Park Lakes Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Park Lakes Elementary School

3925 N STATE ROAD 7, Lauderdale Lakes, FL 33319

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Rhonda Parris

Start Date for this Principal: 9/20/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: B (57%) 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (50%)
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	ATSI
* 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 Lakes Elementary School

3925 N STATE ROAD 7, Lauderdale Lakes, FL 33319

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

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	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
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.

Park Lakes Elementary is committed to motivate all students to develop their potential, become life-long learners and be contributing members of our community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our goal is to offer all students an opportunity to excel in academics and social-emotional learning through real-world literacy and state-of-the-art teaching. In collaboration with parents, community, and stakeholders; our scholars will become global citizens for College and Career Readiness.

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Parris, Rhonda	Principal	A Principal, or Public School Principal, oversees the daily activities and operations within a school. Their main duties include disciplining or advising students, approving Teachers' curriculums and ensuring the school environment is safe for all students and staff members.
Glasford, Terri	Assistant Principal	Assists the Principal to provide instructional leadership to staff including: curriculum planning, review and implementation; and professional development. Assists in the day to day building administration and the safety and welfare of students, staff, volunteers, and activities.
Johnson, Simone	Math Coach	Math Coaches provide instructional support to all teachers and students by co-teaching, mentoring and modeling in classrooms. Candidates will provide support in continual assessment development and the collection, management, and analysis of data.
Austin, Paula	SAC Member	The chair is responsible for notifying members of upcoming meetings and votes. The chair, or designee, will facilitate the SAC meetings and inform the SAC of relevant issues related to school improvement activities.Classroom Teacher/SAC Chairperson

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 9/20/2022, Rhonda Parris

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

7

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

65

Total number of students enrolled at the school

964

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

6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	166	164	154	181	192	195	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1052
Attendance below 90 percent	78	56	62	50	57	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	358
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	3	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	46	52	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	56	50	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	154
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	4	12	33	36	27	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	5	19	52	71	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	215

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	2	53	54	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	166
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/1/2022

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	163	148	162	164	182	164	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	983
Attendance below 90 percent	55	54	45	50	63	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	316
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	2	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	15	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	12	25	21	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60

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	2	8	14	23	24	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	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	163	148	162	164	182	164	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	983
Attendance below 90 percent	55	54	45	50	63	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	316
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	2	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	15	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	12	25	21	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60

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	2	8	14	23	24	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	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	51%	58%	56%				53%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	66%						64%	60%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%						64%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	54%	54%	50%				61%	65%	63%
Math Learning Gains	76%						73%	66%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65%						55%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	37%	59%	59%				35%	46%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	47%	60%	-13%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	54%	62%	-8%	58%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2022					
	2019	46%	59%	-13%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	55%	65%	-10%	62%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	63%	67%	-4%	64%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2022					
	2019	55%	64%	-9%	60%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	34%	49%	-15%	53%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	37	55	30	38	59	33	33				
ELL	49	63	51	52	77	73	32				
BLK	51	67	51	55	78	62	40				
HSP	47	62	53	51	71	75	24				
WHT	50			67							
FRL	52	66	51	55	79	66	37				

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	30	37	27	28	37	42	16				
ELL	48	63	71	36	37	47	33				
BLK	47	57	68	35	27	29	32				
HSP	46	76		42	43		39				
FRL	48	58	68	36	30	32	35				

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	26	55	53	30	56	38	5				
ELL	53	68	69	64	78	55	38				
BLK	54	65	64	61	73	55	33				
HSP	43	61	67	58	77	60	41				
FRL	52	64	65	60	73	55	34				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
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	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	467
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	58
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	59
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	59
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	59
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Park Lakes Elementary has excelled this year in the areas of student achievement in all subject areas school wide. The school with continue to target ELA bottom 25%ile students and Science.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The greatest areas for improvement are SWD ELA, 25%ile ELA and Science based off of multiple assessment and ongiong data.

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 contributing factors to the this need for improvement are inconsistent student attendance, high transient population and

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

According to the FSA 2021/2022 results Mathematics gains and bottom 25%ile showed the most improvement.

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

Some of the contributing factors to the improvement in learning gains Mathematics additional support was provided to the teacher during initial instructional block and push-in support was provided to targeted students.

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

To accelerate learning for our struggling students will be support teachers during initial and small group instruction.

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 be provided professional development on specific strategies that support struggling readers during the quarterly Professional Planning Days, where teachers are provided coverage for a full day to attend on campus professional development and planning. Teachers will be provided modeling, support and feedback during the instructional block.

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 teachers will be provded release time to observe and support one another.Title 1 funds are identified annually to provide coverage for the Professional Planning Days.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	With a previous achievement level of 44% in the area English Language Arts of the fourth grade and a decline for the bottom 30% for the first time this past year, teachers will be provided extensive support through co-teaching, analyzing student's work, implementing high yield strategies, and creating engaging lessons to promote a greater level of comprehension in how students learn and grow in English Language Arts.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By May 2023, 50% of the fourth grade students will deomonstrate or 25% more growthin the area of English Language Arts as demonstrated on the FAST assessment in comparison of the first and last administration.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The area of focus will be monitored through Benchmark Weekly Assessments, comparison of grade level Readiness Assessent to End of Year assessment, a monthly review will be conducted to determine the level of student growth and determine additional supports needed moving forward.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Terri Glasford (terri.glasford@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Establishing and implementing goals to focus teacheing and learnig to ensour that instruction is aligned to BEST standard and implementing tasks that promote increasing time in text and vocabulary instruction that area aligned to the Benchmark program.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	These specific strategies were selected because they are alighned with the end goal in mind of getting teachers to understand how students learn and grow in English Language Arts which will move scholars to higher vocabulary and exposure to various content areas of text. This will lead Park Lakes to meet the goal of increasing student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Monthly PLC to address various topics from planning effective lessons to utilizing vocabulary and comprehension strategies to increase student understanding of language and text. Consistent support from district ELA department to review ELA "look fors" in instruction and provide tiely feedback and support. Quarterly ELA events to promote reading fun and engagement. Monthly review of data to ensure aligned instruction and faciliate data conversations.

Person Responsible   Rhonda Parris (rhonda.parris@browardschools.com)

During PLCs are conducted every three weeks and the team meetings are held weekly. During these meetings, teachers will receive ongoing training and support that will help them provide students with targeted instruction based on the FAST initial data.

Person Responsible   Terri Glasford (terri.glasford@browardschools.com)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	The SWD were identified for the past 3 years as not meeting the goal set by the state. Our SWD have made tremdous gains this past year by improving by 10% points.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By May 2023 the students with disablties will make a 5% point improvement according to the ESSA scores for the 2022/2023 school year.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The students with disablties will be monitored monthly during data chats and IEP meetings according to targeted content area for additional support.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Terri Glasford (terri.glasford@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	We will continue to target SWD for an additional targeted small group instruction focusing on ELA. The students will be provided with
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Our SWD have made increase in all subject areas and would like to continue that progress.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Push in support for SWD focusing on small group instruction targeting comprehension and vocabulary sttrategies.

Person Responsible   Terri Glasford (terri.glasford@browardschools.com)

Monthly PLC to address various topics from planning effective lessons to utilizing vocabulary and comprehension strategies to increase student understanding of language and text. Consistent support from district ELA department to review ELA "look fors" in instruction and provide tiely feedback and support. Quarterly ELA events to promote reading fun and engagement. Monthly review of data to ensure aligned instruction and faciliate data conversations.

Person Responsible   Terri Glasford (terri.glasford@browardschools.com)

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- ◦ The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- ◦ The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- ◦ Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

In reviewing the 21-22 ORR scores Kindergarten proficiency scores were 33%, 1st grade had 44% and 2nd grade had 51%. This demonstrates greater than 50% of the Kindergarten and 1st grade population as not being proficient in ELA. As a result these students will participate in additional small group push-in instruction that focuses on phonics, vocabulary and comprehension. The teachers instructing kindergarten and frist grades will participate in professional learning opportunities that address deficits in instructional practices, emphasizing the whole child, infusing reserch based strategies to promote literacy, and lesson planning design for differentiating instruction.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

In reviewing the 21-22 FSA, 44% of the 4th grade students scored a level 3 or above. Therefore, 66% of the 4th grade population is deficient in ELA. The demonstrates a great need for change of practice with fourth grade instruction. Teachers will be provided tiered professional learning that addresses gaps with understanding how students learn. students will have additional instruction from the literacy coach, and ESSR teachers with push-in and pull out instruction in small groups. This will address our Tier II students with the additional support.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- ◦ Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- ◦ Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- ◦ Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

50% or higher kindergarten-second grade students will achieve grade level expections of proficiency according to Oral Reading Record ELA assessment by May 2023.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

50% of all third-fifth grade students will achieve a score of proficiency or higher according to the result of the FAST assessment by May 2023.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

The area of focus will be monitored through the FAST PM1, PM2, Benchmark Advanced unit assessments, and the Oral Reading Record on a biweekly basis with item analysis and frequent data chats between teachers, support staff and administration. Adaptations will be made with student groups, teachers instruction, and resources based on data find.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Parris, Rhonda, rhonda.parris@browardschools.com

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

  ◦ Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

  ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

  ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

The in fusion of Benchmark Advance and Balanced Literacy implementation will increase academic proficiency by promoting strategies that increase student engagement and ongoing tutorials. The Benchmark Advance Lessons that are embedded into daily instruction will be monitored. In addition, instructional staff will participate in leteracy training to enchance small group instruction and delivery of interactive read-alouds. Teachers will begin by creating lessons plans that are aligned to the BEST Standards. Planned lessons will be evident through whole group and small group activities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

  ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

  ◦ Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The Benchmark intervention will provide teachers and support staff with the framework to increase student engagement and achievement by addressing the gaps with aligned BEST standard resources.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Monthly PLC to address various topics from planning effective lessons to utilizing vocabulary and comprehension strategies to increase student understanding of language and text. Consistent support from district ELA department to review ELA "look fors" in instruction and provide tiely feedback and support. Quarterly ELA events to promote reading fun and engagement. Monthly review of data to ensure aligned instruction and faciliate data conversations.	Glasford, Terri, terri.glasford@browardschools.com

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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

The most notable achievement Park Lakes Elementary has made over the past three years is the shift from teacher centered learning environments to student-centered environments. Teachers are challenged to work collaboratively as teams to develop innovative lesson plans that engage students in inquiry-based, project-based activities. Apart of this shift involves our recent acceptance as a Science Technology Robotics Engineering, and Consistent academic growth for our students will always serve as an area in which Park Lakes would like to show growth.
However, there are other areas that we would like to demonstrate growth. At Park Lakes, we strive to decrease the amount of classroom referrals. We plan to do this by infusing the concepts of social emotional learning (SEL) into our teachers' daily practices. Social and emotional learning (SEL) involves the processes through which children and adults acquire and effectively apply knowledge, attitudes and skills necessary to understand and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships, and make responsible decisions. The five core competencies of SEL center on developing the following abilities in our students:
Self-awareness: The ability to accurately recognize one's emotions and thoughts and their influence on

behavior.

Self-management: The ability to regulate one's emotions, thoughts and behavior effectively in different situations.

Social awareness: The ability to take the perspective of and empathize with others from diverse individuals and groups.

Responsible decision-making: The ability to make constructive and respectful choices about behavior. We plan to provide training for teachers on these competencies in hopes of decreasing the number of referrals for the following incidents. This information represents the type and number of incidents to date that we have encountered up to this quarter. Our goal over the next three years is to decrease the percentage of each incident by ten

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

The low socioeconomic demographic of our student population necessitates a strong partnership with stakeholders. We seek to further develop the relationships with partners that will assist the school in its vision to provide quality education through sustained partnerships with all stakeholders. it is our belief that building relationships with outside organizations is the cornerstone to the success of our students. We seek to establish relationships with business partners at the local and national level. Over the next three years. we desire to strengthen the bonds with our 52 local business partners while at the same time build relationships at the national level.