Plantation Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Plantation Elementary School

651 NW 42ND AVE, Plantation, FL 33317

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Judith Pitter

Start Date for this Principal: 10/6/2015

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 (54%) 2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (46%)
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

Plantation Elementary School

651 NW 42ND AVE, Plantation, FL 33317

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**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		C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership
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
Pitter, Judith	Principal	Oversees the daily activities and operations within a school. Main duties included disciplining or advising students, reviewing curriculum for teachers and ensuring the school environment is safe for all students and staff members
Rhodes, Dana	Assistant Principal	Responsible for carrying out day-to-day organizational tasks and facilitating efficient communication between coaches, support staff, and staff members. Duties consists of daily curriculum updates, parent and student concerns relating to behaviors. Ensuring that all stakeholders are in a safe enviornment.
Scott, Esther	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Responsibilities for supervising, educating and supporting students to help them accomplish learning benchmarks in reading. Duties consist of planning lessons that target specific skills and concepts, managing classroom behavior to keep all students engaged in the daily lesson.
White, Beverly	Math Coach	Responsibilities for supervising, educating and supporting students to help them accomplish learning benchmarks in Math. Duties consist of planning lessons that target specific skills and concepts, managing classroom behavior to keep all students engaged in the daily lesson.
Harley, Rafael	Teacher, ESE	Responsibilities for supervising, educating and supporting ESE students to help them accomplish learning benchmarks in reading and math. Duties consist of planning lessons that target specific skills and concepts, managing classroom behavior to keep all students engaged in the daily lesson. Creating and implementing Individual Education Plans (IEP)
Clarke, Rosalyn	Instructional Coach	Responsibilities for supervising, educating and supporting students to help them accomplish learning benchmarks in reading and writing.. Duties consist of planning lessons that target specific skills and concepts, managing classroom behavior to keep all students engaged in the daily lesson. Creating instructional Focus Calendars (IFC) conducting reading and writing professional develoment for all teachers.
Watson, Winston	Science Coach	Responsibilities for supervising, educating and supporting students to help them accomplish learning benchmarks in Science. Duties consist of planning lessons that target specific skills and concepts, managing classroom behavior to keep all students engaged in the daily lesson. Creating monthly assessments, instructional focus calendars (IFC) and conducting science professional development for all teachers.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 10/6/2015, Judith Pitter

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.*

2

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

47

Total number of students enrolled at the school

539

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

4

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	100	91	78	102	91	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	550
Attendance below 90 percent	49	45	23	32	26	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	194
One or more suspensions	1	2	1	7	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
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	44	32	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	37	30	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	10	9	25	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60

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	1	11	7	40	36	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122

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	16	11	33	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
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	99	83	97	103	82	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	540
Attendance below 90 percent	58	40	31	30	27	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	212
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	8	33	48	27	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	99	83	97	103	82	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	540
Attendance below 90 percent	58	40	31	30	27	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	212
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	8	33	48	27	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	35%	58%	56%				47%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	56%						56%	60%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%						59%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	47%	54%	50%				55%	65%	63%
Math Learning Gains	75%						61%	66%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	66%						46%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	46%	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	45%	60%	-15%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	47%	62%	-15%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2022					
	2019	48%	59%	-11%	56%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

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	56%	65%	-9%	62%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	58%	67%	-9%	64%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2022					
	2019	53%	64%	-11%	60%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	35%	49%	-14%	53%	-18%
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	15	43	50	23	55	54	10				
ELL	24	53		48	79	64	24				
BLK	35	58	56	48	75	66	47				
HSP	42			50							
FRL	31	54	58	46	76	68	42				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	24			17							
ELL	27	44		27	31		20				
BLK	31	26	20	28	21	13	24				
HSP	50										
FRL	32	26	13	25	19	13	27				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	15	39	33	22	47	36					
ELL	46	56	54	50	59	53	26				
BLK	47	55	59	55	62	48	32				
HSP	37	75		58	57						
FRL	46	57	60	55	61	45	36				

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	50
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	20
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	400
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36

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	45
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	51
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	46
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	50
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?

The data component that showed the lowest performance was the ELA achievement percentage which was 31% from the 2021-22 school year. One of the contributing factors was the meeting the rigor of the standards in Tier 1 instruction. There is a significant increase in reading complexity from 2nd to 3rd grade.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was the lowest quartile in Reading. We decreased from 59% to 55% in the lowest quartile in Reading. Our 4th grade students were grouped by ability and the instruction lacked rigor and did not meet the needs of students in the lower quartile.

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

The data component that showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average was the ELA achievement percentage. There was a 30% point gap between the school and state average. The gap is closing each year and are working hard to build capacity on each grade level. The teachers had to hard at teaching foundational skills while trying to accelerate on grade level instruction.

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

The component that showed the most improvement was ELA learning gains. We went from a 47% to a 57% which was a 10% increase. Target instruction was implemented daily to meet the needs of all students.

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

The contributing factors for this improvement was, target instruction, small group, differentiated learning centers with weekly progress monitoring through iReady.

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

Rigorous tier 1 instruction that employs gradual release model which works towards student independence. The instruction includes, frequent modeling, interactive read alouds, accountable talk and shared reading and writing. This ensured that all students were receiving rigorous instruction. Once teachers pinpoint the area of need, they referred to the multi-system of support to align the intervention to the lowest quartile.

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 recieve professional development and district core reading program, Benchmark Advance, Rti, MTSS, and F.A.S.T. PM 1, PM 2 and PM 3,

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

To ensure sustainability, we will build capacity with all stakeholders.

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.**	Currently only 36% of our students with disabilities are proficient in reading.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Students with disabilities will increase in ELA by 5 percentage points to meet the state federal index of 41%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The area of focus will be monitored through weekly, bi-weekly, end of unit (three weeks) and F.A.S.T progress monitoring one, two and three.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rafael Harley (rafael.harley@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	IEP goals and objectives for all SWDs are aligned to the general education standards. Teachers modify learning goals and instruction for students with a significant cognitive disabilities, using the same or similar age appropriate materials as those used by the general population. Special education teachers will be able to articulate what all students need to know, understand and be able to accomplish current benchmarks.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	General and Special Education teachers will use current Benchmarks as a foundation for instruction for all students with disabilities.

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.

1. Analyze Data
2. Implementation of Research-base programs such as Leveled LIteracy Intervention (LLI), Reading Horizon Discovery (grades 1-3) and Elevate (grades 3-5).
3. Bi-weekly Data Chats
4. Support general education teachers implementing accommodations per student iEP's.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

1. Analyze Data
2. Implementation of Research-base programs such as Leveled LIteracy Intervention (LLI), Reading Horizon Discovery (grades 1-3) and Elevate (grades 3-5).
3. Bi-weekly Data Chats
4. Support general education teachers implementing accommodations per student iEP's.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

1. Analyze Data
2. Implementation of Research-base programs such as Leveled LIteracy Intervention (LLI), Reading Horizon Discovery (grades 1-3) and Elevate (grades 3-5).
3. Bi-weekly Data Chats
4. Support general education teachers implementing accommodations per student iEP's.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

#2. 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.**	Currently only 31% of our students were proficient on the Reading portion of the FSA 2022.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	By June, 2023, 51% of the students in grades 3-5 will score a level 3 or above on the F.A.S.T PM 3.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome through weekly, bi-weekly, end of unit and F.A.S.T progress monitoring one, two and three.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rosalyn Clarke (rosalyn.clarke@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Utilize Web Depth of Knowledge, Questions Techniques, Targeted Reading Instruction, Small Group Instruction, Differentiated Centers
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	The above strategies were selected based on Doug Lemov Resources. Teach Like a Champion Techniques, Core Reading Benchmark Advance, Scholastic Bookroom Resources.

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.

1. Anaylze Student Data
2. Implement Research-Based Programs
3. Data Chats
Rigorous Tier 1 Instruction

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

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

Currently our 1st grade students are reading with a 45% proficiency based on the district End-of-Year Assessment.
Currently our 2nd grade students are reading with a 37% proficiency based on the district End-of-Year Assessment.
Currently our Kindergarten students are reading with 67% proficiency based on the district End-of-Year Assessment.

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

Currently 32% of our 3rd grade students were proficient on the 2021-22 FSA.
Currently 31% of our 4th grade students were proficient on the 2021-2022 FSA.
Currently 32% of our 5th grade students were proficient on the 2021-2022 FSA.

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)

Kindergarten per the STAR Literacy data, are at or above 32%.
1st grade per the STAR Literacy data are at or above 39%.
2nd grade per the STAR Reading data are at or above 27%.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

3rd grade per FAST ELA data were at 10% at or above grade level
4th grade per FAST ELA data were at 22% at or above grade level.
5th grade per FAST ELA data were at 13% at or above grade level..

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.

We will monitor using weekly, bi-weekly, End-of-Unit, STAR LIteracy K-2 and FAST (3-5).

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

Clarke, Rosalyn, rosalyn.clarke@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. §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?

*District Core Reading Program
* Leveled Literacy Intervention
* Reading Horizon/ Elevate
* IMAGINE LEARNING
*Benchmark Advance Intervention
* Guided Reading Scholastic Books

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?

These programs are research-based and district approved to meet the needs of all students.
These programs address the needs of Tier 1-Tier 3 students.
These programs are research-based and have been proven to be effective to target all students.

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
*Analyze lagging and leading data. *Implement current IFC's (K-5). *Monitor instruction through daily support and data chats.	Clarke, Rosalyn, rosalyn.clarke@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.

We build an environment that promotes family and community engagement, through parent nights, PTO meetings and quarterly curriculum nights Our school culture is built around, "Taking Care of Self", Others and our School (POWER OF 3).

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

*Parents, staff and community members
*Title 1 Open House
*Monthly SAC Meetings
*Monthly PTO Meetings
*STEM Museum Nights
*Communication to all stakeholders in their respective languages.
*Engaging parents in the shared decision making process during SAC and PTO Meetings.