, families, and educators work together to develop and live a shared school vision. Our school embraces positivity and all activities focus on creating a culture of positive behaviors from all.

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

United Way Reading Pals - They provide 1-on-1 support to our scholars through reading and they give resources (books, financial donations, school supplies)

Publix Supermarket - They are host to our annual Publix Math Night event and they provide us with desserts and supplies throughout the year

PBN Church - They support all school initiatives and help supply our rewards/incentives for various contests/activities

Kiwanis of Pompano - They meet monthly with our Kiwanis Kids Club members and they give awards to our scholars to recognize them for being good citizens,

AXA - makes financial donations to our school to support school initiatives.

Washington Mutual - Hosts monthly Positive Promotional meetings to recognize educators in various areas.

Parents of Pompano - Support our scholars academically, socially and emotionally. They come out to night events, they send in necessary supplies and resources and they support all school initiatives.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning				\$3,061.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	0751 - Pompano Beach Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$1,500.00

			<i>Notes: We will use the School Accountability funds to purchase necessary curricular resources to promote student achievement in Math, ELA and Science. Some examples are Wordly Wise for Vocabulary,</i>			
5100	500-Materials and Supplies	0751 - Pompano Beach Elementary School	School Improvement Funds			\$1,561.00
			<i>Notes: We will use the School Accountability funds to purchase necessary curricular resources to promote student achievement in Math, ELA and Science. Some examples are agenda books, communication folders other supplies needed.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$0.00
					Total:	\$3,061.00