Park Ridge Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Park Ridge Elementary School

5200 NE 9TH AVE, Pompano Beach, FL 33064

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Samantha Whitehead

Start Date for this Principal: 9/28/2021

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 (42%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (44%)
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

Park Ridge Elementary School

5200 NE 9TH AVE, Pompano Beach, FL 33064

[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	97%

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.

Park Ridge Elementary shall be a community that nourishes academic excellence for all students and demonstrates leadership in character development. The mission statement is intended to serve as both the blueprint for improvement and the benchmark by which we will evaluate our progress.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We are dedicated to our students, their families, and our community by fostering respect, leadership, and lifelong learning in an environment that is safe, secure, and incorporates an innovative, hands-on approach to learning.

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
Balchunas, Joseph	Principal	To provide the leadership and management necessary to administer and supervise all programs, policies and activities of the school to ensure high quality educational experiences and services for the students in a safe and enriching environment.
Whitehead, Samantha	Assistant Principal	Assist the school principal in overall administration of instructional programs and campus level operations. Coordinate assigned student activities and services.
Heichen, Amanda	SAC Member	4th Grade Team Leader SAC Chair Title I Liaison PLC Facilitator
Ragin, Trakina	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach will work as a colleague with classroom teachers to support student learning. The instructional coach will focus on individual and group professional development that will expand and refine the understanding about research-base effective instruction.
Turner, Susan	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach will work as a colleague with classroom teachers to support student learning. The instructional coach will focus on individual and group professional development that will expand and refine the understanding about research-base effective instruction.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 9/28/2021, Samantha Whitehead

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.*

6

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.*

29

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

39

Total number of students enrolled at the school

546

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

0

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	97	97	96	106	107	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	581
Attendance below 90 percent	48	35	31	29	40	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	214
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	10	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	3	8	27	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81

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	4	4	1	8	19	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71

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	3	3	7	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/22/2021

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	103	115	113	90	92	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	592
Attendance below 90 percent	25	23	14	11	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	3	3	1	16	16	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	8	11	11	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	103	115	113	90	92	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	592
Attendance below 90 percent	25	23	14	11	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	3	3	1	16	16	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	8	11	11	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	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				32%	59%	57%	33%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				47%	60%	58%	44%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	54%	53%	42%	51%	48%
Math Achievement				46%	65%	63%	49%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				47%	66%	62%	61%	60%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	53%	51%	40%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				23%	46%	53%	31%	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	30%	60%	-30%	58%	-28%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	36%	62%	-26%	58%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				
05	2021					
	2019	17%	59%	-42%	56%	-39%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				

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	40%	67%	-27%	64%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
05	2021					
	2019	32%	64%	-32%	60%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	19%	49%	-30%	53%	-34%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The data for this section is based on the ELA and Math iReady diagnostic data. The 5th grade science data is based on beginning of the year assessments, middle of the year and end of year assessments.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	22/26%	19/22%	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	18/23%	17/22%	0
	Students With Disabilities	2/11%	1/6%	0
	English Language Learners	7/23%	5/14%	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13/16%	5/6%	2/29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/12%	4/5%	1/33%
	Students With Disabilities	1/6%	1/6%	0
	English Language Learners	4/14%	0	0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	13/16%	20/24%	24/38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/16%	18/25%	22/42%
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	4/10%	4/10%	9/27%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5/6%	10/12%	6/32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/6%	10/14%	5/31%
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	1/3%	1/2%	2/18%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	32/36%	35/37%	41/45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	28/37%	30/37%	35/47%
	Students With Disabilities	3/21%	3/21%	5/42%
	English Language Learners	6/16%	9/21%	13/30%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5/6%	10/11%	16/23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/6%	9/11%	14/25%
	Students With Disabilities	0	3/21%	1/13%
	English Language Learners	1/3%	2/5%	1/3%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	14/15%	15/16%	13/19%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/14%	10/14%	9/19%
	Students With Disabilities	1/11%	1/10%	1/20%
	English Language Learners	3/5%	4/7%	7/15%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5/6%	13/14%	4/14%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/6%	9/13%	3/14%
	Students With Disabilities	1/11%	1/10%	0
	English Language Learners	1/2%	7/12%	1/6%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14/21%	19/26%	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/20%	15/26%	0
	Students With Disabilities	3/15%	2/10%	0
	English Language Learners	2/7%	5/16%	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9/14%	3/20%	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/14%	2/18%	0
	Students With Disabilities	1/5%	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6/63%	9/63%	16/63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/50%	5/50%	11/50%
	Students With Disabilities	1/9%	3/9%	5/9%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

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	5	30		18	32		6				
ELL	22	31	58	24	44	50	24				
BLK	22	31	45	26	45	45	34				
HSP	25	33		25	27						
FRL	23	27	62	26	40	42	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	11	43	38	20	46	60	10				
ELL	31	45	57	47	51	57	23				
BLK	29	47	46	43	45	52	22				
HSP	41	53		59	53		31				
FRL	31	48	51	45	47	49	23				

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
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	16	38	31	38	60	45	14				
ELL	30	50	64	41	65	59	18				
BLK	31	43	36	46	63	38	34				
HSP	40	46		60	64						
FRL	32	44	42	48	61	40	31				

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	35
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	34
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	281
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	18
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	36
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	36
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	23
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	
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	35
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 in all grade levels overall demonstrated a decrease in student achievement based on school and district progress monitoring assessments.
Students engaged in learning from home since March 2020 scored significantly lower than students who attended school face to face on school and district progress monitoring assessments.
Based on 2021 district promotion retention criteria, we had more students than normal not meeting criterion for promotion.
Overall learning gains and lowest quartile learning gains were significantly lower than years past for students in grade 5.

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 are math learning gains. They went from 61% to 47%. Although proficiency in math increased, learning gains decreased.

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 factors that contribute to this decline are the lack of consistent and targeted on going data analysis and support for our struggling students. The new actions that would need to be taken are to increase the math block to 90 minutes, beginning small groups, pull out, and push in to start earlier as well as direct coaching provided in the classroom during instructional time.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement are lowest quartile learning gains in ELA. They went from 60% to 67%.

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

Targeted instruction for the lowest quartile students in ELA. This includes push in and pull out, ELO after school camps as well as guided instructional intervention groups.

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

The strategies that will need to be implemented to accelerate learning is focusing on small group instruction, differentiated instruction, actionable feedback, strategically placing teachers to meet the needs of students. As well as, on going professional development, student and teacher data chats, current and relevant materials. Providing time for teacher planning, push in and pull out groups as well as afterschool camps.

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.

The professional development opportunities we will be offering include breaking down the new reading series and providing teachers with reading strategies to increase student achievement. In

math, we will be providing professional development focusing on small group instruction in math with a focus on chunking lessons into digestible bites.

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

The additional services that will be implemented are revised instructional focus calendars to meet the current needs of students. We have 3 esser positions, one focused on intermediate math, one on primary reading and one on intermediate reading. There is a special focus on providing double a triple dosing to our tier 3 students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The school wide ELA data is keeping our school on the lowest 300 list. Although we have increased proficiency, we are still below the state and district average. Additionally, we would like to provide opportunity for students to earn adequate learning gains in ELA, including ESE, ESOL and lowest quartile students.
Measurable Outcome:	By May 2022, 40% of students will demonstrate proficiency or above on the FSA in ELA.
Monitoring:	The area of focus will be monitored through student and teacher data chats, observation with actionable feedback, double dosing in the classroom, small group push in and pull out during and after school. Use of progress monitoring assessments, providing intervention programs with fidelity. Providing current and standard focused materials as well as professional development.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joseph Balchunas (joseph.balchunas@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence based strategy that is being implemented is progress monitoring with on going feedback. We will be monitoring progress using ongoing formative assessment broken down into small chunks of standards. These assessments will include reteaching of the standards for students not meeting mastery. We will also be engaging teachers and students in on going data chats to discuss strengths and weaknesses. We will be providing necessary and targeted assistance via small group intervention. Intervention will take place in class as well as pull out with additional staff members.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Progress monitoring is mandatory for all students and all subgroups in order to determine student mastery, teacher effectiveness and program implementation. The resources being used are on going progress monitoring portfolio maintained by the ELA coach for every teacher and student.

Action Steps to Implement

Conduct on going data chats with teachers and students after each formative assessment.

Person Responsible	Trakina Ragin (trakina.ragin@browardschools.com)

Create assessments aligned to the instructional focus calendar and the Florida standards as well as the Florida test specifications.

Person Responsible	Trakina Ragin (trakina.ragin@browardschools.com)

Conduct teacher professional development in the following areas: data analysis, small group and guided reading, using question stems and test design summary.

Person Responsible	Trakina Ragin (trakina.ragin@browardschools.com)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our area of focus is to increase proficiency in ELA for Students with Disabilities. This impacts student learning by providing students an opportunity to be on grade level in ELA. They are also able to close the achievement gap between them and students without disabilities. This area was chosen because on our schools' ESSA report card, students with disabilities are scoring substantially low.
Measurable Outcome:	By May 2022, 40% of Students with Disabilities will score proficiently on the 2022 FSA in ELA.
Monitoring:	The area of focus will be monitored through student and teacher data chats, observation with actionable feedback, double dosing in the classroom, small group push in and pull out during and after school. Use of progress monitoring assessments, providing intervention programs with fidelity. Providing current and standard focused materials as well as professional development.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joseph Balchunas (joseph.balchunas@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence based strategy that is being implemented is progress monitoring with on going feedback. We will be monitoring progress using ongoing formative assessments broken down into small chunks of standards. These assessments will include reteaching of the standards for students not meeting mastery. We will also be engaging teachers and students in on going data chats to discuss strengths and weaknesses. We will be providing necessary and targeted assistance via small group intervention. Intervention will take place in class as well as pull out with additional staff members. We will be incorporating various instructional strategies for comprehension and phonics like graphical representation, repeated practice as well as instructional focus calendar that allows for more teaching time.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students with learning disabilities will have more flexibility in their learning. We will also ensure to meet all of their IEP requirements throughout the entire school year including their testing accommodations for all formative assessments given throughout the school year. Due to students with disabilities struggling with reading, breaking things down into smaller chunks and providing opportunity for repeated practice will provide an opportunity for students to master the standards and goals.

Action Steps to Implement

Conduct on going data chats with teachers and students after each formative assessment.

Person Responsible	Trakina Ragin (trakina.ragin@browardschools.com)

Create assessments aligned to the instructional focus calendar and the Florida standards as well as the Florida test specifications.

Person Responsible	Trakina Ragin (trakina.ragin@browardschools.com)

Conduct teacher professional development in the following areas: data analysis, small group guided reading, using question stems, comprehension strategies and IEP accommodations.

Person Responsible	Trakina Ragin (trakina.ragin@browardschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

According to the data provided by SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, Park Ridge Elementary did not have any reported incidents to the Department of Education. Park Ridge will continue to implement our school wide positive behavior plan and our plan for a positive school culture to ensure that our students are attending school and participating in a safe environment. The culture and environment of our school will be monitored by our administration with support of our behavior tech through the lens of the behavior and discipline data from the behavior dashboard in BASIS as well as annual survey results provided by parents, students and teachers.

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.

This year, Park Ridge will focus on building positive relationships with parents, families and other community members in many ways. We will be incorporating many different activities and events that will focus on various interests and groups of people. We will be hosting events in school while practicing social distancing. These events include Family Nights, Literacy Nights, Dad's Day, multiple music events, Math and STEM Nights, Mom's Day, Field Day and more. Each family member and student will have a chance to be a part of these events. Parent engagement will increase our student achievement.

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

The following stakeholders provide support and funding to school wide events, initiatives and programs. This assist us with promoting a positive culture and environment at Park Ridge Elementary School.

Riverside Elementary School's PTA assists with promoting a positive culture and environment at Park Ridge Elementary School by donating supplies throughout the school year to assist our students in families. A few examples include, backpacks with school supplies, turkey dinners at Thanksgiving, toys for our annual Angel Tree drive as well as snacks for students to eat during after school camps.

The Kiwanis Club of Deerfield Beach sponsors our Terrific Kid awards given out quarterly, one per class, during our honor roll assemblies.

Afterschool Programs Inc. is one of our business partners who not only provides childcare to our families, but they sponsor and donate family nights, SAC meetings and many other school events by providing us with refreshments and complimentary child care to our families during these events.

In order to create college and career readiness awareness at Park Ridge Elementary School, business and community organization partnerships have been established. These partners are invited to attend our annual career day and present their chosen career path to our students.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$3,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5000	500-Materials and Supplies	1951 - Park Ridge Elementary School	General Fund	291.0	$3,500.00
			Notes: Purchase educational materials to reinforce ELA standards and Test Design Summary. The classroom materials that are used but not limited to Story works, LAFS, Rally, Reaching for the Standards			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$57,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5200	100-Salaries	1951 - Park Ridge Elementary School	IDEA	38.0	$57,500.00
			Notes: To provide a support facilitator to service students with diabilities in grades 3-5.			
					Total:	$100,915.00