

Broward County Public Schools

West Hollywood Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

West Hollywood Elementary School

6301 HOLLYWOOD BLVD, Hollywood, FL 33024

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Lina Palacios

Start Date for this Principal: 9/28/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

West Hollywood Elementary School

6301 HOLLYWOOD BLVD, Hollywood, FL 33024

[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	76%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	95%

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.

West Hollywood Elementary School will provide the opportunity and means for all students to achieve their maximum academic potential and develop social and life skills necessary to become engaged, global citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of West Hollywood Elementary School is to build a school community that will foster leadership, life long learners, college and career success, dynamic communicators, responsible and aware global citizens to adapt to our ever-changing world!

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
Palacios, Lina	Principal	Serves as an instructional leader, engages, stakeholders, and collaborates in the school's decision-making process.
Clinch, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Serves as an instructional leader, engages, stakeholders, and collaborates in the school's decision-making process.
De Los Angeles, Maria	School Counselor	Serves as an instructional leader, engages, stakeholders, and collaborates in the school's decision-making process.
Myers, Mark	Instructional Coach	Serves as an instructional leader, engages, stakeholders, and collaborates in the school's decision-making process.
Zelaya, Patricia	Teacher, K-12	Serves as an instructional leader, engages, stakeholders, and collaborates in the school's decision-making process.
Murphy, Miranti	Instructional Coach	Serves as an instructional leader, engages, stakeholders, and collaborates in the school's decision-making process.
Bernot, Roxanne	Teacher, ESE	Serves as an instructional leader, engages, stakeholders, and collaborates in the school's decision-making process.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 9/28/2016, Lina Palacios

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.*

3

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

27

Total number of students enrolled at the school

474

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

6

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

6

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	72	73	78	64	64	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	416	
Attendance below 90 percent	13	7	7	2	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	31	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	18	39	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	4	22	26	26	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	3	4	22	26	26	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	3	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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 10/6/2021

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	79	82	72	65	73	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	431
Attendance below 90 percent	23	15	19	16	28	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	31	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	18	39	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78

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	6	3	9	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	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				41%	59%	57%	39%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	60%	58%	45%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	54%	53%	42%	51%	48%
Math Achievement				52%	65%	63%	52%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				55%	66%	62%	63%	60%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	53%	51%	51%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				41%	46%	53%	30%	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	35%	62%	-27%	58%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				
05	2021					
	2019	45%	59%	-14%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	48%	65%	-17%	62%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	43%	67%	-24%	64%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
05	2021					
	2019	49%	64%	-15%	60%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	36%	49%	-13%	53%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady Diagnostics was utilized in grades one through five as the progress-monitoring tool.

Note: NR means not reported

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	27/26%	14/32%	46/42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23/39%	22/37%	2/25%
	Students With Disabilities	2/18%	2/16%	3/23%
	English Language Learners	6/27%	7/18%	9/21%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	20/19%	26/21%	41/38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/20%	19/32%	0/0
	Students With Disabilities	3/27%	3/16%	3/25%
	English Language Learners	7/19%	7/16%	6/16%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	26/24%	44/39%	57/51%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23/39%	22/37%	2/25%
	Students With Disabilities	3/17%	4/22%	8/47%
	English Language Learners	4/9%	5/13%	8/18%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17/15%	31/28%	42/38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/18%	16/28%	0/0
	Students With Disabilities	5/24%	4/17%	8/47%
	English Language Learners	4/11%	4/8%	6/15%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	22/30%	32/42%	36/48%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17/35%	22/45%	25/56%
	Students With Disabilities	1/7%	1/7%	3/21%
	English Language Learners	3/15%	5/20%	6/23%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10/14%	18/24%	34/47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/16%	12/25%	0/0
	Students With Disabilities	2/8%	1/7%	4/33%
	English Language Learners	3/11%	3/10%	4/15%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	18/20%	23/25%	27/32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/17%	12/23%	2/11%
	Students With Disabilities	1/4%	1/4%	2/10%
	English Language Learners	0%	2/4%	1/4%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14/17%	22/25%	25/42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/16%	11/22%	0/0
	Students With Disabilities	2/5%	4/17%	4/19%
	English Language Learners	1/4%	2/8%	4/13%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15/20%	21/27%	28/37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/18%	14/31%	0/0
	Students With Disabilities	4/17%	4/16%	6/32%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	2/12%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18/22%	19/24%	31/42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/16%	9/20%	0/0
	Students With Disabilities	4/22%	4/21%	8/39%
	English Language Learners	3/13%	2/6%	4/25%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NR	NR	NR
	Economically Disadvantaged	NR	NR	NR
	Students With Disabilities	NR	NR	NR
	English Language Learners	NR	NR	NR

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	14	42		17	31		10				
ELL	25	40		22	20		18				
BLK	26	43		17	20		20				
HSP	31	54		28	25		20				
WHT	23			23							
FRL	30	49		25	25	20	25				
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	11	39	44	27	49	43	10				
ELL	37	53	50	48	49	33	29				
BLK	36	45	40	44	44	33	33				
HSP	41	51	47	56	59	40	39				

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
MUL	31			38							
WHT	50	64		50	53						
FRL	42	54	49	51	55	39	39				
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	13	32	40	27	46	39	6				
ELL	39	49	53	42	61	58	21				
BLK	31	31	13	42	55	44	31				
HSP	38	43	50	52	65	50	26				
WHT	52	85		73	80						
FRL	38	45	45	52	64	50	29				

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	33
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	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	261
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	93%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
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	30
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	28
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	36
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	23
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	33
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?

Students with Disabilities (SWD) displayed the lowest performance scores in 2018 - 2019 English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics (MAFS) proficiency. ELA decreased by 3% proficiency and MAFS proficiency remained the same from 2017 - 2018 to 2018 - 2019. There was however an increase in ELA and MAFS learning gains and in the lowest quartile. Prior to this year, SWD were removed from class to receive individualized educational services. This may have contributed to the loss of grade level instructional time and a decline in student ELA and MAFS achievement scores.

While reviewing the iReady Diagnostic results, it was noted that English Language Learners (ELL) made very small progress from fall to spring in Reading and Mathematics. There are instances that no progress was made for ELL students. The data displayed the Hispanic/Latino subgroup of students in fourth and fifth were on the cusp of not making ESSA while students in 3rd grade were at 44% proficient. The African American/Black subgroup made growth but range from 35% to 38% proficient.

It was also noted that there isn't an in-house assessment to monitor 5th grade Science. A science assessment will be utilized in fall, winter and spring to determine the students growth and mastery in Science.

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

English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) strategies need to be implemented to ensure continuous growth for ELL students. There may be a need for professional development on how to implement effective ESOL strategies and how to utilize the ESOL instructional strategy matrix.

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

Covid-19 caused the students to learn from home for a year and half. As a result, the English Language Learners (ELL) did not have access to an environment to acquire the English Language. Likewise, students in the ESSA subgroups were home learners and were not given face-to-face instruction or/and intervention; most were provided virtually. Less than half of the school population were at school-learners in the 2020-2021 school year. Students did not always log-in to receive this instruction. Therefore, instruction and intervention was not always provided with fidelity.

Individual student data along with teacher and grade level data was reviewed by the instructional team. A plan was created to provide additional intervention, remediation and enrichment for identified students. Throughout the school year, data will be collected to ensure academic student growth across the grade level and within the ESSA subgroups.

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

Third grade English Language Arts demonstrated the most improvement in its data.

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

Third grade included an additional reading intervention that focused on grade level content. The teachers deconstructed the standard, gathered grade level resources, and modeled reading strategies to understand, interact and interpret the text in regards to the given standard. The small group also focused on grade level content with all students, and the amount of support and scaffolding provided to the students depended on the students present level. The teachers also analyzed the data and retaught standards to students in need of remediation.

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

In order to accelerate learning, each teachers will need to analyze student data and reteach standards to students that need remediation to close the acadmic gap. Likewise, teachers will need to provide enrichment for students that have mastered the standard to ensure their student growth. The leadership team will provide datachats to look for grade level trends, determine the effectiveness of the intervention and make adjustments to the instructional focus calendar, small groups and interventions.

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

Professional Developments Area Opportunites for the 2021-2022 areas

1. Analayzing iReady Data and Next Steps
2. Tier 3 Interventions: Horizons, Level Literacy Intervention
3. Deeper Dive into BEST standards
4. Benchmark Advance for TIER 1 Intervention
5. Spelling, Word Study and Spelling to addrss Phonics
6. How to Use Manipulatives in Mathematics Instruction
7. Small group lessons in Reading and Mathematics
8. Teaching through Word Problems

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

Consistent data monitoring and discussions need to continue to ensure that core instruction and interventions are implemented with fidelity. It is also crucial that standards are deconstructed and backwards planning is utilized to ensure mastery of grade level content. When areas of needs are identified, instructional coaches and district level coaches will be utilized to provide professional development and support for the identified teacher and/or grade level.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Students with Disabilities (SWD) displayed the lowest performance scores in 2018 - 2019

Description and Rationale: English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics (MAFS) achievement levels. SWD scored a 34% on the Federal Index score.

Measurable Outcome: SWD will increase the Federal Index score to 41% or higher.

Monitoring: Inclusive scheduling is being utilized for the 2021 - 2022 school year to ensure that SWD are receiving services in their classes. Monitoring through the RTI process. The Rtl team will meet and develop a Tier 2 or Tier 3 plan. The team will reconvene within six to nine weeks to review the data and determine the progress of the intervention. Teachers and academic interventionist will implement Tier 2 and Tier 3 with fidelity. After Tier 3 is implemented, the Rtl team will review the data and determine the student's progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Roxanne Bernot (roxanne.bernot@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Inclusive scheduling is being utilized for the 2021 - 2022 school year to ensure that SWD are receiving services in their classes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In the past, SWD were removed from their classroom to receive interventions. This often lead to loss of instructional time and interventions that were not standards-based. Therefore, to limit the transition and incorporate standardsbased instruction, the students will receive accommodations, services and interventions in the classroom. This will also allow the ESE facilitator and teacher to collaborate on lesson plans, instuctional pedagogy and strategies that best meets the need of the student. The ESE facilitator will follow the pacing guides for English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics, utilize RALLY as an ELA standards-based instruction book and iReady MAFS lessons, and assess the students' mastery of the standard.

Action Steps to Implement

The Rtl team will meet and develop a Tier 2 or Tier 3 plan.

Person Responsible Miranti Murphy (miranti.murphy@browardschools.com)

The team will review the data and determine the progress of the intervention.

Person Responsible Miranti Murphy (miranti.murphy@browardschools.com)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: African American student subgroup scored 39% on the Federal Index Score.

Measurable Outcome:

African American students will increase the Federal Index score to 41% or higher.

Monitoring:

The following progress monitoring data will be administered this year to monitor student growth.

1. iReady Standards Mastery
2. iReady Interim Assessments
3. iReady Unit Assessments
4. iReady Diagnostics

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Miranti Murphy (miranti.murphy@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Students will utilize concept mapping during instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Concept mapping has a high zone of desired effect. It causes the students to use conceptual structures to summarize the main ideas of what will be learn in the content area. It facilitates the students' ability to synthesize and organize the content to better recall the information.

Action Steps to Implement

Students will be targeted through small group push-in with a support staff.

Person Responsible

Miranti Murphy (miranti.murphy@browardschools.com)

Student progress and growth will be monitored via iReady growth monitoring assessments, to determine next steps, instructional shifts, and revised goals.

Person Responsible

Miranti Murphy (miranti.murphy@browardschools.com)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Multi-Racial**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: Multi-racial students subgroup scored 35%.

Measurable Outcome:

Multi-racial students will increase the Federal Index score to 41% or higher.

Monitoring:

The following progress monitoring data will be administered this year to monitor student growth.

1. iReady Standards Mastery
2. iReady Interim Assessments
3. iReady Unit Assessments
4. iReady Diagnostics

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Miranti Murphy (miranti.murphy@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Students will utilize concept mapping during instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Concept mapping has a high zone of desired effect. It causes the students to use conceptual structures to summarize the main ideas of what will be learn in the content area. It facilitates the students' ability to synthesize and organize the content to better recall the information.

Action Steps to Implement

Ongoing progress monitoring in the form of ORR and Benchmark assessments.

Person Responsible

Miranti Murphy (miranti.murphy@browardschools.com)

Targeted small group instruction in the area of ELA through push-in model.

Person Responsible

Miranti Murphy (miranti.murphy@browardschools.com)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: West Hollywood Elementary data from 2018-2019 Florida State Assessments reflected the following proficient levels: third grade 36%; fourth 37%; and fifth grade 51%. With the lack of face to face instruction during the Covid-19 pandemic, the English Language Arts (ELA) academic gaps increased and attention to ELA is needed to decrease these academic gaps.

Measurable Outcome: On the 2021-2022 Florida State Assessments, the following grades will score as follow: third grade 39% and fourth grade 40%. The fifth grade class scored 36% in 2018-2019; therefore their goal in 2021-2022 is 39%.

The following progress monitoring data will be administered this year to monitor student growth.

Monitoring:

1. iReady Standards Mastery
2. iReady Interim Assessments
3. iReady Unit Assessments
4. iReady Diagnostics

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Miranti Murphy (miranti.murphy@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: The teacher will differentiate reading instruction in small group to address the area of concern.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Utilizing current data, the teachers will be able to implement standards-based intervention to ensure students are achieving the target of the standard.

Action Steps to Implement

Ongoing progress monitoring in the form of ORR and Benchmark assessments.

Person Responsible Miranti Murphy (miranti.murphy@browardschools.com)

Targeted small group instruction in the area of ELA through push-in model.

Person Responsible Miranti Murphy (miranti.murphy@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.

Each year the students are introduced to West Hollywood Elementary expectations. Students are taught what it means to be wildcat with lessons targeted areas in being respectful, optimistic, accountable, and resilient. Students are awarded when they make good decisions through morning announcements, pizza parties, dance parties, and classroom awards/treats. When a student struggles with their behavior, an individualize plan is implemented to help the student modify the behavior.

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.

Each year the students are introduced to West Hollywood Elementary expectations. Students are taught what it means to be wildcat with lessons targeted areas in being respectful, optimistic, accountable, and resilient. Students are awarded when they make good decisions through morning announcements, pizza parties, dance parties, and classroom awards/treats. When students struggles with their behavior, an individualize plan is implemented to help the student modify the behavior.

West Hollywood Elementary has partnerships with community agencies. Hispanic Unity partners with the school to provide parenting classes for families that want assistance with creating a positive home environment. They provide parents with parent resources within the community that assists with housing, taxes, childcare, learning English and so forth. They work with all families, regardless of their ethnicity.

Reading Pals partners with our first grade team to read with our fragile students, either academically or behaviorally. The goal is for the student to build a trusting relationship with an adult.

The local church and Food Pantry provide food and resources for our struggling families to have access to at school. This gives the parents/guardians the opportunity to provide basic needs for their family at no cost.

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

Key stakeholders are as follow:

Students have the right to learn, feel safe and be actively involved in their education.

Teachers teach social and emotional lessons to help student learn how to interact with one another and express their emotions. Coping skills are also taught in the classroom.

Guidance, instructional staff and administration works one on one with students, provide interventions, and support to ensure there is a positive culture to foster learning and healthy relationships.

Community partners help support our families and provide resources in the community to help our families excel at home.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$1,718.06
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5000	520-Textbooks	0161 - West Hollywood Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$1,718.06
			<i>Notes: iReady LAFS, MAFS, and Mathematical Practice books were purchased for small group to implement conceptual mapping.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American				\$1,718.06
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5000	520-Textbooks	0161 - West Hollywood Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$1,718.06
			<i>Notes: iReady LAFS, MAFS, and Mathematical Practice books were purchased for small group to implement conceptual mapping.</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Multi-Racial				\$1,718.06
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			0161 - West Hollywood Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$1,718.06
			<i>Notes: iReady LAFS, MAFS, and Mathematical Practice books were purchased for small group to implement conceptual mapping.</i>			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$1,718.06
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			0161 - West Hollywood Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$1,718.06
			<i>Notes: iReady LAFS books were purchased for reading small group.</i>			
Total:						\$6,872.24