# Mary M Bethune Elementary School

**2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan**

## Table of Contents

# Mary M Bethune Elementary School

### 2400 MEADE ST, Hollywood, FL 33020

### [ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

## Principal: Latosha Williams

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2021-22 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2021-22 Economically<br>Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| **School Grades History** | 2021-22: B (55%)<br><br>2018-19: C (51%)<br><br>2017-18: D (38%) |
| **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** | N/A |
| * 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

# Mary M Bethune Elementary School

## 2400 MEADE ST, Hollywood, FL 33020

### [ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

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

Elementary School
PK-5

**2021-22 Title I School**

Yes

**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**
(as reported on Survey 3)

100%

**Primary Service Type**
(per MSID File)

K-12 General Education

**Charter School**

No

**2018-19 Minority Rate**
(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)

94%

## 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.**

Our mission is to provide a personalized learning experience for all students with a rigorous curriculum that builds towards college and career readiness preparing students to become global citizens.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Our vision is to provide a creative learning experience that cultivates character and provides a rigorous curriculum in a safe, secure environment.

### 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 |
|------|----------------|--------------------------------|
| Williams, Latosha | Principal | Oversees daily instructional (teaching and learning) and operations of the school. Analyzes multiple data points and make adjustments as needed (staffing, instruction, professional learning needs, etc.). Communicates and seeks input from all stakeholders through collaborative planning, SAC meetings, staff meetings, and one on one data meetings with teachers. Supports and monitors the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions to ensure that the needs of all students are met. Participates in the design of professional development to meet the needs of the staff. Meets regularly to discuss the status of the school and any needs or decisions that need to be made. |
| Eames, Theon | Assistant Principal | Assists with the daily operations and supports teaching and learning throughout the school. Participates in collaborative planning, observations, and makes recommendations for adjustments. Supports and monitors the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions to ensure that the needs of all students are met. Participates in the design of professional development to meet the needs of the staff. Meets regularly to discuss the status of the school and any needs or decisions that need to be made. |
| Pellecer, Gloria | Math Coach | Instructional support for Math and Science. Supports teachers with lesson plans, data driven instruction, classroom management and administering assessments. Conducts non evaluation feedback, implements the coaching cycle (observations, model lessons, provide feedback), conduct classroom walk throughs, and provides professional development. |
| Jenkins, Nikitress | Other | Supports exceptional student education instruction, compliance, parent supports for students with special needs, and supports other school initiatives. Provides push in support to struggling readers in a small group setting. |
| Solano-Millar, Faustina | School Counselor | Supports social and emotional learning of students, provides supports to families and supports school initiatives such as mentoring, academic success incentives, safety and security. Oversees ELL, MTSS and 504 plans. Holds guidance lessons, small group and individual counseling along with peer mediation/conflict resolution. |
| Bradley, Tyesha | Teacher, ESE | Provides instructional support to students with IEPs and supports other school initiatives such as push in support, lower quartile support and academic success incentives. Coach and supports new teachers and oversee our school's induction program. |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Saturday 7/1/2017, Latosha Williams

**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.*

3

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

23

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

417

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

0

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

2

**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 | 52 | 61 | 71 | 62 | 56 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 373 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 18 | 20 | 26 | 22 | 26 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 136 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 18 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 14 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 3 | 7 | 6 | 10 | 12 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 |

**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 | 6 | 1 | 20 | 30 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87 |

**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 | 2 | 0 | 17 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| 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**

Friday 9/2/2022

**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 | 52 | 70 | 56 | 60 | 71 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 383 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 21 | 26 | 20 | 21 | 37 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 146 |
| 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 | 4 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 2 | 3 | 9 | 33 | 13 | 12 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 |

**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 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 9 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 |

**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 | 52 | 70 | 56 | 60 | 71 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 383 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 21 | 26 | 20 | 21 | 37 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 146 |
| 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 | 4 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 2 | 3 | 9 | 33 | 13 | 12 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 |

**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 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 9 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 |

**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 | 38% | 58% | 56% | | | | 36% | 59% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 60% | | | | | | 59% | 60% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 67% | | | | | | 64% | 54% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 49% | 54% | 50% | | | | 54% | 65% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 80% | | | | | | 54% | 66% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 69% | | | | | | 59% | 53% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 19% | 59% | 59% | | | | 33% | 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 | 32% | 60% | -28% | 58% | -26% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 42% | 62% | -20% | 58% | -16% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -32% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 33% | 59% | -26% | 56% | -23% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -42% | | | | |

| 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 | 62% | 65% | -3% | 62% | 0% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 50% | 67% | -17% | 64% | -14% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -62% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 35% | 64% | -29% | 60% | -25% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -50% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 30% | 49% | -19% | 53% | -23% |
| 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 | 47 | 67 | 25 | 71 | 57 | 10 | | | | |
| ELL | 25 | | | 50 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 34 | 64 | 67 | 50 | 82 | 67 | 13 | | | | |
| HSP | 42 | 50 | | 37 | 76 | | 17 | | | | |
| FRL | 36 | 55 | 59 | 47 | 81 | 73 | 14 | | | | |

| 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 | 12 | 50 | | 12 | 50 | | 7 | | | | |
| ELL | 22 | 58 | | 28 | 33 | | 8 | | | | |
| BLK | 30 | 40 | 44 | 23 | 33 | 53 | 13 | | | | |
| HSP | 22 | | | 22 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 45 | | | 45 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 27 | 42 | 43 | 21 | 31 | 57 | 13 | | | | |

| 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 | 9 | 55 | | 44 | 65 | | | | | | |
| ELL | 12 | 60 | | 35 | 40 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 37 | 57 | 60 | 54 | 55 | 58 | 39 | | | | |
| HSP | 28 | 73 | | 50 | 55 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 35 | 57 | 62 | 54 | 53 | 55 | 35 | | | | |

## 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) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 56 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 64 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 446 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 42 |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|---|---|
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **English Language Learners** | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 46 |
| 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 | 54 |
| 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 | 44 |
| 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 | 53 |
| 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?**

More than half of students in all grade levels, subgroups, and content areas, came in one to two grade levels below. We noticed through progress monitoring data that all grade levels, subgroups and content areas were increasing. In the end, based on FSA Data, the majority of our students made significant learning gains in all grade levels, subgroups, and content areas.

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

While our students made significant learning gains, proficiency is still our greatest need for improvement. Our goal for ELA and Mathematics was 50% Proficiency. Mathematics was able to almost achieve this goal with a 49% Proficiency in Grades 3-5, however, ELA was still more than 10 points behind.

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

The contributing factors to this need for improvement are deficiencies in prerequisite skills in both ELA and Mathematics. The new actions that will be taken to address this improvement will be working on these prerequisite skills both in whole group instruction, small group instruction, ESSER and Paraprofessional Pull-out and Push-in support.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was learning gains in both ELA and Mathematics.

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

In the 2021-22 School year, Bethune Elementary School had the advantage of having 3 ESSER Teachers as well as Paraprofessional support. Because of this, we were able to target students in need

of support. We had many groups for push-in and pull-out support, providing small group, targeted instruction to those students that were deficient in both ELA and Mathematics.

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

In order to accelerate learning, we will again target students for support and reteaching. However, this year, Bethune Elementary does not have the ESSER Support that was provided in 2021-22, making it more difficult to implement the small group instruction as we would like. We will be looking at more reteaching in targeted groups by classroom teachers to try and accelerate learning.

**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.**

Each week, grade levels attend "Power Hour" which is how we implement professional development and discuss data with the teachers. In addition, coaching support is provided through modeling and push-in during instructional blocks.

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

The additional services that will be provided are establishing student groups, based on data, for push-in and pull-out support by our ESSER Teacher, Paraprofessionals, and Coaches.

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

**:**

| #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. | After analyzing our data, and not receiving the additional ESSER Teacher support, students will have to be targeted through Tier 1 Instruction by the teachers. Therefore, struggling students will have to receive additional support through small group instruction (addressing prerequisite deficiency) and flex group (reteaching grade-level standards) during the ELA Block. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. | By June, 2023 50% or more of student's in Grades 3-5 will be proficient in ELA as measured by the FAST Assessment. |
| **Monitoring:** Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. | Area of Focus will be monitored through the FAST Progress Monitoring data and Unit Assessments |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Nikitress Jenkins (nikitress.l.jenkins@browardschools.com) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. | One of the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus is Annotating Text. This strategy allows students to build knowledge and meaning from text. In addition, explicitly teaching academic vocabulary and writing to respond to text will be other area of focus. This will allow students to utilize and understand academic vocabulary. Responding to text, through writing, will allow students to build a deeper level of comprehension of the text. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy. | In order to become proficient in grade-level standards, students must know how to dissect and understand text at higher levels; not just a recall of information. By incorporating writing/annotating, the students are building a deeper understanding of skills, while also incorporating vocabulary and grammar. In this way, students will take ownership of learning and be actively engaged in the activities. |

### 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.

Professional Learning will be provided to ensure effective deployment of the strategies. Professional learning will be provided through "Power Hour" and push-in into the classrooms through modeling. Classroom walk-throughs will be conducted to monitor and provide support for effective use of strategies.

Immediate feedback and support will be provided.
Collaborative data chats will be conducted to monitor effectiveness and revise as needed.

**Person Responsible** Nikitress Jenkins (nikitress.l.jenkins@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.** | Since we had significant gains in Mathematics and nearly met our goal of 50% proficiency, we want to continue to grow. Therefore, we want to increase our proficiency goal to 60%. By achieving this goal, we know that learning gains will also show significant increases. |
| **Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | By June, 2023, 60% or more of students in grades 3-5 will demonstrate proficiency in Mathematics as measured by the FAST Assessment. |
| **Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | Monitoring of our goal will be done through the FAST Progress Monitoring Assessments as well as Topic Assessments and Cumulative Topic Assessments through the Savvas Math Program. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Gloria Pellecer (gloria.pellecer@browardschools.com) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** | The evidence based strategy being implemented goal setting. Clear lesson goals will help teachers and students to focus on every aspect of the lesson and about what matters most about the lesson. Making sure teachers and students have goals in mind for the lesson will give them more ownership of the outcomes. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.** | Since our students made significant gains last year, based on FSA data, we want to focus on proficiency and getting those numbers up to at least 60% in Mathematics. By having teachers and students set goals for not only lessons but for where they want to be at the end of the year, gives them something to work towards. It also allows teachers and students to monitor progress as they move through standards. In this way, they are able to target specific standards that need more attention. |

**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.

Professional Learning will be provided to ensure effective deployment of the strategy. Professional learning will be provided through "Power Hour" and push-in into the classrooms through modeling. Classroom walk-throughs will be conducted to ensure effective use of strategy.
Immediate feedback and support will be provided.
Collaborative data chats will be conducted to monitor effectiveness and revise as needed.
Through Collaborative data chats deficiencies will be identified for both students and standards so that reteaching targets can be established.

| **Person Responsible** | Gloria Pellecer (gloria.pellecer@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**

Kindergarten scholars that are not on track for the Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA Assessment = 54%
First Grade scholars that are not on track for the Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA Assessment = 37%
Second Grade scholars that are not on track for the Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA Assessment = 50%

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

Third Grade Scholars that are below a Level 3 or above on statewide, standardized ELA Assessment = 47%
Fourth Grade Scholars that are below a Level 3 or above on statewide, standardized ELA Assessment = 65%
Fifth Grade Scholars that are below a Level 3 or above on statewide, standardized ELA Assessment = 65%

**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, 2023, 80% of students in Grades K-2 will be on track to pass the ELA FAST Assessment

### Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

By June, 2023, proficiency in ELA will increase by 14% (from 36 to 50%), as measured by the Statewide FAST Assessment.

**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.

Data Monitoring will take place through PM1, PM2, and PM3 of the FAST Assessments as well as Benchmark Unit Assessments, and Intervention student progress monitoring. As well, the Instructional Leadership Team will conduct walk-throughs of the classrooms and provide immediate feedback to the teachers.

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

Jenkins, Nikitress, nikitress.l.jenkins@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?

Professional Development
Data chats of School-wide, District and State Assessments
Data driven decision making in regards to reteaching, grouping, ESSER, and Paraprofessional support

**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?

Based on the FSA data, there are a large number of students in grades K-5 that are not proficient in ELA. These practices are researched based and proven to increase proficiency.

**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 |
|---|---|
| Provide regular professional development through Power Hour Teacher engagement in data/student work analysis and planning for upcoming lessons and for planning of student groupings with ESSER and Paraprofessional support Monitor data for evidence of learning | Jenkins, Nikitress, nikitress.l.jenkins@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 school maintains a comprehensive PBIS plan that is shared with all stakeholders and explicitly taught and practiced throughout the year. Developing a positive relationship for all stakeholders consisting of staff, students, families, and community is crucial for the most efficient operation of a school. Staff are engaged with purposeful staff development. Family engagement activities are planned throughout the year. Mentoring groups for students are established. Supporting staff, students and families will create a safe learning environment for all students that will allow all students to be successful.

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

Stakeholders include administrators, teachers, support staff, scholars, families, the School Advisory Committee, PTA and community members. Each serves as a critical partner in this process.