

Broward County Public Schools

Lakeside 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	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lakeside Elementary School

900 NW 136 AVE, Pembroke Pines, FL 33028

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Riquelme Rodriguez

Start Date for this Principal: 9/23/2015

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)	56%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (58%) 2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (63%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lakeside Elementary School

900 NW 136 AVE, Pembroke Pines, FL 33028

[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	56%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	90%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		A	A

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.

The mission of Lakeside Elementary is to work collaboratively with staff, parents, and community members so that all students reach their maximum potential by engaging in a collaborative, integrated learning environment, experience an enhanced, comprehensive curriculum and participate activities driven by interactive technology.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Lakeside Elementary is for students to achieve their maximum potential in all areas and prepare them to be collegiate and career ready.

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
May , Kathryne	Principal	Mrs. May coordinates administrative oversight and plans all phases of instructional leadership for the school including educational programming, administration, budgetary planning, discipline, and counseling services. She also maintains a safe and secure environment and building facility, with oversight of the custodial, facilities, and security components.
Archer, Marjorie	Assistant Principal	Ms. Archer ensures a safe, pleasant and effective educational atmosphere, provides discipline as necessary and enforces school policy. She assists the Principal to manage employees and oversees the instructional plan implementation. She supports the Principal in setting the overall direction, coordination and evaluation of the staff within the school.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 9/23/2015, Riquelme Rodriguez

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

636

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

11

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

11

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	115	123	102	104	113	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	663
Attendance below 90 percent	36	37	24	21	28	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	160
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	21	23	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	26	35	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	9	6	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	9	3	14	29	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76

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	1	16	5	9	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
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	105	95	102	115	105	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	662
Attendance below 90 percent	8	13	11	7	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	14	11	12	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	4	1	2	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	105	95	102	115	105	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	662
Attendance below 90 percent	8	13	11	7	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	14	11	12	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	4	1	2	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	57%	58%	56%				75%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	67%						69%	60%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%						61%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	57%	54%	50%				77%	65%	63%
Math Learning Gains	72%						70%	66%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%						61%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	47%	59%	59%				58%	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	77%	60%	17%	58%	19%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	75%	62%	13%	58%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
05	2022					
	2019	66%	59%	7%	56%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

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	80%	65%	15%	62%	18%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	76%	67%	9%	64%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
05	2022					
	2019	73%	64%	9%	60%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				

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	15	39	41	22	42	35	12				
ELL	55	74	67	59	69	43	41				
ASN	78	91		96	94						
BLK	46	48	46	37	62	40	41				
HSP	56	70	65	57	71	54	45				
WHT	61	63		59	72						
FRL	41	55	48	40	59	41	30				
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	26	38		16	14		8				
ELL	62	68	54	55	58		56				
ASN	87	45		86	58		75				
BLK	52	54		29	24	10	30				
HSP	62	65	38	54	46	24	51				
MUL	50			60							
WHT	79	71		67	40		83				
FRL	54	51	20	43	30	14	42				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	44	59	52	49	70	65	29				
ELL	70	72	78	71	68	62	51				
ASN	90	68		91	78						
BLK	65	62	44	80	70	82	43				
HSP	74	68	67	71	71	61	57				
WHT	84	82		85	58		63				
FRL	68	64	59	73	69	63	48				

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	59
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	471
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	59
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	90
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
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	60
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	64
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	45
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?

Looking at data from 2019, 2021, and 2022, our scores across content areas for our Students with Disabilities decreased dramatically over these years. We had improved from 2017 in all areas to 2019, and we're looking to continue that trend. In 2017 our ELA achievement was 25 and we increased to 44 in 2019. Our ELA Learning Gains in 2017 was 23 and we increased to 59 in 2019. Our ELA LG Lowest 25 in 2017 was 6 and we had increased to 52. With the changes due to covid, online learning, and the inability to provide all accommodations, the students with disabilities have shown a negative impact on learning.

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

Classroom teachers, ESE Support facilitators, and Support Teachers need to continue to teach in small group settings (students 4 - 8), provide interventions based on targeted needs, and monitor progress weekly. Communication between these teachers needs to be ongoing and weekly. During progress monitoring 2 in December, the progress of these students needs to be discussed to find if interventions are having an impact on achievement. If progress is not being made, then interventions need to be adjusted at that time.

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

All staff needs to monitor student progress in subgroups ongoing. The classroom teacher should be providing accommodations, the support teachers need to be providing targeted intervention, and the administration needs to monitor for fidelity for all of these components. During classroom walkthroughs

on all teaching staff, administration will use a file containing the Students with Disabilities in grades K - 5 to monitor implementation of interventions, small group settings, and accommodations aligned to their IEP.

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

In 2022 Math Learning Gains overall for students with disabilities showed the most improvement. In 2017 this subgroup had scored 32 and improved to 70 in 2019. Then during the time when we closed due to covid, provided a blended setting with online learning and face-to-face learning, where they scored 14 and finally returned to the building in 2022 where they regained to 42.

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

This area, Math Learning Gains, is directly attributed to the return to full face-to-face learning where students with disabilities were able to be instructed in small group settings with teacher interaction and math manipulatives. These strategies and accommodations are the only method some students with disabilities are able to learn mathematics.

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

We will need to continue the push in/pull out small groups for reading and math intervention. We will continue aggressive communication regarding progress for these students. We will adjust interventions if needed ongoing.

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 in all areas continue to be provided with professional development on interventions. Some of this is provided through peer observations of the intervention being used by a master teacher. Some is provided from district provided professional development. Some is provided through online learning. Last, we will use district support ongoing to help implement specific interventions in reading and math.

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

We believe fidelity of the consistent use of programs by trained staff members and monitoring by administration will provide the improvement and maintain our success.

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.

Students with disabilities scored 15 in English Language Arts Achievement on the 2022 Florida Standards Assessment. They also scored 22 on the Mathematics Achievement. This is well below the 67 in ELA and 65 in Math scored by their non disabled peers.

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 will increase from 15% to 24% as per the FAST ELA assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Interventions will be monitored with data. Classroom teachers will monitor progress on class data. Administration will have data chats with teachers. Progress monitoring 2 in December 2022 will be compared to Progress monitoring 1.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marjorie Archer (marjorie.archer@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Monitoring implementation of interventions with fidelity as an evidence based practice will be used so that the use of these interventions is consistent and daily.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

One of the main reasons our students with disabilities did not achieve during the past 2 school years is a lack of interventions, a decrease in attendance, and the inability to provide accommodations consistently.

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.

Our two Exceptional Student Education support facilitators will form groups based on screening for needs.

Person Responsible

Marjorie Archer (marjorie.archer@browardschools.com)

Our two Exceptional Student Education support facilitators will teach these groups with fidelity weekly and monitor lesson progress.

Person Responsible

Marjorie Archer (marjorie.archer@browardschools.com)

After 30 lessons, our two Exceptional Student Education support facilitators will assess students using mastery tests to determine student progress.

Person Responsible

Marjorie Archer (marjorie.archer@browardschools.com)

#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.

Students in grades 3 - 5 scored below 30% proficient on the Reading FAST Progress Monitoring 1. This is a critical need because that shows that 70% are not proficient in reading in these grades.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June of 2023, 50% or more of our students in grades 3 - 5 will be proficient on the Reading FAST Progress Monitoring 3.

Monitoring:

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

Students will be tracked by classroom teachers using comprehensive data sheets. These will collect the data from ongoing common unit assessments on benchmarks, FAST PM 1, FAST PM2, and our STAR Reading Assessment program.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marjorie Archer (marjorie.archer@browardschools.com)

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

All students identified as the lowest quartile in grades 3 - 5 have been screened for targeted intervention in their area of need. Each of these students were placed in an intervention group according to their needs with an ESSER teacher, an ESE teacher, or a classroom teacher.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Targeted intervention will be monitored through data analysis. The teachers will adjust groups ongoing according to this data collection.

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.

Our ESSER teachers will screen all students in grades 3 - 5 in the lowest quartile, and our new students, for an intervention.

Person Responsible

Marjorie Archer (marjorie.archer@browardschools.com)

Our ESSER teachers will form groups of students in grades 3-5 based on intervention needs.

Person Responsible

Marjorie Archer (marjorie.archer@browardschools.com)

Our ESSER teachers will instruct groups of students daily with fidelity.

Person Responsible

Marjorie Archer (marjorie.archer@browardschools.com)

Our ESSER teachers will assess students periodically with interim assessments to monitor progress.

Person Responsible

Marjorie Archer (marjorie.archer@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.

In our school, we use a program called GOLDEN GATORS. This program promotes and recognizes individuals that are doing well academically and/or behaviorally, or for improvement in those areas. We have used this for several school years, but for this year, we are expanding this to other groups within the school. For this school year, staff can give to students, staff, or classes showing an improvement or noticeable action in academics, behavior, or SEL. Students can give to other students or staff for the same. We are trying to broaden this program so that more participation will provide motivation for all students and staff to participate as much as possible.

In addition, we are returning to our LUNCH LOOT program which provides incentives for students & classes to show and maintain kind and orderly behaviors in the cafeteria with each other.

Last, for academic motivation we are celebrating programs we use in the school such as Reading in the Hallway, Reflex Math, and Accelerated Reader. We announce students on the morning TV announcements, display certificates in the hallways, and provide incentive prizes for achievement in these programs.

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

Our support staff team is responsible for promoting and maintaining a positive school culture and environment. Each member is aligned to a grade level to help motivate, monitor, and maximize the use of all academic and behavioral programs to get the most of our students. Support teacher - Tara Biesel kindergarten. Autism Coach - Jennifer Freesland 1st grade. Support teacher - Liuvy Reges 2nd grade. Support teacher - Rhoda Brijanand 3rd grade. ESE Support Facilitator - Carli Chiarelli 4th grade. Literacy coach - Mericis Sanchez 5th grade. ESE Support Facilitator - Michelle Chemaly - ESE students grades K - 5. Kathryne May, principal, and Marjorie Archer, assistant principal, are responsible for monitoring students and staff in all grade levels through data analysis and classroom walkthroughs.