

Broward County Public Schools

Mirror Lake 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

Mirror Lake Elementary School

1200 NW 72ND AVE, Plantation, FL 33313

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Marlen Veliz

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (56%) 2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Mirror Lake Elementary School

1200 NW 72ND AVE, Plantation, FL 33313

[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	90%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Mirror Lake Elementary provides a learning environment with purpose and opportunity, in order to advance academic, social and emotional growth for all students with the commitment for our staff, parents, students, and our community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Educating today's students for tomorrow's world by preparing them for college and career readiness by making learning engaging, accessible, and meaningful.

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
Veliz, Marlen	Principal	Oversees operational and instructional aspects of the school. Puts learning as the center of daily activities by shaping a vision of academic success for all students. In education by cultivating leadership in others and improving instruction by managing teachers, data, and processes.
Hafez, Hend	Assistant Principal	Assist with overseeing the operational and instructional aspects of the school. In charge of the academic and social and emotional behavior of students. Ensures that the mission and vision of the school is followed.
Johnson, Kiara	Instructional Coach	Ms. Johnson provides feedback, models, provides resources, and professional development to teachers as needed. She participates in data analysis and data chat with teachers. She serves as the literacy content expert and provides support on curriculum, high-quality instructions, and the science of teaching reading.
Smiley, Melissa	Other	Assists teachers in an autism program and assist general education teachers with strategies. Many of our students are mainstreamed and support is provided by the autism coach. In addition, we promote inclusion so trainings and acceptance activities and training are provided by the coach.
Wilson, Sherry	Other	Works directly with teachers, administrators, and parents in coordinating the delivery of exceptional students program. Provides explanations to parent(s) of the Procedural Safeguards as well as the availability of resources within the District to meet the unique needs of the student.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Marlen Veliz

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.*

34

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

609

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.

3

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems**

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	100	117	94	102	97	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	601
Attendance below 90 percent	100	117	94	102	97	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	601
One or more suspensions	40	42	29	25	21	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	183
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	15	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	30	23	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	11	24	15	17	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83

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	0	8	8	28	29	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	5	0	25	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
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	95	104	87	91	89	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	552
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	95	104	87	91	89	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	552
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	52%	58%	56%				55%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	66%						58%	60%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%						56%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	45%	54%	50%				55%	65%	63%
Math Learning Gains	64%						68%	66%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63%						68%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	44%	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	44%	60%	-16%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	72%	62%	10%	58%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2022					
	2019	52%	59%	-7%	56%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

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	49%	65%	-16%	62%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	64%	67%	-3%	64%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2022					
	2019	58%	64%	-6%	60%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	50%	49%	1%	53%	-3%
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	25	48	47	28	41		21				
ELL	59	74		36	52		38				
BLK	43	60	63	37	61	59	33				
HSP	65	76		54	66		55				
MUL	50	70		50	60						
WHT	64	63		52	78		67				
FRL	49	65	61	41	65	59	39				
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	29	33	29	22	30	55	28				
ELL	50	41		37	25		36				
BLK	45	60	43	25	31	15	39				
HSP	56	48		43	32		45				
MUL	46			54							
WHT	52			33							
FRL	44	46	33	27	20	25	28				
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	33	52	52	39	58	63	34				
ELL	58	56	54	52	67	80	61				
BLK	52	58	54	50	69	73	49				
HSP	56	58	64	59	63	64	59				
MUL	80										
WHT	53	55		61	67		50				
FRL	51	60	58	49	66	69	51				

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	55
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	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	442
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	52
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	51
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	61
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	58
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	65
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	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?

SWD scored lower than their peers in the areas ELA (25%), math (28%), and Science (21%). Also, BLK subgroup was the second lowest scoring group with 43% in ELA, and 33% in Science.

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

Reading Comprehension using integration of Science and Social Studies texts.
Math number sense, conceptual understanding, and fluency.

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 pandemic caused a great gap.
We are providing these students with small group instruction by our support staff members in the areas of reading, math, and Science.
Implementing researched based programs with fidelity.
In addition, we are closely monitoring the progress of these students.

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

WHT students increased 12% in the area of ELA and 19% in the area of Math.

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

Students were consistent in their attendance, increased small group instruction, and had the opportunities to attend extended learning before and after school.

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

Culturally responsive teaching practices, reinforcement of small group instruction, fluent grouping based on data collection, and effective implementation of ESE accommodation.

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.

Leaders and teachers will be provided with opportunities to participate in various professional developments in ELA and Math and the series.

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

Utilizing our Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief Fund teachers and support staff to provide additional support through pull-out/push in small group instruction to assist in closing the achievement gaps.

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.

Mirror Lake Elementary will be focusing on ELA proficiency Level. Based on our FSA ELA Data, our ELA proficiency level in 2022 had an increase of 3 percentage points. 2021 we earned 49% and in 2022 we achieved 52%. Our focus this year is to improve our Tier 1 and Tier 2 instruction utilizing higher order questions with higher text complexity as well as additional small group instruction to continue to improve our proficiency level in ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase ELA achievement level from 52% to 55% by the end of 2022-2023 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Student progress will be closely monitored through unit assessment data and via classroom observations and monthly data collections.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Hend Hafez (hend.hafez@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Implementation of Benchmark Curriculum Resources, and Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) for students working below level.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

These are research based program/strategies and have proven great results.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. 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.

Mirror Lake Elementary will be focusing on ELA proficiency Level. Based on our FSA ELA Data, our ELA proficiency level in 2021 for our SWD was 35%. They had a 3 percentage points increase, however they scored below the 41% state requirement. Our focus this year is to improve our Tier 1 and Tier 2 instruction utilizing higher order questions with higher text complexity as well as additional small group instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase ELA proficiency level for SWD from 35% to 42 % by the end of 2021-2023 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Student progress will be closely monitored through unit assessment data and via classroom observations and monthly data collections.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Hend Hafez (hend.hafez@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Implementation of Benchmark Curriculum Resources, and Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) for students working below level.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

These are research based program/strategies and have proven great results.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

Daily phonics instruction.

Differentiated hands on center activities

Project-based learning

Small group skill and strategy based instructions

Using research-based intervention programs

Introduce and apply tier 2 and tier three vocabulary and the National vocabulary program in delay instruction

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

Differentiated hands on center activities

Project-based learning

Small group skill and strategy based instructions

Using research-based intervention programs

Introduce and apply tier 2 and tier three vocabulary and the National vocabulary program in delay instruction

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)

Increase ELA proficiency level for SWD from 35% to 42 % by the end of 2022-2023 school year.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Increase ELA proficiency level for SWD from 35% to 42 % by the end of 2022-2023 school year.

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.

Implementation of Benchmark Curriculum Resources, and Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) for students working below level.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Hafez, Hend, hend.hafez@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?

The Benchmark Advance curriculum is being implemented as Tier 1 instruction to achieve the measurable outcomes of reading skills in each grade level. Benchmark Advance is closely aligned to the BEST standards and meets Florida's definition of evidence-based. Benchmark Advance is also listed on the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan for the 2022-2023 school year.

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?

Benchmark Advance is a program that provides students opportunities to develop literacy skills and content knowledge. Benchmark Advance is BEST standards aligned and is the suggested reading curriculum from the state of Florida. Through this program student's literacy deficiencies can be identified and addressed.

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
Literacy Coach responsible for monitoring the following steps (kiara.johnson@browardschools.com): Academic Camps	Johnson, Kiara, kiara.johnson@browardschools.com
Vocabulary: implementation of Vocabulary Workshop, Wordly Wise, and National Vocabulary- In addition, students utilize Tier II vocabulary daily as shared on daily announcements.	Johnson, Kiara, kiara.johnson@browardschools.com
Proper prescription given to Rtl students- ensure small group daily instruction- interventions done with fidelity	Johnson, Kiara, kiara.johnson@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.

Administration and support staff worked collaboratively to develop a school-wide positive behavior plan that addresses the school vision and goals. Due to unstructured time in the hallways, a positive behavior incentive program is needed to decrease hallway behavior by 50%. Our goal is to decrease hallway incidents by 50% by the beginning of the 2nd quarter. Data will be checked by the administration weekly. All staff will keep track of positive behaviors in the hallways by class and turn individual Dolphin Dollars into administration daily. Names will be pulled from the box three times a week and announced daily. Names will be pulled from the box three times a week and announced on the morning ITV show. Students with winning Dolphin Dollars will be given prizes by the administration. All staff will be trained by the administration on the criteria for giving Dolphin Dollars to students. Teachers will keep charts in their classrooms to track the

dollars weekly. The administration will use the CHAMPS 7-Up Checklist to monitor and assess weekly. As classes demonstrate an increase in overall positive behaviors, the number of students chosen will increase. Hallways will have bulletin boards with photos of students receiving prizes from the administration. Students with multiple wins will be invited to have a special lunch with the administration.

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

Marlen Veliz-Principal
Hend Hafez- Assistant Principal
Lisa Piper- Guidance Counselor
Dymond Cross, PTO President Parent/Community Representation
Marie Joseph- . PK Team Leader
Priscilla Maxwell- Kindergarten Team Leader
Andrea Gresham - 1st Grade Team Leader/BTU Rep
Andrea Cutrone - 2nd Grade Team Leader
Victoria Leibowitz- 3rd Grade Team Leader
Jannette Hill - 4th Grade Team Leader
Lawrence Hennequin - 5th Grade Team Leader