

Broward County Public Schools

Dania 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	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Dania Elementary School

300 SE 2ND AVE, Dania Beach, FL 33004

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Lewis Jackson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2010

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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: B (55%)
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

Dania Elementary School

300 SE 2ND AVE, Dania Beach, FL 33004

[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	74%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	84%

School Grades History

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

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.

The mission of Dania Elementary is to provide ALL students with educational opportunities that will enable them to successfully reach their potential through the cooperative efforts of the home, school and community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Provide the highest quality education to all students.

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
Jackson, Lewis	Principal	Supervise the logistical facility, safety, and academic procedures that move us toward our mission and vision.
Edwards, Jamie	SAC Member	To facilitate the development and monitor progress of the annual School Improvement Plan.
Markevich, Galina	Assistant Principal	Assist with supervision of logistical, safety, and academic processes that help us move toward our mission and vision.
Hall, Sandra	Reading Coach	Assist in gathering and analyzing student reading achievement data. Use the data to create, implement, and monitor plans to move us toward our SIP goals.
Hengge, Jennifer	Math Coach	Assist in gathering and analyzing student math and science achievement data. Use the data to create, implement, and monitor plans to move us toward our SIP goals.
Fumero, Janet	Other	Assist in gathering and analyzing exceptional student achievement data. Use the data to create, implement, and monitor plans to move us toward our SIP goals.
page, elysia	School Counselor	Assist in gathering and analyzing SEL student achievement data. Use the data to create, implement, and monitor plans to move us toward our SIP goals.
Magliocca, Patricia	Other	Assist in gathering and analyzing Special Programs student achievement data. Use the data to create, implement, and monitor plans to move us toward our SIP goals.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2010, Lewis Jackson

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.*

2

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

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

29

Total number of students enrolled at the school

386

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

11

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

12

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	66	57	61	51	58	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	363
Attendance below 90 percent	20	22	19	21	10	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	13	10	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	1	2	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/22/2021

2020-21 - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Number of students enrolled		
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

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	60	71	56	61	83	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	415
Attendance below 90 percent	25	35	17	13	27	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142
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	0	4	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	5	3	6	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	2	6	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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				59%	59%	57%	54%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				56%	60%	58%	62%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	54%	53%	68%	51%	48%
Math Achievement				76%	65%	63%	72%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				87%	66%	62%	85%	60%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				72%	53%	51%	74%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				55%	46%	53%	57%	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	48%	60%	-12%	58%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	62%	62%	0%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	59%	-11%	56%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	58%	65%	-7%	62%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	75%	67%	8%	64%	11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2021					
	2019	71%	64%	7%	60%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	46%	49%	-3%	53%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

i-Ready Diagnostic Assessment, 5th grade science beginning of the year test by SBBC Elementary Learning Department, NGSS FCAT Science

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17/28%	21/34%	29/46%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/28%	19/35%	26/48%
	Students With Disabilities	4/33%	2/20%	3/33%
	English Language Learners	1/14%	3/43%	2/29%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14/23%	11/22%	19/31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14/27%	10/22%	17/32%
	Students With Disabilities	4/33%%	2/29%	1/10%
	English Language Learners	3/43%	2/29%	2/40%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	12/25%	12/24%	13/27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/20%	6/16%	8/23%
	Students With Disabilities	4/24%	4/22%	5/29%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	1/14%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	9/19%	11/22%	8/17%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/21%	9/24%	6/17%
	Students With Disabilities	4/24%	3/17%	2/11%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/14%	1/17%
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	27/48%	29/52%	34/59%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19/43%	20/44%	25/54%
	Students With Disabilities	3/20%	2/14%	5/33%
	English Language Learners	1/13%	4/57%	2/25%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4/7%	13/22%	20/37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1/2%	8/17%	14/32%
	Students With Disabilities	1/7%	1/7%	2/17%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/13%	2/25%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	26/38%	30/44%	29/45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21/40%	23/43%	21/42%
	Students With Disabilities	8/30%	11/39%	9/36%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/20%	1/20%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14/24%	15/23%	16/42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/19%	9/18%	9/33%
	Students With Disabilities	6/25%	6/22%	6/50%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/20%	2/50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	22/31%	28/38%	26/37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13/26%	18/35%	18/37%
	Students With Disabilities	3/14%	2/10%	3/15%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11/16%	16/25	1/9%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/11%	10/23%	1/11%
	Students With Disabilities	1/5%	2/12%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	NA	23/33%	26/37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	13/33%	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	5/33%	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	0/0	NA
	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	42	36		45	42		29				
ELL	59	60		44	27		31				
BLK	41	35		28	7		34				
HSP	58	58	50	45	35		33				
MUL	69			23							
WHT	65	40		72							
FRL	47	46	29	36	27	17	37				
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	49	58	47	61	76	74	46				
ELL	52	59	47	68	81	67	44				
BLK	60	61	42	77	90	76	48				
HSP	51	46		77	86		64				
MUL	67			80							
WHT	65	62		72	86		60				
FRL	57	56	50	75	86	72	52				
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	45	62	60	57	65	54	54				
ELL	34	61	78	60	88	86					
BLK	43	48	60	68	83	53	53				
HSP	62	69	79	78	88	94	55				
MUL	60			60							
WHT	68	72		74	81		75				
FRL	52	59	65	71	85	76	55				

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	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	332

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	29
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	48
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	46
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial 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?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	59
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	36
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?

A few common trends noted are that students performed:

- *much lower than a typical face to face school year,
- *scored lowest on the Winter diagnostic,
- *SWD and ELLs generally performed lower than other subgroups, and
- *Total and FRL student results were similar.

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

Based on 2019 data, SWD and ELLs demonstrate a need for improvement, especially in ELA and Lowest Quartile Learning Gains in ELA.

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

Focused reading and writing skills would need to be put in place to address SWD and ELL needs. Teachers would need professional development in providing effective strategies to these subgroups.

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

Math achievement gains showed the most improvement from 2019 to 2020. However, Math achievement gains plummeted in 2021.

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

Many students in grades 3-5 were engaged in extended math learning opportunities before and after school. Students were actively involved in extracurricular school programs (i.e. Debate, Robotics, and Safety Patrol) thereby creating a well rounded and engaged student learning environment.

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

We will implement math fluency opportunities that are engaging and challenging (i.e. competitions and challenges among peers, classes and other schools). Teachers will receive professional development on the implementation of effective math teaching strategies. ELO opportunities will be enhanced.

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.

We will provide professional learning opportunities that use effective math teaching strategies (i.e. reasoning, probing incorrect responses, using manipulatives, providing challenging and rigorous assignments). Teachers will be provided training on analyzing and using leading and lagging data.

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

To provide a venue for ongoing sustainability, teachers will be expected to meet as teams to discuss gathered data and create plans to accelerate learning based on the data. Teachers will be given opportunities to plan together and meet with Curriculum Coaches on a regular basis. Teacher teams will continually review and revised scope and sequences as deemed necessary by gathered student data.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The current i-Ready diagnostic shows that 21% of students are on grade level (tier 1), 49% are one grade level below (tier 2) and 30% are two or more grade levels below (tier 3). Within ELA, comprehension of literature (31%), comprehension of informational text (30%) and vocabulary (30%) having the highest percentage of tier 2 and tier 3. Instructional practice is our area of focus due to our new reading program, Benchmark Advance and our new intervention program, Reading Horizons. Teachers need to receive training in both these curriculums.
Measurable Outcome:	All reading teachers will be trained in Benchmark Advance. All teachers using the new intervention programs, Reading Horizons will be trained by the end of October, 2021. All teachers will improve their vocabulary and comprehension instruction. Based on i-Ready, the percentage of students on-grade level will increase from 21% to 56% by May 2022.
Monitoring:	The literacy coach will track who has attended training through the district. She will assist in giving additional training and will model lessons during our monthly grade-level curriculum meetings, targeting comprehension and vocabulary instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sandra Hall (sandra.hall@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will use the collaborative learning strategy to increase teacher learning of the new curriculum. Teachers will share best practices using the Frayer Model of vocabulary instruction and graphic organizers for comprehension instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We are selecting the collaborative learning strategy because it has been shown to be the most effective adult learning strategy. Lauren Davis, Former Department Chair and Instructional Coach states in "when teachers come together to share information, resources, ideas, and expertise, learning becomes more accessible and effective for students. Collaborating means purposefully building interpersonal relationships and working towards healthy interdependence, which occurs when teachers are comfortable giving and receiving help without forfeiting accountability." (Schoolology, 2020)

Action Steps to Implement

The Literacy Coach will have monthly grade-level curriculum meetings. The grade-level teams will work collaboratively to share best practices and learn strategies to increase their instructional expertise in teaching comprehension and vocabulary.

Person Responsible Sandra Hall (sandra.hall@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.

Total Referrals per 100 students: State - 2.5; School -3.25

Violent Incidents per 100 students: State - 0.88; School - 0

Drug Incidents per 100 students: State - 0.13; School - 0

Property Incidents per 100 students: State 0.02; School - 0

The majority of our referrals pertained to disruption of the learning environment and leaving a supervised area without permission. We have collaborated with parents and teachers to create individual student behavior plans to stem these incidents.

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.

Staff collaborate to aspire to high expectations for each other and students. A focused alignment defines our positive culture and climate. Staff input is requested for many school wide decisions. This imparts a feeling of ownership.

We have a schoolwide positive behavior plan in place that promotes consistency across all levels.

Annual staff surveys request how each staff member likes to be recognized. Leadership uses this information to personalize recognition strategies.

We also promote local and global citizenship by participating in numerous charitable activities: Jump Rope for Heart, Relay for Life, Autism Walk, Jingle Jog, etc.

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

We are fortunate to have several stakeholder groups who promote a positive culture and climate:

*Funshine Club - facilitates staff "get togethers"

*Faculty Council - is a conduit between staff and administration

*Birthday Club - organizes birthday celebrations

*PTO - organizes and implements fund raising activities that benefit staff and students

*Cups of Gratitude - peers recognize peers for positive actions

*Safety Patrol and Global Patrol are student organizations that promote positive relationships with peers and our environment.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$150,628.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			0101 - Dania Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$33,558.00
			Notes: Professional development will be conducted at no cost to the school or district as we plan to use school and district-based personnel to conduct the trainings. A 53.33% teacher will provide individual and small group reading remediation and acceleration in the areas of need.			
			0101 - Dania Elementary School	Other		\$117,070.00
			Notes: Two ESSER funded teachers will be used to meet with small groups to remediate and accelerate targeted Tier 2 and 3 students in grades K-5.			
Total:						\$156,128.00