

Broward County Public Schools

Dillard Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Dillard Elementary School

2330 NW 12TH CT, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33311

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Lavina Robinson

Start Date for this Principal: 8/9/2022

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* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (45%) 2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (53%)
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	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Dillard Elementary School

2330 NW 12TH CT, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33311

[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	100%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		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.

The mission of Dillard Elementary is to provide quality education to all students, to collaboratively develop students and prepare them for the 21st century in a stimulating, safe and motivating learning environment. Dillard Elementary embodies its purpose through a variety of program offerings and high expectations that are embedded within the culture of the school. All students are provided with a stimulating learning environment that consists of reading, writing, language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. Students' learning is enhanced through the use of multi-media such as I-pads, and laptops. Classrooms are also equipped with Smart Boards or Promethean Boards, projectors, document cameras, and Elmos.

This year we are placing an emphasis on increasing tier 1 teaching and learning and closing the achievement gap through studying and implementing Don Lemov's text: Teach Like A Champion.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Dillard Elementary, it is our belief that all students can learn if provided the opportunity. The vision of Dillard Elementary is to develop a healthy community of learners who are academically proficient, effective communicators, and responsible citizens. All stakeholders have high expectations for students and are dedicated to providing all students with a challenging and rewarding learning 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
Robinson, Lavina	Principal	<p>The primary leader in the school building. The principal is responsible for establishing a schoolwide vision of commitment to high standards and the success of all students. The principal ensures that the school allows both adults and children to put learning at the center of their daily activities by being the head of the school leadership team and monitoring the implementation of the school's vision. The principal also monitors school-wide data to assess student, class, grade and school-wide progress to ensure the school is achieving its goals and engages teachers in conversation regarding class, grade, and school-wide data, mentor teachers and facilitate reflective conversations.</p> <p>The principal also supports teachers and coaches to develop curriculum knowledge to maximize classroom instruction and student learning.</p>
Orr, Camille	Assistant Principal	<p>Supports teachers in developing their knowledge about the curriculum, and promotes teacher collaboration with a focus on effective classroom instruction. Monitors school-wide data to assess student, class, grade, and school-wide progress to ensure the school is achieving its goals and engages teachers in conversation regarding class, grade, and school-wide data, mentor teachers and facilitate reflective conversations, supports teachers and coaches to develop curriculum knowledge to maximize classroom instruction and student learning.</p>
Basden, Adrienne	Instructional Coach	<p>Mrs. Basden is the Literacy Coach at Dillard Elementary School. She supports teachers in planning and implementing effective standards based English Language Arts lessons. Mrs. Ashley also creates standards based assessments for grades 2-5 and meets with teachers to dig deep into the data and use the data to inform instruction. Mrs. Ashley also creates and modifies the Math Instructional Focus calendar as needed. She also facilitates and leads Math Professional Learning Communities.</p>
Chestnut, Kierra	School Counselor	<p>Ms. Chestnut supports the social and emotional learning of the students at Dillard Elementary. He assists students and teachers with learning strategies, self-management and social skills, and promotes success for our diverse students. He implements a school counseling program to support students through this important developmental period. The program provides education, prevention and intervention activities, which are integrated into all aspects of our students' lives. The program teaches knowledge, attitudes and skills students need to acquire in academic, career and social/emotional development, which serve as the foundation for future success.</p>
Fuller, Wynell	Attendance/ Social Work	<p>Mrs. Fuller. support services include mental health counseling, crisis support, and intervention, addressing issues of non-attendance and truancy, psychosocial evaluations, and consultation.</p>
Waldorf, Kelly	Math Coach	<p>Mrs. Waldorf is the Math Coach at Dillard Elementary School. She supports teachers in planning and implementing effective standards based math</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		lessons. Mrs. Ashley also creates standards based assessments for grades 2-5 and meets with teachers to dig deep into the data and use the data to inform instruction. Mrs. Ashley also creates and modifies the Math Instructional Focus calendar as needed. She also facilitates and leads Math Professional Learning Communities.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/9/2022, Lavina Robinson

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.*

1

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

39

Total number of students enrolled at the school

575

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

7

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

7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	98	110	115	108	102	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	660
Attendance below 90 percent	59	72	54	54	50	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	350
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	8	9	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
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	43	41	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	34	39	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	5	14	12	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

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	6	10	5	36	45	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	173

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	6	9	3	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/17/2022

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	92	116	110	96	125	130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	669
Attendance below 90 percent	63	73	74	50	77	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	415
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	32	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	35	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	1	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	24	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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

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	92	116	110	96	125	130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	669
Attendance below 90 percent	63	73	74	50	77	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	415
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	32	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	35	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	1	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	24	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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

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	31%	58%	56%				34%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	53%						58%	60%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%						68%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	40%	54%	50%				59%	65%	63%
Math Learning Gains	63%						62%	66%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%						49%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	29%	59%	59%				22%	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	36%	60%	-24%	58%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	38%	62%	-24%	58%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	23%	59%	-36%	56%	-33%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

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	61%	65%	-4%	62%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	53%	67%	-14%	64%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2022					
	2019	60%	64%	-4%	60%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	21%	49%	-28%	53%	-32%
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	50		29	47		19				
ELL	29			50							
BLK	30	52	46	39	62	51	27				
HSP	50			60							
FRL	31	51	45	40	62	50	27				

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	23			53							
ELL				17							
BLK	25	32	36	28	20	27	14				
FRL	26	33	38	29	21	25	16				
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	23	57	56	33	47	33	20				
ELL											
BLK	34	58	68	59	62	49	22				
FRL	34	57	68	59	62	49	22				

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	46
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	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	370
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
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	55
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	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

ELA

*As students matriculate from 3rd grade to fourth grade there is a slight increase in proficiency, however, when there is a decrease in fifth grade.

*Students with disabilities and English Language Learners also demonstrate a decrease in proficiency in ELA and Math as they progress from third to fifth grades.

Math

There is a decrease in Math proficiency from 3rd to 4th grade and a slight upturn in proficiency in fifth grade.

While reviewing the iReady Diagnostic results from the 2021-2022 school year, it was noted that English Language Learners (ELLs) made very little progress from fall to spring and in some cases no progress at all.

Students with disabilities also saw a significant drop in proficiency in Math.

Science scores are consistently below the district's average.

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

1. ELA Proficiency for SWD
2. Overall proficiency 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?

The contributing factors to this need for improvement are:

1. State testing scores
2. Interim and summative school assessments

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

Math Achievement and Math Learning Gains.

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

Contributing factors to this achievement were:

1. Additional support teachers who provided a double and triple dose of small group math instruction.
2. Before-school and after-school remediation and enrichment academic camps.
3. Bi-weekly PLC meetings focused on sharing best practices and reviewing student work samples

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

1. Focus on student work
2. Small group instruction

3. Targeted center activities
4. Sharing best practices

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.

Professional Development Opportunities

1. Benchmark Advanced Reading System
2. Teach Like A Champion Techniques

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

Continued professional development in the Benchmark Advance Reading System

Professional development in Teach Like A Champion Techniques

Sharing best practices in PLC

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Three-year trend data indicates that SWD continue to perform significantly below the district and state average in ELA. In addition, SWDs are performing below the federal index of 41%.

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

By June 2023, ELA proficiency of SWD students will increase from 25% to 30%.

Monitoring:

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

Data of SWDs from PM1, PM2, PM3, will be monitored during quarterly data chats. Topic Assessments from the Envision Math Program will be monitored and reviewed by the Math Coach, ESE Facilitator, and the ESE Specialist.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelly Waldorf (kelly.waldorf@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

Implement Teach Like A Champion Techniques

Rationale for Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

Based on observation data, there is a need for an increase in student engagement. Through the techniques, teachers will learn how to Check for Understanding, raise academic expectations, increase the ratio of the cognitive work students do, motivate and engage students, make classrooms more writing-intensive, improve discussions, and anticipate when it is necessary to redirect student behavior so it is positive and productive which will lead to an increase in academic outcomes.

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.

Provide professional development to all classroom teachers and ESE service providers.

Person Responsible Lavina Robinson (lavina.robinson@browardschools.com)

Weekly classroom walkthroughs

Person Responsible Camille Orr (camille.orr@browardschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:****Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Three-year ELA trend data shows that overall in grades 3-5, 70% of scholars are not proficient readers.

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

By June 2023, ELA proficiency will increase from 31% to 40%.

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

1. F.A.S.T. Data from PM1, PM2, PM3 & Benchmark Advance Assessment Data will be monitored and reviewed with instructional staff via Data Chats with the administrative team.
2. Classroom walkthroughs/Timely Feedback

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Adrienne Basden (adrienne.smoot@browardschools.com)

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

Targeted implementation of ELA centers in all classrooms.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Learning centers give students the chance to demonstrate how much they've learned. During center time, teachers have the opportunity to monitor and observe students' skills, in addition, teachers may use this time to pull small groups for remediation or acceleration.

Students also need the opportunity to practice the skills they were taught in class. They need time to work with other students, and use hands-on manipulative materials without being under direct instruction from a teacher. When students are given the chance to practice skills on their own they can try out new ways of doing things and truly make the learning their own.

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.

Provide professional development on the adopted reading program: Benchmark Advance

Person Responsible

Lavina Robinson (lavina.robinson@browardschools.com)

Provide professional development on the implementation of ELA Centers

Person Responsible

Lavina Robinson (lavina.robinson@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

Based on AP3 data, specifically, the iReady Diagnostic, ELA proficiency data for grades K-2 is 36%. In order to support the ELA goal of 40% of scholars in grades 3-5 demonstrating proficiency in ELA, targeted ELA interventions and extended learning opportunities must be available and offered to primary scholars in grade K-2.

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

As evidenced by the results of the 2022 FSA (ELA), 31% of scholars in grades 3-5 showed proficiency in ELA. This data indicates a need for Extended Learning Opportunities in ELA for scholars and increased improvements in Tier I instruction for ELA. as well as differentiated, tiered ELA 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)

By May 2023, 40% of scholars in grades K-2 will meet proficiency as evidenced by FAST PM3 assessment data.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

By May 2023, 40% of scholars in grades 3-5 will meet proficiency as evidenced by FAST PM3 assessment data.

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.

Administration and Instructional coaches will conduct weekly focused classroom walkthroughs with timely, actionable feedback.

Progress monitoring assessments will be reviewed and instructional adjustments made via Data Chats.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Robinson, Lavina, lavina.robinson@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 following district-adopted ELA resources will be utilized during the ELA instructional block:

Benchmark Advance Reading System

Fountas and Pinnell Spelling and Word Study Program

Reading Horizons

Instructional Planning: Standards-Based Planning, quality Tier I instruction with targeted, deliberate interventions, targeted extended learning opportunities, analyze student work and assessment data.

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?

AP3 iReady Diagnostic data
2022 FSA ELA data

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
Create a master schedule with common ELA Planning for each grade level	Orr, Camille, camille.orr@browardschools.com
Evaluate implementation of Tier I standards based instruction	Robinson, Lavina, lavina.robinson@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.

Dillard Elementary builds a positive school culture and environment by greeting, students, parents, faculty, and staff every morning. Teachers welcome scholars every morning with a special greeting before they enter the classroom. Administration greets scholars every morning via the morning announcements and encourage them to make good choices. The district's character traits are taught and scholars are recognized each month for demonstrating the monthly character traits.

In addition, our volunteer program is growing each year. Parents and community partners are encouraged to participate in school activities and volunteer at our parent nights and on field trips. Monthly School Advisory Council meetings are held and an increase in the number of attendees has also increased. The school's Guidance Team facilitates monthly activities and recognition programs that promote a positive school environment for students and adults.

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

There are several stakeholders who play an integral part in promoting a positive school culture and environment. Administrators, teachers, parents, students, security staff, and community partners all play an important role in fostering a positive school culture. The administrative team works closely with the security team, facilities team, and teachers to ensure that scholars have a safe, clean, and nurturing school environment. Community and business partners serve as mentors and provide additional services to enrich the lives of our scholars.