

Broward County Public Schools

# Sheridan Park Elementary School



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

# Sheridan Park Elementary School

2310 N 70TH TER, Hollywood, FL 33024

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

Principal: Jacqueline Carro

Start Date for this Principal: 9/27/2015

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	98%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (52%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	

\* 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

## Sheridan Park Elementary School

2310 N 70TH TER, 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	63%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	75%

### School Grades History

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

### 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 Sheridan Park Elementary is to facilitate the development of lifelong learning in our students by providing a foundation of academic and social skills for the 21st century.

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

Preparing today's students to be tomorrow's leaders.

### 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
Carro, Jacqueline	Principal	Oversees daily activities and operations of the school.
Arden, Kathleen	Reading Coach	Oversees school's literacy program, RTI, PLC
Aziz-Prescott, Juliana	Instructional Coach	Oversees Autism Special Program
Linares-Colon, Delcarmen	Math Coach	Oversee school's math program, ESOL contact

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Sunday 9/27/2015, Jacqueline Carro

**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.*

7

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

34

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

565

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

4

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

3

### Demographic Data

## Early Warning Systems

### 2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	92	87	114	103	102	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	608
Attendance below 90 percent	32	13	20	14	19	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	13	28	18	21	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93

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	5	7	10	8	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	4	10	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/10/2021

### 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	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	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	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				60%	59%	57%	54%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				63%	60%	58%	55%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	54%	53%	52%	51%	48%
Math Achievement				68%	65%	63%	66%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				72%	66%	62%	67%	60%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63%	53%	51%	47%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				51%	46%	53%	51%	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	61%	60%	1%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	64%	62%	2%	58%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	59%	-7%	56%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	60%	65%	-5%	62%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	76%	67%	9%	64%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2021					
	2019	63%	64%	-1%	60%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	47%	49%	-2%	53%	-6%
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 Diagnostic Reading and Math and Statewide Science Assessment for 5th grade

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	79/35%	80/92%	58/60.3%
	Economically Disadvantaged	53/32.1%	53/49.1%	39/61.5%
	Students With Disabilities	11/27.3%	11/45.5%	7/71.4%
	English Language Learners	23/21.7%	23/21.7%	15/20%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	79/24.1	80/37.5%	17/5.9%
	Economically Disadvantaged	53/24.1	53/39.6%	12/8.3%
	Students With Disabilities	11/18.2	11/9.1%	1/0%
	English Language Learners	23/21.7	23/13%	6/0%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	107/40.2%	108/51.9%	62/43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	72/36.1%	72/47.2%	39/38.5%
	Students With Disabilities	17/23.5%	17/35.3%	12/16.7%
	English Language Learners	25/12%	28/25%	20/25%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	107/18.7%	108/31.5%	16/31.3%
	Economically Disadvantaged	72/12.5%	72/26.4%	10/40%
	Students With Disabilities	17/17.6%	18/22.2%	3/33.3%
	English Language Learners	25/8%	27/11.1%	7/14.3%
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	95/50.5%	95/63.2%	96/68.8%
	Economically Disadvantaged	66/39.4%	66/57.6%	68/60/3%
	Students With Disabilities	20/25%	20/30%	18/44.4%
	English Language Learners	11/18.2%	11/36.4%	11/54.5%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	95/20%	95/30.5%	14/57.1%
	Economically Disadvantaged	66/19.7%	66/22.7%	9/55.5%
	Students With Disabilities	20/5%	20/15%	4/0%
	English Language Learners	11/9.1%	11/18.2%	1/100%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	94/30.9%	98/44.9%	94/49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	67/29.9%	69/43.5%	66/33%
	Students With Disabilities	12/8.3%	14/28.6%	14/36%
	English Language Learners	18/22.2%	18/16.7%	18/28%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	93/24.7%	98/31.6%	99/54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	67/20.9%	69/27.5%	68/51.5%
	Students With Disabilities	12/16.7%	14/21.4%	15/33%
	English Language Learners	18/16.7%	18/11.1%	19/42%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	105/32.4%	105/40%	82/50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	72/33.3%	72/36.1%	49/24%
	Students With Disabilities	29/17.2%	29/20.7%	23%26%
	English Language Learners	17/5.9%	17/11.8%	14%29%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	105/24.8%	105/36.2%	95/55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	72/20.8%	72/36.1%	56/48.2%
	Students With Disabilities	29/24.1%	29/20.7%	24/42%
	English Language Learners	17/0%	17/5.9%	17/41%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			98/37.76%
	Economically Disadvantaged			65/35%
	Students With Disabilities			24/25%
	English Language Learners			17/18%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

**Subgroup Data Review**

<b>2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2019-20</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2019-20</b>
SWD	30	39	23	27	18	15	26				
ELL	41	41	36	41	35	25	28				
ASN	47	55		39	27						
BLK	36	53		26	19		13				
HSP	49	43	27	47	35		37				
WHT	51	54		46	48		50				
FRL	39	42	43	38	25	29	29				
<b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2017-18</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2017-18</b>
SWD	33	49	48	48	51	48	35				
ELL	59	67	50	69	78	72	49				
ASN	68	76		88	100						
BLK	63	68		57	61	70	50				
HSP	58	60	50	69	70	50	45				
WHT	63	63	64	66	73	81	52				
FRL	57	62	54	67	73	64	44				
<b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b>
SWD	32	43	38	37	47	29	29				
ELL	46	59	61	59	59	53	13				
ASN	80	88		96	88						
BLK	42	48	40	54	62	38	39				
HSP	49	55	60	64	63	52	42				
MUL	90			80							
WHT	61	49		69	68		59				
FRL	51	54	52	64	66	46	42				

**ESSA Data Review**

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	70
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	355

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
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	40
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	42
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	44
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

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	54
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	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

## Analysis

### Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

#### What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The common trend that emerges in ELA for this school year across grade levels is that students with disabilities and our students in the lowest quartile were making progress and learning gains; however the 2021 school year shows that these students scored below grade level and did not make learning gains.

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

The data components that indicate the greatest need for improvement are the achievement levels in ELA across all grade levels and all subgroups.

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

Contributing factors that led to this need for improvement were the hybrid learning model and lack of student attendance and participation.

The new actions would be to continue to monitor student attendance during face to face learning. Also, ensuring that new adopted reading series is being implemented, and reading interventions using evidence-based strategies is occurring daily.

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



The data components that indicate the greatest area of improvement are the achievement levels in the subgroup of SWD in the area of math.

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

Contributing factors that led to this improvement include adding math IEP goals, mainstreaming in the areas of math for students with autism, and offering extended learning opportunities in the mornings and afternoons for our students needing remediation beyond the classroom setting. The new actions would be to continue these practices along with utilizing the ESSR position support.

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

Strategies that will need to be implemented include the following:

- \* small group instruction for remediation conducted with fidelity and using evidence-based practices
- \* utilizing the ESSR reading position to target students showing a substantial reading deficiency
- \* provide extended learning opportunities earlier in the school year and to include all grade levels
- \* continue to monitor student data based on BAS running records, i-Ready Diagnostic and weekly reading lessons, teacher observations
- \* conduct weekly RTI meetings and monitor the progress of Tier2/Tier 3 students; ensuring that interventions match student needs and are evidence based

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

Professional development opportunities will be offered both on the district and school level. Primary and Intermediate grades will be offered professional development on the Benchmark Advanced Reading Series and BEST Standards given by the Elementary Learning Department. Teachers will also have opportunities to participate in district trainings on intervention strategies given by the Literacy Department on Heggerty Phonemic Awareness, Leveled Literacy Interventions and Reading Horizons.

These district trainings will be supported on the school level by the literacy coach who will conduct voluntary trainings monthly and visiting and observing classrooms.

For math, professional development is offered by the Math Department on BEST Standards and the GAP Analysis of the MAFS and BEST Standards. The math coach will support these trainings by conducting voluntary monthly meetings and visiting and observing classrooms.

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

Additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond will be:

- \* Support staff will provide guidance and assistance to all teachers as needed
- \* Guidance counselor will provide SEL lessons and resources
- \* Principal will continue to meet with teachers and address classroom needs of students

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

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

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	After reviewing the school's data based on i-Ready and FSA scores from 2021, the area of ELA was chosen.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	By May of 2022, 52% of our third, fourth, and fifth graders will score proficient on the Spring 2022 FSA ELA assessment.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	<p>This area of focus(ELA), will be monitored in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* i-Ready Diagnostic</li> <li>* i-Ready Lessons</li> <li>* Administration of the Benchmark Assessment for AP2 and AP3</li> <li>* Data chats with grade levels</li> <li>* Monitoring of Tier 2 and Tier 3 students in the RTI process</li> <li>* Unit Assessments from Benchmark Advanced</li> </ul>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Jacqueline Carro (jacqueline.carro@browardschools.com)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	The evidence-based strategy that will be implemented for this area of focus will be to deliver reading instruction using an explicit and systematic approach. This will include all the areas of reading: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. These practices will be utilized in both whole group and differentiated small group instruction. Students will be screened using diagnostic assessments and progress monitored. The strategies will be utilized using resources from Benchmark Advance Reading Series, Leveled Literacy Instruction, Reading Horizons, and Foundations/ Wilson.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	The rationale for selecting these specific strategies is that these are evidence-based strategies as outlined in the Broward County K-12 Reading Plan.
<b>Action Steps to Implement</b>	
	* Screening and identifying students using the Benchmark Assessment AP1, i-Ready Diagnostic, and 2021 FSA scores
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Kathleen Arden (kathleen.arden@browardschools.com)
	* Use data collected to determine the specific interventions needed for identified students and progress monitor these students through the MTSS/RTI process.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Kathleen Arden (kathleen.arden@browardschools.com)
	* Provide resources to teachers for screening, diagnosing, and progress monitoring.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Kathleen Arden (kathleen.arden@browardschools.com)
	* Monitor teacher classrooms to ensure that these practices are being implemented with fidelity.

**Person Responsible** Jacqueline Carro (jacqueline.carro@browardschools.com)

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** After reviewing our i-Ready Diagnostic and Math 2021 FSA Scores an additional area of focus will be in the area of math.

**Measurable Outcome:** By May of 2022, 52% of third, fourth, fifth graders will score proficient or above on the 2022 Math FSA assessment.

**Monitoring:** This area of focus will be monitored by the following:

- \* i-Ready Diagnostics
- \* i-Ready Lessons
- \* Go Math Chapter Tests
- \* Small group instruction
- \* Data Chats
- \* Use of evidence based interventions for math students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 in the MTSS/RTI process

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Delcarmen Linares-Colon (delcarmen.linares@browardschools.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The evidence based strategy that will be implemented in this area of focus will be to teach the seven mathematical thinking and reasoning standards in an explicit and systematic manner.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The MAFS and BEST Standards are both based on students being able to fluently solve computational math problems and then use mathematical reasoning to apply this knowledge to solve word problems.

### Action Steps to Implement

\* Screening and identifying students using the GO Chapter Tests, i-Ready Diagnostic, and 2021 FSA scores

**Person Responsible** Delcarmen Linares-Colon (delcarmen.linares@browardschools.com)

\* Use data collected to determine the specific interventions needed for identified students and progress monitor these students through the MTSS/RTI process.

**Person Responsible** Delcarmen Linares-Colon (delcarmen.linares@browardschools.com)

\* Provide resources to teachers for screening, diagnosing, and progress monitoring.

**Person Responsible** Delcarmen Linares-Colon (delcarmen.linares@browardschools.com)

\* Monitor teacher classrooms to ensure that these practices are being implemented with fidelity.

**Person Responsible** Jacqueline Carro (jacqueline.carro@browardschools.com)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**After reviewing our school discipline data to the data across the state our incidents were very low. The primary concern that will monitor this school year will be property incidents which has been identified as computers being issued to students last school year for hybrid learning. The school culture and environment will be monitored by using a collection of discipline data on this type of incident.**

### **Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment**

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

#### **Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.**

The school addresses building a positive school culture and environment by implementing a school wide behavior plan that focuses on reinforcing positive behaviors. Classroom teachers are also implementing 10 minutes daily of SEL lessons.

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

The stakeholders and their roles in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school are the following:

Leadership- ensures that all stakeholders are aware of the schoolwide positive behavior plan

Teachers- are implementing the schoolwide positive behavior plan

Students- are aware of the schoolwide positive behavior plan and follow the rules and procedures of the school and classrooms

Parents- are aware of the behavior plan and reinforce expected behaviors with their child

Business Partners- provide incentives and rewards to be used for reinforcing student behavior and to boost teacher morale

### **Part V: Budget**

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

<b>1</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA</b>				<b>\$60,400.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	3336		1321 - Sheridan Park Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		\$7,600.00
			<i>Notes: iReady Teacher Toolbox for remediation materials for teachers to utilize with teachers during small group instruction as well as during ELO camps</i>			
	5000		1321 - Sheridan Park Elementary Schl	Other		\$47,800.00
			<i>Notes: Instructional support teachers hired using ESSER funds to remediate students.</i>			
	5000		1321 - Sheridan Park Elementary Schl	Other Federal		\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: Funding for ELO camps for students needing additional remediation beyond the school day.</i>			
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math</b>				<b>\$52,800.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5000		1321 - Sheridan Park Elementary Schl	Other Federal		\$47,800.00
			<i>Notes: Instructional support teachers hired using ESSER funds to remediate students</i>			
	5000		1321 - Sheridan Park Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: Funding for ELO camps for students needing additional remediation beyond the school day.</i>			
<b>Total:</b>						<b>\$113,200.00</b>