**Broward County Public Schools** 

# Hollywood Central 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       | 19 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 21 |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 22 |

# **Hollywood Central Elementary School**

1700 MONROE ST, Hollywood, FL 33020

[ no web address on file ]

#### **Demographics**

**Principal: Delicia Decembert** 

Start Date for this Principal: 9/17/2021

| 2019-20 Status<br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
|---|--|
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)   | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| 2020-21 Title I School  | Yes  |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)   | 95%  |
| 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* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History   | 2018-19: C (44%)<br>2017-18: C (47%)<br>2016-17: C (45%)   |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Inf   | ormation*  |
| 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. F   | or 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 <a href="https://www.floridacims.org">www.floridacims.org</a>.

#### 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       | 19 |
| Title I Requirements           | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 22 |

### **Hollywood Central Elementary School**

1700 MONROE ST, Hollywood, FL 33020

[ no web address on file ]

#### **School Demographics**

| School Type and Gr<br>(per MSID I |          | 2020-21 Title I School | Disadvan            | I Economically<br>taged (FRL) Rate<br>rted on Survey 3) |
|-----------------------------------|----------|------------------------|---------------------|---|
| Elementary S<br>PK-5              | school   | Yes                    |                     | 70%   |
| Primary Servio<br>(per MSID I     |          | Charter School         | (Report             | 9 Minority Rate<br>ed as Non-white<br>Survey 2)         |
| K-12 General E                    | ducation | No                     |                     | 79%   |
| School Grades Histo               | ry       |                        |                     |   |
| Year<br>Grade                     | 2020-21  | <b>2019-20</b><br>C    | <b>2018-19</b><br>C | <b>2017-18</b><br>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 <a href="https://www.floridaCIMS.org">https://www.floridaCIMS.org</a>.

#### **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.

The mission of Hollywood Central Elementary school and community is to deliver a quality education to all students by providing a safe, orderly, and caring environment, while offering well planned learning opportunities and stressing high but individualized expectations.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Hollywood Central Elementary School vision statement is aligned to the following guiding principles:

We believe every student has the right to a quality education.

We believe every student can learn, but in different ways and at different times.

We believe a safe, orderly, and caring environment is necessary for learning.

We believe every student has the right to be treated with respect.

We believe every student's achievement will rise to the level of expectation.

We believe quality education results from a partnership that is shared among the home, school, and community.

We believe the ultimate success of democracy is dependent upon the quality of public education.

We believe students should be taught to "learn how to learn."

We believe that to meet the challenges of change, risks must be taken.

We believe that all student and staff should have experiences that develop interpersonal skills and sensitivity in working with others of diverse backgrounds and abilities.

#### **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<br>Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|-----------------------|------------------------|--|
| Decembert,<br>Delicia | Principal              | The job duties and responsibilities of the Principal of Hollywood Central Elementary School (Delicia Decembert) is established for the purpose of promoting and maintaining high student achievement by providing curricular and instructional leadership, maintaining overall school site operations; receiving, distributing and communication information to enforce school, District and State policies; maintaining a safe school environment; coordinating site activities and communicating information to staff, students, parents, and community members.   |
| Heverly,<br>Kelly     | Assistant<br>Principal | The job duties and responsibilities of Assistant Principal (Kelly Heverly) of Hollywood Central Elementary is to assist the building principal in organizing and fostering a positive, safe environment that is conducive to best meeting the needs of all students, staff, and parents. This includes responsibilities as: leading, directing, counseling, and supervising a variety of personnel and programs; creating effective parent, teacher, child communications, supporting, encouraging, mentoring, and evaluating staff; fostering teamwork between teachers and among staff and parents, and managing budget items.   |
| Eutsey,<br>Lisa       | Instructional<br>Coach | The Literacy Coach/Instructional Coach will support K-5 staff in the implementation of the site reading plan and program. The Literacy Coach will work directly with teachers at Hollywood Central by providing classroom-based demonstrations, collaborative, and one-on-one support, and facilitating teacher inquiry and related professional development. The Literacy Coach will also focus on enhancing teachers' ability to provide instruction that builds students' sense of engagement in the ownership of leadership. Moreover, the Literacy Coach works with administrations and teachers to collect and analyze data, interpret, and use it to guide instructional decisions. |
|                       | School<br>Counselor    | Ms. LaBruto offers individual counseling to help students resolve personal or interpersonal problems. They may also offer small group counseling to help students enhance listening and social skills, learn to empathize with others, and find social support through healthy peer relationships.   |

#### **Demographic Information**

#### Principal start date

Friday 9/17/2021, Delicia Decembert

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

1

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

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

21

Total number of students enrolled at the school

335

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

1

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

2

**Demographic Data** 

#### **Early Warning Systems**

#### 2021-22

#### The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator  | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |  |
|--|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| Indicator  | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |  |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 48          | 66 | 81 | 59 | 65 | 66 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 385   |  |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 23          | 21 | 30 | 20 | 29 | 16 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 139   |  |
| 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 FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 3  | 16 | 19 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 38    |  |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 2  | 16 | 18 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 36    |  |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 4           | 7  | 18 | 15 | 14 | 14 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 144   |  |

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

| Indicator                            |   |   |   |   |   | Gr | ade | e Le | evel | l |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|------|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                            | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6   | 7    | 8    | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| 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 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |  |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| indicator                           | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |  |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |  |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |  |

#### Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/29/2021

#### 2020-21 - As Reported

#### The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator                                 | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                                 | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| 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                            |   |   |   |   |   | Gr | ade | e Le | vel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                            | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6   | 7    | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| 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 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |  |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| indicator                           | K | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |  |
| 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 |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                                 | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled               | 48          | 66 | 81 | 59 | 65 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 385   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 23          | 21 | 30 | 20 | 29 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 139   |
| 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  | 3  | 16 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 38    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 2  | 16 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 36    |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |    |    |    |    |   |   |   | Total |    |    |    |       |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator                             | K           | 1 | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9     | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| Students with two or more indicators | 3           | 1 | 11 | 10 | 14 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     | 0  | 0  | 0  | 56    |

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

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

## 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).

| Sahaal Crada Campanant      |        | 2021     |       |        | 2019     |       |        | 2018     |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| School Grade Component      | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             |        |          |       | 43%    | 59%      | 57%   | 43%    | 56%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 59%    | 60%      | 58%   | 59%    | 57%      | 55%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 56%    | 54%      | 53%   | 52%    | 51%      | 48%   |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 39%    | 65%      | 63%   | 47%    | 62%      | 62%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 47%    | 66%      | 62%   | 48%    | 60%      | 59%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 32%    | 53%      | 51%   | 34%    | 47%      | 47%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 31%    | 46%      | 53%   | 49%    | 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-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 03         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 37%    | 60%      | -23%                              | 58%   | -21%                           |
| Cohort Con | nparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 04         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 44%    | 62%      | -18%                              | 58%   | -14%                           |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -37%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 05         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 45%    | 59%      | -14%                              | 56%   | -11%                           |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -44%   |          |                                   | •     |                                |

|           |          |        | MATH     |                                   |       |                                |
|-----------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade     | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 03        | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     | 31%    | 65%      | -34%                              | 62%   | -31%                           |
| Cohort Co | mparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 04        | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     | 38%    | 67%      | -29%                              | 64%   | -26%                           |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -31%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 05        | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     | 44%    | 64%      | -20%                              | 60%   | -16%                           |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -38%   |          |                                   | •     |                                |

|            |          |        | SCIEN    | CE                                |       |                                |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade      | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 05         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 30%    | 49%      | -19%                              | 53%   | -23%                           |
| Cohort Con | nparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |

#### **Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments**

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

The progress monitoring tool(s) that were used to compile the data below for Hollywood Central is the iReady Online Program. This online program helps students' teachers(s) to determine students' needs, personalize their learning, and monitor progress throughout the school year. iReady allows the teachers to meet the students exactly where they are which assists in providing the data to increase the students; learning gains. Moreover, the iReady Diagnostic were also used to as an adaptive assessment that adjusts its questions to suit the students' needs.

|                          |  | Grade 1                                  |   |   |
|--------------------------|--|--|---|---|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall                                     | Winter                                    | Spring                                    |
|                          | All Students   | 66                                       | 66  | 66  |
| English Language<br>Arts | Economically Disadvantaged   | 31.4%                                    | 33.3%                                     | 35.9%                                     |
|                          | Students With Disabilities   | 55.6%                                    | 55.6%                                     | 77.8%                                     |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners   | 45.5%                                    | 30%                                       | 8.3%                                      |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall                                     | Winter                                    | Spring                                    |
|                          | All Students   | 66                                       | 66  | 66  |
| Mathematics              | Economically Disadvantaged   | 33.3%                                    | 20%                                       | 36.1%                                     |
|                          | Students With Disabilities   | 62.5%                                    | 55.6%                                     | 66.7%                                     |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners   | 44.4%                                    | 7.7%                                      | 16.7%                                     |
|                          |  | Out de 0                                 |   |   |
|                          |  | Grade 2                                  |   |   |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall                                     | Winter                                    | Spring                                    |
|                          | Proficiency All Students   |  | Winter<br>81                              | Spring<br>81                              |
| English Language<br>Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged  | Fall                                     |   |   |
|                          | Proficiency  All Students  Economically  Disadvantaged  Students With  Disabilities  | Fall<br>81                               | 81  | 81  |
|                          | Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners  | Fall<br>81<br>25%                        | 81<br>36%                                 | 81<br>46%                                 |
|                          | Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners  Number/% Proficiency  | Fall<br>81<br>25%<br>14.3%<br>0%<br>Fall | 81<br>36%<br>12.5%<br>20%<br>Winter       | 81<br>46%<br>25%<br>29.4%<br>Spring       |
|                          | Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners  Number/% Proficiency  All Students                            | Fall<br>81<br>25%<br>14.3%<br>0%         | 81<br>36%<br>12.5%<br>20%                 | 81<br>46%<br>25%<br>29.4%                 |
|                          | Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners  Number/% Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall<br>81<br>25%<br>14.3%<br>0%<br>Fall | 81<br>36%<br>12.5%<br>20%<br>Winter       | 81<br>46%<br>25%<br>29.4%<br>Spring       |
| Arts                     | Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners  Number/% Proficiency  All Students Economically               | Fall 81 25% 14.3% 0% Fall 81             | 81<br>36%<br>12.5%<br>20%<br>Winter<br>81 | 81<br>46%<br>25%<br>29.4%<br>Spring<br>81 |

|                          |  | Grade 3                               |                                      |                                 |
|--------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall                                  | Winter                               | Spring                          |
|                          | All Students   | 59                                    | 59                                   | 59                              |
| English Language<br>Arts | Economically Disadvantaged   | 32.4%                                 | 45.9%                                | 55.6%                           |
|                          | Students With Disabilities   | 33.3%                                 | 30%                                  | 50%                             |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners   | 37.5%                                 | 22.2%                                | 50%                             |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall                                  | Winter                               | Spring                          |
|                          | All Students   | 59                                    | 59                                   | 59                              |
| Mathematics              | Economically Disadvantaged   | 12.5%                                 | 16.2%                                | 28.6%                           |
|                          | Students With Disabilities   | 0%                                    | 30%                                  | 30%                             |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners   | 37.5%                                 | 11.1%                                | 36.4%                           |
|                          |  | Grade 4                               |                                      |                                 |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall                                  | Winter                               | Spring                          |
|                          | 1 Tolloichoy   |                                       |                                      |                                 |
|                          | All Students   | 65                                    | 65                                   | 65                              |
| English Language<br>Arts | All Students Economically Disadvantaged  | 65<br>30.6%                           | 65<br>36.8%                          | 65<br>52.8%                     |
|                          | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities   |                                       |                                      |                                 |
|                          | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners   | 30.6%                                 | 36.8%                                | 52.8%                           |
|                          | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language  | 30.6%<br>11.1%                        | 36.8%<br>0%                          | 52.8%<br>33.3%                  |
|                          | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students                             | 30.6%<br>11.1%<br>16.7%               | 36.8%<br>0%<br>23.1%                 | 52.8%<br>33.3%<br>40%           |
|                          | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners  Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | 30.6%<br>11.1%<br>16.7%<br>Fall       | 36.8%<br>0%<br>23.1%<br>Winter       | 52.8%<br>33.3%<br>40%<br>Spring |
| Arts                     | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically                | 30.6%<br>11.1%<br>16.7%<br>Fall<br>65 | 36.8%<br>0%<br>23.1%<br>Winter<br>65 | 52.8% 33.3% 40% Spring 65       |

|                          |                              | Grade 5 |        |        |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency      | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students                 | 66      | 66     | 66     |
| English Language<br>Arts | Economically Disadvantaged   | 20.5.%  | 25.6%  | 39.5%  |
|                          | Students With Disabilities   | 20%     | 20%    | 14.3%  |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners | 20%     | 20%    | 31.3%  |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency      | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students                 | 66      | 66     | 66     |
| Mathematics              | Economically Disadvantaged   | 17.1%   | 27.5%  | 34.2%  |
|                          | Students With Disabilities   | 6.7%    | 26.7%  | 23.1%  |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners | 7.1%    | 20%    | 26.7%  |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency      | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students                 | N/A     | N/A    | N/A    |
| Science                  | Economically Disadvantaged   | N/A     | N/A    | N/A    |
|                          | Students With Disabilities   | N/A     | N/A    | N/A    |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners | N/A     | N/A    | N/A    |

## Subgroup Data Review

|           |             | 2021      | SCHOO             | DL GRAD      | E COMF     | ONENT              | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 |
| SWD       | 19          | 27        |                   | 28           | 19         |                    | 25          |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 40          | 32        |                   | 19           | 9          |                    | 17          |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 30          | 42        |                   | 16           | 15         |                    | 31          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 35          | 25        |                   | 18           | 10         |                    | 24          |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 31          | 31        |                   | 24           | 8          |                    | 15          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 31          | 29        | 18                | 16           | 14         |                    | 24          |            |              |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2019      | SCHO              | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | ONENT              | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2017-18 |
| SWD       | 15          | 56        | 57                | 28           | 36         | 9                  |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 36          | 61        | 57                | 34           | 49         | 43                 | 26          |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 26          | 39        | 50                | 10           | 31         | 25                 | 6           |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 37          | 58        | 59                | 40           | 51         | 38                 | 23          |            |              |                         |                           |

|           |             | 2019      | SCHO              | DL GRAD      | E COMF     | PONENT             | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2017-18 |
| WHT       | 70          | 76        |                   | 60           | 56         |                    | 65          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 38          | 55        | 55                | 35           | 48         | 31                 | 23          |            |              |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2018      | SCHO              | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | ONENT              | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2016-17 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2016-17 |
| SWD       | 19          | 27        |                   | 26           | 9          |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 24          | 54        | 50                | 33           | 45         | 47                 | 23          |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 29          | 58        | 64                | 33           | 39         | 10                 | 29          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 33          | 56        | 62                | 39           | 48         | 50                 | 43          |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 70          | 64        |                   | 70           | 57         |                    | 68          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 37          | 55        | 52                | 42           | 46         | 41                 | 45          |            |              |                         |                           |

#### **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  | 26  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 6   |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 70  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 210 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8   |
| Percent Tested  | 90% |

## Subgroup Data

| Č i   |    |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|----|--|--|--|--|--|
| Students With Disabilities  |    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                | 24 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        |    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% |    |  |  |  |  |  |
| English Language Learners   |    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                 | 31 |  |  |  |  |  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?         |    |  |  |  |  |  |

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?   |            |  |  |  |  |
| 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?   |            |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%  |            |  |  |  |  |
| Black/African American Students  |            |  |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students  | 27         |  |  |  |  |
| 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  |            |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  |            |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%   |            |  |  |  |  |
| Multiracial Students   |            |  |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   |            |  |  |  |  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?   |            |  |  |  |  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?   | N/A        |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%  | N/A        |  |  |  |  |
| · ·  | N/A        |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%  | N/A        |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%  Pacific Islander Students   | N/A<br>N/A |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%  Pacific Islander Students  Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students  |            |  |  |  |  |
| 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?   |            |  |  |  |  |
| 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?  Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%   |            |  |  |  |  |
| 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?  Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%  White Students   | N/A        |  |  |  |  |
| Pacific Islander Students  Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students  Pacific Islander Students  Pacific Islander Students  Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%  White Students  Federal Index - White Students  | N/A<br>22  |  |  |  |  |
| 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?  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<br>22  |  |  |  |  |
| 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?  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?  Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                                      | N/A<br>22  |  |  |  |  |
| 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?  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?  Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%  Economically Disadvantaged Students | N/A 22 YES |  |  |  |  |

#### **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 reflecting on the Early Warning System (EWS) from Part 1(D), the potential areas of concern are: Number of students with attendance below 90% and the number of students in Grades 3-5 who earned a Level 1 in ELA or Math.

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

After analyzing the data, the data component that showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average is Math Achievement (39%) and Math Learning Gains (47%) from the 2019 school year. The contributing factor(s) that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is the lack of high quality Tier 1 instruction in mathematics standards based instruction and a change of teachers in specific grade 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?

After analyzing the data, the contributing factors to this need for improvement that showed the greatest decline is the area of Math Lowest 25 Percentile of Students. The contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance is the lack of high quality Tier 1 instruction in mathematics standard based instruction from the prior year due to a change of instructional staff in specific grade levels. The new actions that Hollywood Central would need to be taken to address this need for improvement is implementing quality Tier 1 Standard-Based Instruction in the areas ELA, Math, and Science.

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

After analyzing the data, the data component that showed the most improvement is the ELA Lowest 25 Percentile student group.

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

The new actions Hollywood Central incorporated in this area is by creating an ELA Interventionist position that identifies struggling students at the beginning of the school year who have reading deficiencies in one or more areas of reading. The ELA Interventionist implements high quality standard based instruction and strategies to boost student achievement in the area of ELA while also using evidence and research-based instructional materials.

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

- 1. Engaging in productive and effective professional learning communities (PLCs) by implementing coaching tools such as Analyzing Student Work (ASW).
- 2. Creating a Progress Monitoring Calendar and Standards-Based Mastery Check Database that provides instant student performance data using school wide grade level formative assessments.
- 3. Weekly, Monthly, and Daily Classroom Walk-throughs to determine if strong TIER 1 instruction is taking place in all subject-areas school wide.

4. Instructional staff will attend professional development in areas that showed the greatest decline from the prior school year.

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 that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders are:

Reading Horizons- In this course, teachers/support facilitators providing intensive interventions to students with identified deficiencies in phonological awareness and decoding will gain an overall understanding of using a Structured Literacy Approach to deliver phonics instruction following the scope and sequence.

#### ELA Instructional Materials-Part 1/2-

In this professional learning course, participants will receive an introduction of the features of the 2021 adopted core reading instructional materials related to program structure, texts, spiral design behind the instructional framework, lesson structure, assessments, and the teacher resource system. Participants will be oriented to several high quality resources that address whole group instruction, small group instruction, and independent practice.

#### Effective Small Group Instr for Math K-5-

Participants will recognize the importance of using formative assessment data in the decision-making process to identify student math deficits and then apply this knowledge to effectively select instructional strategies that will support student learning.

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

#### Benchmark Assessment System-

This one-day professional learning course will target intermediate level (grades 3-5) classroom teachers and literacy coaches, providing comprehensive training on administration and data analysis of the Benchmark Assessment System (BAS) to support differentiated instructional decision-making. The BAS is a compatible running record assessment that provides formative data for monitoring the reading progress of students. Emphasis will be placed on the analysis of quantitative and qualitative data to plan differentiated reading instruction that meets the targeted needs of students.

#### Effective Small Group Instr for Math K-5-

Participants will recognize the importance of using formative assessment data in the decision-making process to identify student math deficits and then apply this knowledge to effectively select instructional strategies that will support student learning.

#### BEST Things to Know-Deeper Dive K-5-

Teachers learn the major similarities and differences between the MAFS and LAFS and the new Florida BEST Standards for English Language Arts and Mathematics. In addition, participants will explore various resources available to them for planning high quality, standards aligned instruction.

#### **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

#### Areas of Focus:

#### **#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

Area of

Focus
Description
and

In analyzing the data, Black/African-American students performed well below other subgroups. Focusing on the instructional strategies, standards-based formatives, and consistent progress monitoring will support their learning gains.

Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

By June 2022, the Black/African-American students group performed well below the other subgroups. Focusing on the instructional strategies, standards-based formatives, and consistent progress monitoring will support their learning gains.

This Area of Focus will be monitored by having frequent data chats that identifies Black/ African-American students by monitoring their performance based on the formative assessments.

Person responsible

**Monitoring:** 

for monitoring outcome:

Delicia Decembert (delicia.decembert@browardschools.com)

Evidencebased Strategy: Embedded High Quality Instruction-The goal or purpose of this best practice is to use student academic and/or behavior information to better identify students with learning disabilities or behavior needs in order to give students the necessary supportive interventions that will maximize their full potential and learning. Implementation of iReady, Acaletics Math Program, Benchmark Advance, and Go Math/Think Central will provide common standards-based formative assessments. Students will participate in targeted reading interventions. School-wide PLC's focusing on the CARE (Curriculum, Assessment, Remediation, and Enrichment) while anlayzing grade-level common assessments.

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy: Classroom teachers can increase students' ELA/Math success throughout the primary and intermediate grades by implementing high-quality instruction. which refers to the utilization of both research validated instructional practices and core reading and math programs such as iReady, Acaletics Math Program, Benchmark Advance, and Go Math/Think Central evidence-based programs. Implementing high quality instructional allows teachers to rule inadequate instruction as a reason for poor performance.

#### **Action Steps to Implement**

- 1. Providing all students with differentiated instructional based on each students' learning needs.
- 2. Ensuring teachers are utilizing effective grouping procedures such as: small groups, paired instruction, independent work, and one-on-one instruction.
- 3. Monitoring school wide grade level common assessments K-5.
- 4. Identifying students with (SWD) that should not be on grade level standards based on previous formatives and summative assessments.
- 5. Ensuring all classroom teachers are given the opportunity to attend professional development that will strengthen TIER 1 instruction in all academic areas.

Person Responsible

Delicia Decembert (delicia.decembert@browardschools.com)

#### **Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, 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.

Hollywood Central will continue to positive, safe and supportive school climate that fosters safety; promotes a supportive academic, disciplinary, and physical environment; and encourages and maintains respectful, trusting, and caring relationships throughout the school community. Creating a positive, safe and supportive school environment requires schools to identify a framework for understanding school climate, measure the climate to identify areas for improvement, and develop a strategy to implement improvements. Positive school climates improves student achievement, teacher retention, and mental health, among other beneficial outcomes.

#### 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.

Building a positive environment in individual classrooms throughout Hollywood Central is a matter of cultivating and maintaining positive relationships. It takes commitment and consistency from the whole team-administrators, teachers, and support staff.

- 1. Building Strong Relationships- Teachers needs to have the time to talk to their students in and out of the classroom. The goal should be for every adult in the building to maintain a high rate of positive interactions with students and to show genuine interest in their lives, their activities, their goals and their struggles.
- 2. Teach Social Skills- Behavior should treated like academics, and students should be taught the skills they need to executed desired behaviors. These behaviors and values include honest, sensitivity, concern and respect for others, a sense of humor, reliability, and so on. Together with the staff, teachers should identify the social skills you want your students to have and the step-by-step routines to teach them.
- 3. Clarify Classroom Rules-Classroom rules communicate your expectations to your students. They tell students this is the positive environment you deserve. This is the standard of behavior we know you can achieve.
- 4. Be Role Models-Observing the actions of others influences how they respond to their environment and cope with unfamiliar situations.

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

Stakeholder typically refers to anyone who is invested in the welfare and success of a school and its students, including administrators, teachers, staff members, students, parents, families, community members, local business leaders, and elected officials such as school board members. The stakeholders play an important role in managing schools. They are the partners of the school leaders in making the schools conducive to teaching and learning. They are also responsible for the achievement of the learning outcomes through their active participation in school activities, programs and projects.

#### Part V: Budget

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

| 1      | III.A.  | Areas of Focus: Instructiona | \$2,385.00                               |                 |       |            |
|--------|---|------------------------------|--|-----------------|-------|------------|
|        | Function  | Object                       | Budget Focus                             | Funding Source  | FTE   | 2021-22    |
|        | 6400  | 100-Salaries                 | 0121 - Hollywood Central<br>Elem. School | Title, I Part A | 335.0 | \$2,385.00 |
|        | Notes: Extended Learning Opportunities for Students in Grades 3, 4, 5 |                              |  |                 |       |            |
| Total: |   |                              |  |                 |       | \$2,385.00 |