

Broward County Public Schools

Pines Lakes Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Pines Lakes Elementary School

10300 JOHNSON ST, Pembroke Pines, FL 33026

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Susan Sasse

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2013

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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (48%) 2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (56%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Pines Lakes Elementary School

10300 JOHNSON ST, Pembroke Pines, FL 33026

[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	91%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C	C	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.

Preparing the next generation to be problem solvers and innovative thinkers through S.T.E.M. project based learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pines Lakes Elementary is committed to providing a happy, caring and stimulating environment where children will recognize and achieve their fullest potential.

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
Sasse, Susan	Principal	To provide the leadership and management necessary to administer and supervise all programs, policies and activities of Pines Lakes Elementary (PLE) to ensure high quality educational experiences and services for the students in a safe and enriching environment. Monitor student performance and teacher instructional practice, analyze data trends, and along with instructional coaches, provide support for teachers.
Balroop, Amrita	Assistant Principal	Monitor student performance and teacher instructional practice, analyze data trends, and along with the Literacy coach, provide support for teachers. Shares current educational trends, research and technology; understands the unique needs, population trends and characteristics of the students served at PLE; demonstrate effective communication and interaction skills with all stakeholders and track accountability.
Dejean, Christina	SAC Member	Responsible for implementing and facilitating strategies and materials to meet the needs of all students as part of the School Improvement Plan. Also serve on subcommittees such as Grade Level Chairs, Community Events and SAC/SAF.
Creviston, Kelly	Instructional Coach	Provide guidance and support for teachers in the area of English Language Arts (ELA), collaborate appropriate professional development and PLC support. Instructional Coach provides personalized support that is based on identified needs of individual teachers and differentiated supports that foster the growth and development of teachers. In addition to strategic content focused mentoring, coach supports teachers to develop skills in critical areas such as establishing positive classroom culture and climate, implementing instructional strategies, analyzing student work, differentiating instruction and supporting English Language Learners and student with special needs. Also, coaches will work collaboratively, build skills, analyze data, examine needs related to professional practice and engage in peer coaching with teachers.
Norman, Rashon	Teacher, ESE	ESE Specialist - provides support to school to ensure that students with disabilities demonstrate increased participation and performance in the standard or

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>Access curriculum, statewide assessments, and accountability systems. Support teachers in tracking students' data to make appropriate instructional decisions.</p> <p>The ESE Specialist provides personalized support based on identified needs of individuals based on differentiated supports that foster the growth and development of teachers.</p>
Wolfe-Yoloye, Carlene	School Counselor	Help students process their problems and plan goals and action. Mediate conflict between students and teachers to ensure that they can meet their academic goals.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2013, Susan Sasse

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.*

15

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.*

20

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

33

Total number of students enrolled at the school

491

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.

5

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	97	80	98	99	73	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	536
Attendance below 90 percent	38	23	30	36	25	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	177
One or more suspensions	1	1	2	15	17	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
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	26	20	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	40	23	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	2	14	14	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	3	3	10	29	35	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110

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	7	5	9	13	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
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

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	83	88	84	79	84	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	500
Attendance below 90 percent	30	18	19	17	10	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	5	5	7	10	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	2	2	3	6	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	5	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	83	88	84	79	84	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	500
Attendance below 90 percent	30	18	19	17	10	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	5	5	7	10	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	2	2	3	6	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	5	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	48%	58%	56%				54%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	53%						54%	60%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						39%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	38%	54%	50%				60%	65%	63%
Math Learning Gains	58%						81%	66%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%						67%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	33%	59%	59%				56%	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	44%	60%	-16%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	57%	62%	-5%	58%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	49%	59%	-10%	56%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

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	40%	65%	-25%	62%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	61%	67%	-6%	64%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
05	2022					
	2019	72%	64%	8%	60%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	52%	49%	3%	53%	-1%
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	20	38		23	55		21				
ELL	52	49		34	67		48				
BLK	41	59	54	26	52	57	15				
HSP	53	50	40	48	66	63	38				
WHT	42			40							
FRL	52	57	44	36	60	61	33				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	24	23		32	62		7				
ELL	48	55		36	50		29				
BLK	42	50		24	50		20				
HSP	43	53		34	46	40	26				
WHT	60										
FRL	46	47		26	42	50	23				
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	30	36		30	70	58	29				
ELL	53	48	44	65	81	73	59				
BLK	51	53	27	65	83	64	48				
HSP	52	53	45	57	76	67	64				
WHT	79	64		63	86						
FRL	50	48	39	57	78	66	54				

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	47
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	38
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	373
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	43
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	50
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	41
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	48
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?

Overall our school improved by 30 percentage points based on the Florida Standards Assessment calculation from 2020-2021 to 2021-2022.

FSA results indicated that we met 1 goal in the 7 categories, lowest quartile math

FSA results indicated that we improved by 6 percentage points in English Language Arts Learning Gains
FSA results indicated that we have consistently declined with our Students with Disabilities subgroup for the past three years.

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

Based on Florida Standards Assessment administered for grades 3-5 in 2021-2022, the area with the greatest need for improvement is Mathematics. Using 18-19 FSA scores as our baseline data our proficiency has decreased by 22 percentage points from 18-19 to 21-22.

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

During the pandemic students were taught math with digital manipulatives which contributed to students not completely exposed to the CRA (Concrete, Representational, Abstract) strategy to teaching math. Additionally when students returned to face-to face learning there were still protocols that prevented students from working in groups and teachers from providing students with hands on practice.

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

The area that showed the most improvement is our lowest quartile learning gains in mathematics. Lowest quartile subgroup data for 2020-2021 FSA data indicated 47 percentage points and 2021-2022 FSA data indicated 60 percentage points.

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

Teachers placed their focus on mathematics through Professional Learning Communities. This allowed teachers to review students' data and plan instruction to meet the needs of each learner. We also had a ESSER Math teacher that worked with our Tier 2 and 3 math students to focus on closing the achievement gaps.

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

Administration, instructional coaches and district departments will conduct instructional walkthroughs to provide feedback on standards based instruction and teacher instructional strategies. Teachers will use this feedback to improve instructional practices, lesson plan, collaborate with instructional coaches and seek professional development if needed in particular areas.

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.

Math New Materials Implementation
Thinking Maps Training
Positive Behavior Plan & Independent Work Time Professional Development
Mathematics EnVision Professional Development from District trainers

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

Administration will elicit teacher feedback via a survey, continue to meet with the professional development committee and ensure that school improvement plan is aligned to student and staff needs.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. 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.

In reviewing our Florida Standards Assessment data trends in ELA from 2019 to 2022 shows a constant decline in proficiency for our students with disabilities.
 2019-30 percentage points
 2020-24 percentage points
 2021-20 percentage points

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By June 2023 students with disabilities (SWD) will show a 5% increase in ELA proficiency based on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (F.A.S.T.).

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This area of focus will be monitored through the ongoing student assessments based on the ELA pacing guide, the F.A.S.T. progress monitoring assessment, iReady data and teacher/classroom observations conducted by administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Susan Sasse (susan.sasse@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Teacher-led PLCs are aligned with our instructional cycle calendar and by participating in PLCs teachers learn strategies to improve instruction for SWD.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Professional Learning Communities impact both teacher practices and 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.

Determine student needs through initial diagnostic assessments.

Person Responsible

Amrita Balroop (amrita.balroop-sookhansingh@browardschools.com)

Analyze student data to determine student progress and goals.

Person Responsible

Kelly Creviston (kelly.creviston@browardschools.com)

Create individual student goals for all students.

Person Responsible

Kelly Creviston (kelly.creviston@browardschools.com)

Ensure teacher instructional plan is aligned to student goals on IEPs.

Person Responsible

Rashon Norman (rashon.norman@browardschools.com)

Continue to progress monitor throughout the school year.

Person Responsible

Susan Sasse (susan.sasse@browardschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

In reviewing our Florida Standards Assessment data trends in Math from 2019 to 2022 shows a decline in proficiency.
 2019-60 percentage points
 2020-31 percentage points
 2021-38 percentage points

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By June 2023, 50% of students will be proficient or higher in Math as measured by the Spring 2023 F.A.S.T.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This area of focus will be monitored through ongoing student topic assessment data, F.A.S.T. assessment data and teacher/classroom observations conducted by administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amrita Balroop (amrita.balroop-sookhansingh@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Teachers will participate in professional development opportunities in Math to learn and implement strategies to improve instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The professional development opportunities will build capacity for teachers in the area of Mathematics to that they are better equipped to meet student needs.

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.

Teacher teams review their student performance data to enhance their Tier 1 instruction and implement differentiated teaching methodologies.

Person Responsible

Amrita Balroop (amrita.balroop-sookhansingh@browardschools.com)

Teachers will actively participate in data chats and team meetings.

Person Responsible

Susan Sasse (susan.sasse@browardschools.com)

Teachers will reteach and remediate their instruction based on review of student progress monitoring data.

Person Responsible

Susan Sasse (susan.sasse@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

Pines Lakes Elementary 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data from the iReady progress monitoring tool reflected the following proficiency for each of the grade level:

Kindergarten - 46 percent proficiency

1st - 42 percent proficiency

2nd - 40 percent proficiency

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

Pines Lakes Elementary 2021-2022 Florida Standards Assessment data reflected the following proficiency for each grade level:

3rd - 39

4th - 43

5th - 52

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)

By June 2022, students in grades K-2 will achieve 50% or above proficiency or higher as measured by the Spring 2023 F.A.S.T. STAR ELA Administration.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

By June 2022, students in grades 3-5 will achieve 50% or above proficiency or higher as measured by the Spring 2023 F.A.S.T. Cambium ELA Administration.

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.

This area of focus will be monitored through ongoing student cycle assessment data, F.A.S.T. progress monitoring, iReady data and teacher/classroom observations conducted by administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Sasse, Susan, susan.sasse@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?

Teacher-led PLCs are aligned with our instructional cycle calendar and by participating in PLCs teachers learn strategies to improve instruction.

School administration will use suggested reading "look fors" when conducting informal reading walkthroughs to monitor whole group and small group instruction during the 90 Minute-Literacy Block in K-5 grade to provide teachers with feedback to improve instructional practice.

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?

Professional Learning Communities impact both teacher practices and student achievement.

Immediate teacher feedback has proven to impact teacher practices and student performance when teachers are able to reflect and make informed decisions about how to maximize student growth in reading.

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
Teacher teams review their student performance data to determine the focus of their PLC.	Balroop, Amrita, amrita.balroop-sookhansingh@browardschools.com
Admin will review and approve of PLCs.	Sasse, Susan, susan.sasse@browardschools.com
Teachers will actively participate in PLCs throughout the year.	Balroop, Amrita, amrita.balroop-sookhansingh@browardschools.com
Teachers will reteach & remediate their instruction based on review of student progress monitoring data.	Sasse, Susan, susan.sasse@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 “Power of 3” framework is taught and reinforced schoolwide The three tenets are: Taking Care of Self, Taking Care of Others, and Taking Care of our Environment. All teachers utilize the Rick Morris Behavior monitoring system. Teachers are encouraged to use deescalation strategies and a calm-down corner for identified students. Students are provided visual schedules, incremental time feedback systems, checklists, and social stories to help them to be successful academically.

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

The role off all staff is to provide input into our Schoolwide Positive Behavior Plan. Staff are trained in the plan & students participate in a quarterly behavior assembly. Parents are informed of our plan and we work alongside parents and families to have carryover expectations of our positive school environment into the home.

Parents have an important role to be an active participant in their child's academic, behavior, and socialemotional growth. They will be invited and encouraged to become active members of the School Advisory Council. At these monthly meetings, parents are provided information regarding the school's Title I budget allocation, including professional development and parent involvement funds. Parents are encouraged to provide input into the development of our SIP and Title I activities. An annual evaluation will be conducted using surveys completed by parents, staff, and students. Results will be analyzed to evaluate the effectiveness of the school's Title I Parent Involvement Plan. Administration takes on the role of implementing the plan and providing consequences as needed.