

Broward County Public Schools

Plantation 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	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Plantation Elementary School

651 NW 42ND AVE, Plantation, FL 33317

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Judith Pitter

Start Date for this Principal: 10/9/2016

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 (51%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: D (40%)
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	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Plantation Elementary School

651 NW 42ND AVE, Plantation, FL 33317

[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	81%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	98%

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.

To provide the best learning environment opportunity for each child in order to develop his or her highest level of achievement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To provide an equitable learning environment conducive to learning through STEM.

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
Pitter, Judith	Principal	To promote and maintain high student achievement by providing curricular and instructional leadership maintaining overall school site operations; receiving, distributing and communicating information to enforce school, District and State policies.
Rhodes, Dana	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discipline/Behavior Support/Referrals • Supervise Faculty and Staff (PK-2 teachers, paras, custodians, guidance, ESE) • Classroom observations and teacher/custodial evaluations • Instructional support/student achievement • Facilitator and Coach for Math and Science • Lowest 25% student support • Bullying Investigative Designee • Threat Assessment
Rhodes, Dana	Instructional Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessments – benchmark, monthly, FSA • Reading Facilitation, Support, and Training • Coaching and Modeling • Test Prep materials and schedules • Academic Camps • Push-ins and additional Support • Administrative Designee • Instructional support/student achievement • Classroom observations • Lowest 25% student support -facilitator • School Operations • Classroom support • Testing Coordinator
White, Beverly	Instructional Coach	Facilitate Math programs/instruction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessments • ACALETICS • IREADY • Coaching and Modeling • Instructional support/student achievement • Classroom support • Lowest 25% student support • School Operations
Harley, Rafael	Teacher, ESE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructional support/student achievement • Lowest 25% student support • Social Services for students School Operations • Guidance training for teachers/parents • Testing facilitation w/admin. • Chrysalis • Classroom support • Mentors

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Leaders • RTI • Bullying Prevention Liaison • SEL
Scott, Esther	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Literacy Support K-2 – Esther Scott <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading Facilitation, Support and Training • Assessments – benchmark, monthly, • Curriculum updates and training • Coaching and Modeling • Academic Nights and Fairs • Instructional support/student achievement • Lowest 25% student support • School Operations • Classroom support
	School Counselor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructional support/student achievement • Lowest 25% student support • Social Services for students School Operations • Guidance training for teachers/parents • Testing facilitation w/admin. • Chrysalis • Classroom support • Mentors • School Leaders • RTI • Bullying Prevention Liaison • SEL

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 10/9/2016, Judith Pitter

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

1

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

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

46

Total number of students enrolled at the school

575

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

3

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

2

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	99	83	97	103	82	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	540
Attendance below 90 percent	58	40	31	30	27	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	212
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	8	33	48	27	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	2	4	12	21	15	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74

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	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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
	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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
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	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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	

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				47%	59%	57%	40%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				56%	60%	58%	45%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	54%	53%	40%	51%	48%
Math Achievement				55%	65%	63%	48%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				61%	66%	62%	61%	60%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	53%	51%	53%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				35%	46%	53%	36%	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	45%	60%	-15%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	47%	62%	-15%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	59%	-11%	56%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	56%	65%	-9%	62%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	58%	67%	-9%	64%	-6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2021					
	2019	53%	64%	-11%	60%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	35%	49%	-14%	53%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Progress monitoring of ELA and Mathematics through iReady diagnostic in fall, winter and spring.
 Progress monitoring bi-weekly in ELA and Mathematics with Standard Mastery
 Science we use the FCAT

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	83/25%	83/25%	83/32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	68/21%	68/19%	68/26%
	Students With Disabilities	15/22%	15/0%	15/18%
	English Language Learners	12/8%	12/8%	12/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	83/14%	83/23%	83/28%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/12%	11/18%	13/21%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/10%	2/18%
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	97/27%	97/32%	97/30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	90/29%	90/33%	90//31%
	Students With Disabilities	10/27%	10/23%	10/15%
	English Language Learners	10/30%	10/0%	10/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	97/10%	97/15%	97/24%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/10%	12/15%	20/25%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	1/14%
	English Language Learners	1/10%	0/0	1/10%
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	103/44%	103/44%	103/55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	88/44%	88/44%	88/55%
	Students With Disabilities	15/23%	15/23%	15/23%
	English Language Learners	15/14%	15/13%	15/13%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	103/17%	103/27%	103/37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13/16%	20/25%	24/36%
	Students With Disabilities	4/31%	3/27%	3/38%
	English Language Learners	2/13%	1/7.1%	1/10%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	82/21%	82/23%	82/27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	66/19%	66/21%	66/26%
	Students With Disabilities	8/0%	8/0%	8/1%
	English Language Learners	14/0%	14/0%	14/10%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	82/16%	82/29%	82/30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/14.3%	16/26.2%	19/32.8
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/7%	2/16.7%
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	76/27%	76/34%	76/0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	65/26%	65/33%	65/0%
	Students With Disabilities	6/0%	6/0%	6/0%
	English Language Learners	11/11%	11/11%	11/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	76/16%	76/29%	76/29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/16.7%	18/30%	16/31.4%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/16.7%	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/11%	1/12.5%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	-	-	61/25%
	Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-
	Students With Disabilities	-	-	-
	English Language Learners	-	-	-

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	24			17							
ELL	27	44		27	31		20				
BLK	31	26	20	28	21	13	24				
HSP	50										
FRL	32	26	13	25	19	13	27				
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	15	39	33	22	47	36					
ELL	46	56	54	50	59	53	26				
BLK	47	55	59	55	62	48	32				
HSP	37	75		58	57						
FRL	46	57	60	55	61	45	36				
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	19	29		32	39	33	20				
ELL	32	41	54	44	64	70	30				
BLK	37	45	40	45	58	55	31				
HSP	50	46		59	71						
FRL	39	44	40	48	61	53	37				

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	25
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	38
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	203
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	93%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
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	31
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	25
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	50
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
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	23
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 data component that showed the lowest performance was the ELA achievement percentage which was 47% from the 2018-2019 school year. Even though it was the lowest data component it was an improvement from the previous school year which was 40%. However, we were still below the district average of 60%. One of the contributing factors was the meeting the rigor of the standards in Tier 1 instruction. There is a significant increase in complexity from 3rd to 4th grade.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was the lowest quartile in math. We decreased 50% to 43% which is a 7 point decline. Our 4th-grade classes were grouped by ability and the instruction was no rigorous and did not meet the needs of the students in the lowest quartile.

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

The data component that showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average was the ELA achievement percentage. There was a 10 percentage point gap between the school and the state average. The gap is closing each year and we are working hard to build capacity through each grade level. The teachers had to work hard at teaching foundational skills while trying to accelerate the students.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was ELA lowest quartile. We went from 40% to 59% which was a 19 point increase. Targeted instruction was implemented daily to meet the needs of the students.

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

The contributing factor for this improvement was targeted instruction of the lowest quartile in small groups with weekly progress monitor through I-Ready.

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

Rigorous tier 1 instruction that employs the gradual release model, which works towards student independence. The instruction includes frequent modeling, interactive read alouds, accountable talk, close reads, shared reading and writing to ensure that all student are receiving rigorous instruction. Once teachers pin point the arear of need they refere to the multitier system of support to align the intervention to the lowest quartile students. The intervention strategies include: small group instruction, differentiated learning centers, one-on-one instruction, the use of Level Literacy Intervention, Reading Horizons, Phonics Spelling and Word Study, and customize I-Ready lessons

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.

Teachers will receive professional development in District core reading program Benchmark Advance, I-Ready Tools for Scaffolding, Math Acaletics, RtI/MTSS, and Benchmark Assessment System (BAS)

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

To ensure sustainability we will build capacity with the all stakeholders

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: Currently only 15% of our student with disabilities are proficient in reading.

Measurable Outcome: Students with Disabilities will achieve and increase of overall achievement for ELA, thus meeting the state required targets.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored through monthly assessment with I-ready.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rafael Harley (rafael.harley@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

IEP goals and objective for all SWD's are aligned to the general educational standards. Teachers modify learning goals and instruction for students with a significant cognitive disabilities using the same, or similar aged appropriate materials as those use by student with out disabilities. General and special educational teachers can articulate what all students need to know, understand and be able to do in relation to the current standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

General and special education teachers use the current standards as the foundation for instruction for all students with disabilities.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Analyze Data
2. Implementation of Research Base programs such as LLI, Reading Horizon, and Benchmark Advance
3. Data Chats
4. Support general education teachers with utilizing with accommodations

Person Responsible

Rafael Harley (rafael.harley@browardschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

This is an area of focus aligned with the district literacy initiative.

Measurable Outcome:

By Spring 2022, 50% or more of students in grades 3-5 will score a level 3 or above on the Florida Standards Assessment.

Monitoring:

Bi-weekly Cycle Assessments, weekly iReady progress monitoring (usage/proficiency), Data Chats, bi-weekly grade level Collaborative meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dana Rhodes (dania.rhodes@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Utilize Web Dept of Knowledge Questioning Techniques, Targeted Reading Instruction, Small Group Instruction, Differentiated Centers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The above strategies were selected based on Doug Lemov Resources: Teach Like a Champion Techniques, Core Reading Benchmark Advanced, Scholastic Bookroom Resources, iReady.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Analyze student data
2. Implement Research-Based Programs
3. Data Chats
4. Rigorous Tier 1 Instruction.

Person Responsible

Dana Rhodes (dana.rhodes@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.

In 2019-2020 the school reported 1.3 incidents per 100 students. The rate is greater than the statewide 1.0 incidents per 100 students. The primary area of concern were 23 suspension. The school culture has implemented the Power of Three a behavior incentive program that reduce suspension significantly in the 2020-2021 school year.

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.

We build an environment or culture in which engaging programs take place and consider and plan for: families to feel welcomed, valued, and respected by program staff; two-way communication and relationship building with families are adapted to meet changing family and community circumstances; opportunities are provided for family support and development through the family partnership process and through intentional parent/family peer groups within the program and community.

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

Parents, Staff and Community Members
 Title I Open House
 SAC Meeting
 STEM Museum Nights
 Parent Meetings

Communication to all stakeholders in the respective languages. Engaging parents in the shared decision-making process during SAC Meetings. Collaborating with teachers, students and parents during monthly STEM Museum Nights. Personnel responsible: SAC Chairperson, Magnet Coordinator, Teachers, School Administrators

To include all stakeholders on the vision and mission of the school and to ensure that all students are successful Sign-in Sheets, Parent participation, parent surveys

Review Customer Service survey: administration

Print and complete Customer Service sheet during staff meeting: School Administrators and support staff
 Provide exceptional customer service to families and community stakeholders-Customer survey, sign-in sheets, Upload Customer Service survey with a summary of findings.

Connect families with school, district and local community resources. Upload documents by the fifth week of each quarter Convene a FACE Resource Team comprised of one representative from administration, instructional, paraprofessional, cafeteria, custodial, after school program, social worker, and school counseling.

Meet once each quarter to identify needs of community and discuss available school/ community resources and services for families that will minimize barriers - food, shelter, illnesses, hardship assistance, job referral agencies, etc. Update FACE SPACE with relevant information based on identified needs.

Provide ongoing updated relevant resources to families and the community Photos of updated FACE space; Upload completed programs and services sheet.

FACE members. FACE Resource Team.

Recognize the cultural uniqueness of families served in the school/community. Between the 5th and 6th week of school. Print and complete Cultural Awareness sheet. Identify ways to give value to and celebrate the traditions of the community and integrate them into the school culture. (ex. serving dishes from a particular culture during school events; acknowledging traditions and holidays; signage in different languages, etc.)

These are in addition to the 4 Cultural District Mandates and should be ongoing. Bridge the Cultural Gap between families & staff Upload completed Cultural Awareness sheet.

Continue the "Catch Them Being Great". Recognizing individuals within the school supporting a positive environment/culture in your school. Monthly During staff meetings, highlight a faculty and or/ staff who have been "Caught Being Great". Have the individual(s) complete the form and share with peers the specific steps or actions taken to achieve the accolade/recognition.

Example.....

Mr. Smith really knows how to make families feel welcome.

- Warm genuine smile
- Greets parents by name
- Gives his fullest attention
- Has open body language
- Consistent communication about student's progress.

Provide incentives to maintain a positive school environment

Upload the complete Catch them Being Great form and list of staff who were "Caught Being Great".

Share Social and Emotional Learning Competencies with families

1st Semester Distribute SEL competencies to families (<https://casel.org/wpcontent/uploads/2017/01/Competencies.pdf>) and/or facilitate a workshop for families on modeling behaviors that promote SEL skills at home.

Provide tiered support for Social Emotional Learning.

Upload a copy of each agenda, sign-in sheet, photos, Twitter.

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				\$3,066.08
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			0941 - Plantation Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$3,066.08
			Notes: ELO Camps material and supplies.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$3,066.08
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22

			0941 - Plantation Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$3,066.08
			<i>Notes: ELO Camps materials and supplies.</i>			
Total:						\$6,132.16