Dania Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Dania Elementary School

300 SE 2ND AVE, Dania Beach, FL 33004

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Lewis Jackson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2010

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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (65%) 2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: A (67%)
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

Dania Elementary School

300 SE 2ND AVE, Dania Beach, FL 33004

[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	78%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		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 Dania Elementary is to provide ALL students with educational opportunities that will enable them to successfully reach their potential through the cooperative efforts of the home, school and community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Provide the highest quality education to all students.

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
Jackson, Lewis	Principal	Supervise the organization and academic processes of the school
Markevich, Galina	Assistant Principal	Assist the principal with supervising the organization and academic processes of the school.
Fumero, Janet	Other	Supervises ESE processes at the school
Hall, Sandra	Reading Coach	Supervises the implementation of the Literacy program and assists teachers
Hengge, Jennifer	Math Coach	Supervises the implementation of the math curriculum and asssists teachers
Magliocca, Patricia	Other	ASD Coach oversees our autism program and assists teachers, students and parents
page, elysia	School Counselor	Provides SEL services to our staff, students and families
Edwards, Jamie	SAC Member	SAC Chairperson facilitates our SAC meetings and spearheads our School Improvement planning

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2010, Lewis Jackson

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.*

4

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

34

Total number of students enrolled at the school

415

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

5

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

4

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	75	63	71	70	71	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	427
Attendance below 90 percent	37	20	37	20	26	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	161
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	22	13	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	21	17	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	4	8	7	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	4	9	18	19	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

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	2	2	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/1/2022

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	66	57	61	51	58	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	363
Attendance below 90 percent	20	22	19	21	10	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	13	10	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	1	2	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	66	57	61	51	58	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	363
Attendance below 90 percent	20	22	19	21	10	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	13	10	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	1	2	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	52%	58%	56%				59%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	74%						56%	60%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	73%						51%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	56%	54%	50%				76%	65%	63%
Math Learning Gains	79%						87%	66%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	68%						72%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	53%	59%	59%				55%	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	48%	60%	-12%	58%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	62%	62%	0%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
05	2022					
	2019	48%	59%	-11%	56%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

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	58%	65%	-7%	62%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	75%	67%	8%	64%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2022					
	2019	71%	64%	7%	60%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	46%	49%	-3%	53%	-7%
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	41	64		46	62		50				
ELL	49	71	64	57	88		44				
BLK	36	69	83	44	70	69	38				
HSP	54	73	67	60	87		60				
MUL	83			75							
WHT	81	86		71	75						
FRL	46	73	82	51	76	64	50				

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	42	36		45	42		29				
ELL	59	60		44	27		31				
BLK	41	35		28	7		34				
HSP	58	58	50	45	35		33				
MUL	69			23							
WHT	65	40		72							
FRL	47	46	29	36	27	17	37				

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	49	58	47	61	76	74	46				
ELL	52	59	47	68	81	67	44				
BLK	60	61	42	77	90	76	48				
HSP	51	46		77	86		64				
MUL	67			80							
WHT	65	62		72	86		60				
FRL	57	56	50	75	86	72	52				

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	64
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	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	515
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	53
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	62
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	58
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	67
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	79
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	78
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	63
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?

A few common trends noted are that the students' performance in algebraic thinking was strongest and fractions was the weakest area in grades 3-5 according to the 2022 Mathematics FSA. In ELA, student performance was highest in key ideas and details and lowest in integration of knowledge and ideas according to the ELA FSA.

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

Based on 2022 data, SWDs demonstrate a need for improvement, especially in ELA and Lowest Thirty Percent Learning Gains in ELA.

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

Focused reading and writing skills need to be put in place to address SWD and ELL needs. Teachers need to strengthen integration of knowledge and ideas by providing more effective strategies to these subgroups.

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

Math achievement gains showed the most improvement from 2021 to 2022 based on the 2022 Mathematics FSA.

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

The biggest contributing factor to this improvement was the use of ESSER teachers to provide academic interventions.

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

We will continue to implement the use of an ESSER teacher as well as the instructional coaches to provide interventions.

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.

The teachers will be encouraged to attend professional development trainings to effectively use the new math curriculum. The instructional coaches will also provide support in using the new materials and resources during curriculum meetings.

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

To provide a venue for ongoing sustainability, teachers will be expected to meet as teams to discuss gathered data and create plans to accelerate learning based on the data. Teachers will be given opportunities to plan together and meet with Curriculum Coaches on a regular basis. Teacher teams will continually review and revise scope and sequences as deemed necessary by gathered student data.

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.	The current FAST data, PM 1 for K-1 shows that 45% of students are on grade level (Tier 1), 23% are one grade level behind (Tier 2), and 32% are two or more levels behind, (Tier 3). The PM 1 data for 2nd grade shows 57% of students are on grade level (Tier 1), 8% are one year below, (Tier 2) and 35% are two or more levels below grade level (Tier 3). The current FAST data, PM 1 shows that 19% of students in grades 3-5 are on grade level (Tier 1), 30% are one grade level below (Tier 2) and 50% are two grade levels below (Tier 3). Within ELA, Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary was the area with the highest percentage of Tier 3 students (43%). Our focus will be on improving reading across genres and vocabulary through utilizing the curriculum, Benchmark Advance. This will be used as a Tier 1 Benchmark Advance has an intervention component that will be used for Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention. Reading Horizons will also be used as an intervention.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Based on FAST, the percentage of students on grade level will increase from 19% to 58% by May of 2023.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The literacy coach will assist in giving additional training and will model lessons during the monthly grade level curriculum meetings, targeting vocabulary and integration of knowledge and ideas.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sandra Hall (sandra.hall@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	We will use the collaborative learning strategy to increase teacher learning of the curriculum. Teachers will share their best practices using the Frayer Model of vocabulary instruction and graphic organizers for comprehension and integration of knowledge and ideas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this	We are selecting the collaborative learning strategy because research has shown it to be the most effective adult learning strategy. Lauren Davis, former department chair and instruction coach states, "when teachers come together to share information, resources, ideas, and expertise, learning becomes more accessible and effective for students. Collaborating means purposefully building interpersonal relationships and working towards healthy interdependence, which occurs when teachers are

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

comfortable giving and receiving help without forfeiting accountability." (Schoology, 2020).

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.

The Literacy Coach will have monthly grade level curriculum meetings. The grade level teams will work collaboratively to share best practices and learn strategies to increase their instructional expertise in teaching vocabulary and integration of knowledge and ideas.

Person Responsible   Sandra Hall (sandra.hall@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

The current FAST data, Early Literacy PM 1 for K-1 shows that 45% of students are on grade level (Tier 1), 23% are one grade level behind (Tier 2), and 32% are two or more levels behind, (Tier 3). The PM 1 Reading data for 2nd grade shows 57% of students are on grade level (Tier 1), 8% are one year below, (Tier 2) and 35% are two or more levels below grade level (Tier 3).

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

The current FAST data, PM 1 shows that 19% of students in grades 3-5 are on grade level (Tier 1), 30% are one grade level below (Tier 2) and 50% are two grade levels below (Tier 3). Within ELA, Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary was the area with the highest percentage of Tier 3 students (43%).

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)

In K-1, the percentage of students on grade level will increase from 45% to 75% by the May 2023 as evidenced by FAST PM 3. In second grade, the percentage of students on grade level will increase from 57% to 80% by the end of May 2023 as evidenced by the FAST PM 3.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

In grades 3-5, the percentage of students on grade level will increase from 19% to 58% by May 2023 as evidenced by the FAST PM 3.

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

The Literacy Coach will have monthly grade level curriculum meetings. The grade level teams will work collaboratively to share best practices and learn strategies to increase their instructional expertise in teaching vocabulary and integration of knowledge and ideas. The teachers will analyze the data from the Benchmark Advance Unit tests and the FAST PM 1 and PM 2 to examine which standards need to be retaught.

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

Hall, Sandra, sandra.hall@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?

Our reading intervention teacher in K-2 will be utilizing the district approved curriculum, Reading Horizons. She will implement this program with all Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. Our reading intervention teacher for grades 3-5 will be implementing the intervention portion of our Tier 1 Curriculum, Benchmark Advanced with Tier2 and 3 Students. Classroom teachers will be using Reading Horizons and Benchmark Advance are evidenced based curriculums which align with BEST standards and the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidenced-Based Reading Plan.

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?

We are selecting the collaborative learning strategy becuase it has been shown to be the most effective adult learning strategy. Lauren Davis, Former Department Chair and Instructional Coach states in "when teachers come together to share information, resources, ideas, and expertise, learning becomes more accessible and effective for students. Collaborating means purposefully building interpersonal relationships and working towards healthy interdependence, which occurs when teachers are comfortable giving and receiving help without forfeiting accountability." (Schoology, 2020)

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
The Literacy Coach will have monthly grade-level curriculum meetings. The grade-level teams will work collaboratively to share best practices and learn strategies to increase their instructional expertise in teaching comprehension and vocabulary.	Hall, Sandra, sandra.hall@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.

Staff collaborate to aspire to high expectations for each other and students. A focused alignment defines our positive culture and climate. Staff input is requested for many school wide decisions. This imparts a feeling of ownership.
We have a schoolwide positive behavior plan in place that promotes consistency across all levels.
Annual staff surveys request how each staff member likes to be recognized. Leadership uses this information to personalize recognition strategies.
We also promote local and global citizenship by participating in numerous charitable activities: Broward Education Foundation, Pennies for Patients, American Heart Association, Relay for Life, and Autism Walk.

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

We are fortunate to have several stakeholder groups who promote a positive culture and climate:
*Funshine Club - facilitates staff "get-togethers"
*Faculty Council - is a conduit between staff and administration
*PTO - organizes and implements fundraising activities that benefit staff and students
*Cups of Gratitude - peers recognize peers for positive action
*Positive Behavior Plan Committee
*Student Council - between students and staff