Sanders Park Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sanders Park Elementary School

800 NW 16TH ST, Pompano Beach, FL 33060

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Karen Nesbeth

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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: B (59%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (58%)
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

Sanders Park Elementary School

800 NW 16TH ST, Pompano Beach, FL 33060

[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	88%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	99%

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.

Sanders Park's ongoing commitment is to educate all students in a safe, secure and highly engaging learning environment through standards- based instruction.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To prepare 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.**:**

Part I: School Information

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Nesbeth-bennett, Karen-daunn	Principal	The principal is the face of the school. They lead teachers and staff, set goals and ensure students meet their learning objectives. Provide instructional leadership for all educational programs at the school; work collaboratively to develop, implement and monitor an instructional framework that aligns curriculum with state standards. Principals also lead the school's day-to-day operations such as - prepare and manage the school's budget; manage and inventory the school's assets; Recruit, retain, develop and evaluate an effective and diverse faculty and staff. Lead and manage organizational processes for school operations including, but not limited to, student discipline, student attendance, school food service, student transportation, master schedules, extracurricular activities, school finance and financial reporting, and maintenance of the physical plant.
Fleming, Anitra	Assistant Principal	In collaboration with Principal, the Assistant School Principal assists in leading and managing the school. The assistant principal handles issues of school management, student activities and services, community relations, personnel, and curriculum instruction. Ensures that student learning is a top priority through leadership actions that build and support a focus on school success. Assist in working collaboratively to develop, implement and monitor an instructional framework that aligns curriculum with state standards, effective instructional practices, student learning needs and assessments. Assist in recruiting, retaining, developing and evaluating an effective and diverse faculty and staff. Lead and manage organizational processes for school operations including, but not limited to, student discipline, student attendance, school food service, student transportation, master schedules, extracurricular activities, school finance and financial reporting, and maintenance of the physical plant.
Hunt, Andrea	Math Coach	A math coach plans and provides modeling, coaching, planning, or observing with each teacher using effective math strategies on a weekly basis. They also assist teachers and administrators with the implementation of new instructional strategies, technology, math assessments, comprehensive curriculum, and math interventions.
Wallace, Shakitha	School Counselor	Guidance Counselors are professionals who work in schools or other educational institutions providing academic, personal, career advice to students, and provide SEL strategies. They work to examine and assess any potential or skills students may have and communicate this to them to help boost their self-esteem and well-being. Establishes small group counseling sessions. Provide materials and suggestions for classroom oriented guidance activities. Serves as the Child Abuse, Foster Care, Homeless designee. Member of the Behavior Threat Assessment Team.
Baldwin, Zobeida	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Meet the educational needs of students by assisting teachers and students in the implementation of the Reading Programs.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Clarke-Smith, Athlean	Other	To provide on-site procedural and curricular assistance to all school-based personnel with regard to the education of students with disabilities. Serve as the principal's designee for all exceptional student education (ESE) staff in accordance with the annual Local Education Agency (LEA) Memo. Coordinate required ESE meetings. Member of the Behavior Threat Assessment Team.
Smith, Yolanda	Reading Coach	Meet the educational needs of students by assisting teachers and students in the implementation of the Reading Programs. They also assist teachers and administrators with the implementation of new instructional strategies, technology, ELA assessments, comprehensive curriculum, and interventions. Provides professional development for school staff by modeling and coaching in the area of reading and on effective reading strategies for content area instruction. Ensures student and teacher needs are being met by analyzing data and recommend steps to address those needs.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/1/2018, Karen Nesbeth

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.*
5

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.*
4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
25

Total number of students enrolled at the school
413

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
1

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	62	71	78	56	70	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	407
Attendance below 90 percent	35	33	41	28	26	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	197
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	5	15	13	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	8	11	11	9	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	6	9	5	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/22/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - Updated

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

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

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				50%	59%	57%	48%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				63%	60%	58%	57%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	54%	53%	48%	51%	48%

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement				70%	65%	63%	66%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				80%	66%	62%	70%	60%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	53%	51%	65%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				36%	46%	53%	52%	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	42%	60%	-18%	58%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	48%	62%	-14%	58%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
05	2021					
	2019	46%	59%	-13%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	61%	65%	-4%	62%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	64%	67%	-3%	64%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2021					
	2019	72%	64%	8%	60%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	32%	49%	-17%	53%	-21%
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 Reading and Math data for all grade levels (1-5) was complied using the iReady Diagnostic Assessments.
Grade 5 Science
Fall - School developed standards assessment
Winter - Broward Standards Assessment (BSA)

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15/27%	16/27%	2/67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/24%	14/26%	2/67%
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	2/29%	2/25%	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12/21%	5/9%	1/33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/17%	4/8%	1/33%
	Students With Disabilities	1/25%	1/25%	0
	English Language Learners	1/14%	1/17%	0

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14/23%	15/24%	1/33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/22%	12/23%	1/33%
	Students With Disabilities	1/9%	0	1/50%
	English Language Learners	2/33%	1/17%	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	8/14%	16/26%	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/13%	14/25%	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	2/33%	0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	19/41%	15/31%	20/42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/39%	12/29%	17/42%
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	3/7%	7/15%	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/8%	6/15%	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	9/18%	18/31%	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/19%	17/33%	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	3/27%	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6/11%	24/41%	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/10%	22/42%	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	3/27%	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10/17%	15/25%	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/15%	14/25%	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	1/10%	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12/22%	23/39%	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/21%	21/38%	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	2/20%	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9/14%	20/33%	
	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	8			12							
ELL	55			47	90						
BLK	41	64	45	42	53	55	33				
HSP	55			38							
FRL	42	64	55	41	52		30				
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	44	56		42	61	58					
ELL	46	50		69	79		40				
BLK	48	61	53	69	79	59	36				
HSP	73			75							
FRL	50	62	52	69	79	57	34				

| 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	36	55	60	32	45		43				
ELL	50	44		71	71						
BLK	47	59	50	66	70	69	52				
HSP	64			73							
FRL	48	57	50	66	70	63	52				

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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	19
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	359
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	89%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	10
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	53
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
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	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

Current data suggests students in grades K-5 begin to demonstrate a decline in skills such as Phonics, Vocabulary, and reading comprehension (literature/informational text). Based on the End-of-year i-Ready AP 3 diagnostic data, 24% of students are performing above grade level, 19% are on-grade level, 36% is performing 1 grade level below, 12% is performing 2 grade levels below, and 9% is performing 3 or more grade levels below in reading.

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

The overall proficiency in Science Achievement showed the greatest need with a decline of 16% from the previous year.

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 contributed to the need for improvement were:

-Inconsistency with following instructional plan/pacing from previous year.
-No small group pull-out support was provided
-Solely relied on new Stem Scopes resource for Tier 1 instruction which had limited rigorous assessments.
-Did not implement end of standard mini-assessments/Checkpoints

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

The overall learning gains in mathematics showed the greatest improvement of 10% from previous school year. Learning gains for grade 3 increased from 88% to 100%, 61% to 75% in grade 4 and 76% to 84% in grade 5.

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

The contributing factors for this improvement were:

-Ongoing progress monitoring (Checkpoints, end-of standard assessments, etc.)
-Small group push-in support was provided Mon-Thurs.
-Bi-weekly PLCs/PD
-Rigorous assessments created via SchoolCity

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

Reading instruction will be provided by implementing Benchmark Advance Florida which supports a balanced-literacy approach (ie. Shared reading, IRA, guided reading/writing, Writer's/reading workshop, etc.). Students who are not making adequate progress will be recommended to the Response to Intervention (RTI) Team who will determine if intervention/evaluation is necessary. Lastly, extended learning opportunities will be offered to students through daily push-in support and afterschool camps/tutoring.

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 participate in bi-weekly professional learning communities to develop a deeper understanding of grade level standards (LAFS/BEST). Additionally, instructional coaches and school leaders will participate in district-led monthly meetings and professional development.

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

Best practices from lessons learned across grade levels will be continued next year and beyond with minor adjustments as needed. A focus on grade level planning by use of a Team Meeting Notes document will used to guide weekly meeting conversations regarding deliberate lesson planning. Program implementation such as Haggerty, LLI, Benchmark Advance Florida, Accaletics, and i-Ready will be implemented with fidelity to improve reading and math fluency and mastery of foundational skills. Additionally, ongoing data analysis will will be conducted to ensure timely instructional adjustments are made to meet the needs of all students. Lastly, PLCs, grade level meetings, and data conversations/chats will assist with the sustainability of the aforementioned programs and best practices.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As evidence of the 2021 Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), students scoring proficiency in ELA was 45%. Additionally, after reviewing the i-Ready AP 1 Diagnostic data, the current projected proficiency is 27%. Thus, there is a sense of urgency to teach students foundational reading and writing skills in grades tK -5 to increase overall reading achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency in ELA from 45% to 52% by June 2022 as indicated by the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA).
Monitoring:	Progress monitoring of student ELA data will be conducted on a weekly and monthly basis. School created checkpoints will be created to monitor student's progress with standards taught. Additionally, monthly checkpoints created via SchoolCity will be monitored to determine student progress. As a result of progress monitoring this data, professional learning communities topics/focus will shift to support and meet the needs of teachers. In addition, teachers will adjust instruction based on student needs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Yolanda Smith (yolanda.m.smith@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	ELA Instruction will be provided by utilizing the balanced-literacy framework (ie. Shared reading, IRA, guided reading/writing, Writer's/reading workshop, etc.). In addition, extended learning opportunities will be offered to students through daily push-in support and afterschool camps/tutoring. Lastly, students who are not making adequate progress, will be recommended to the Response to Intervention (RTI) team and possibly given an intervention to support learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The district has adopted a new basal program and supports reading instruction through the use of Benchmark Advance Florida. The Florida Benchmark Advance curriculum is grounded in the science of reading and designed for remote and on-site learning. Foundational skill standards are covered in systematic lessons that develop essential background knowledge and content vocabulary. Additional instructional resources that will be used to support reading instruction includes but is not limited to: Level Literacy Intervention (LLI), Heggerty Phonemic Awareness System, Reading Horizons, and BEST Things to Know: Deeper Dive grade level PLCs.

Action Steps to Implement

Administering, analyzing, and providing feedback using I-Ready Diagnostics and school created checkpoints working in collaboration with the reading coach, Teacher, and ESE support specialist.

Person Responsible Yolanda Smith (yolanda.m.smith@browardschools.com)

Monitoring, scheduling, conducting CPST meetings and assessing the progress of goals and analyzing student data.

Person Responsible Yolanda Smith (yolanda.m.smith@browardschools.com)

Providing opportunities for teacher professional development concerning best practices in foundational skills, small group differentiated instruction, and progress monitoring.

Person Responsible Yolanda Smith (yolanda.m.smith@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.

Based on school discipline data retrieved from the Behavior and Academic Support Information System, 20 referrals were written for Unruly/Disruptive behavior. Approximately 87% of referrals written were classroom-based, which indicates the core effectiveness for managing behavior is ineffective.

A School-wide Positive Behavior Team was created and will review student discipline data each quarter. Strategies for support and school-wide incentives will be discussed to decrease the number of office discipline referrals (ODRs). Our goal is to decrease the percentage of ODRs by 10% for Unruly/Disruptive Behavior by 6/9/2022, as measured by ODRs in BASIS. This data will be monitored by implementing the following strategies:

-Create school-wide reward system to focus on reinforcing unwanted behaviors
-Increase teaching of all school-wide expectations with emphasis on Act Responsibly & Respect.
-Reinforce hallway rules and expectations
-Daily reminders of SPE strut will be reviewed on the morning announcements.
-Review discipline flow chart quarterly with ALL staff to ensure they understand and use precorrections prior to issuing referrals.
-SPBP Team will train teachers on lessons and behavior strategies.
-Administrators will conduct classroom management observations across 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.

Sanders Park's ongoing commitment is to educate all students in a safe, secure and highly engaging learning environment through standards- based instruction. This is achieved by consistently holding teachers and students held to high academic expectations, and a majority of students meet or exceed those expectations. Communication of expectations is reviewed weekly and monthly during faculty meetings, professional learning communities, and team meetings. Additionally, the school makes an effort to involve various stakeholders during monthly School Advisory Meetings (SAC), parent engagement nights, and through partnerships with local businesses and organizations.

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

Various stakeholders within the school that promote a positive culture and environment at the school are:

Principal- Create and foster a school-wide vision/mission, establish norms, build relationships, model appropriate behavior, celebrate success, etc.
Assistant Principal- Support vision/mission, build positive relationships with staff, students and other stakeholders, celebrate success, model positive behavior, etc.
Guidance Counselor- Building and teaching Social emotional Learning strategies and lessons.
School Resource Officer- Partnering with school and being visible in school/community.
Instructional Coaches-Fostering positive relationships with teachers to offer support in order to increase academic achievement.
School Advisory Council (SAC) Chairperson- Liaison who plans, promotes, and facilitate monthly meetings with parents and various stakeholders to communicate important information pertaining to the school community.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$17,901.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0891 - Sanders Park Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$10,500.00
			Notes: Salaries for teachers for ELO afterschool Camps			
	5100	519-Technology-Related Supplies	0891 - Sanders Park Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$2,400.00
			Notes: Illuminate Education - School City assessments in reading and math.			
	3336	500-Materials and Supplies	0891 - Sanders Park Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$1,551.00
			Notes: Instructional materials for ELO Camps			
	5100	140-Substitute Teachers	0891 - Sanders Park Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$1,950.00
			Notes: Funding fir substitutes to provide coverage for teachers participating in professional development/curriculum planning activities.			
	3336	500-Materials and Supplies	0891 - Sanders Park Elementary School	General Fund		$1,500.00
			Notes: Supplemental materials to support implementation of ELA standards.			
					Total:	$17,901.00