

Broward County Public Schools

Stirling 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	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Stirling Elementary School

5500 STIRLING RD, Hollywood, FL 33021

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jacqueline Arnaez

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (57%) 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (49%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Stirling Elementary School

5500 STIRLING RD, Hollywood, FL 33021

[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	76%

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.

Stirling Elementary School's mission is to academically and socially prepare all students by promoting intensive academic and behavioral programs in a changing, diverse society. We will strive to meet these challenges through data-driven intervention programs, improving academic areas in all subgroups, prioritizing school safety, and increasing our commitment to parental and community involvement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Stirling Elementary School's vision is that all students will exemplify positive character traits, outstanding behavior, and strive for academic excellence.

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
Arnaez, Jacqueline	Principal	Facilitate and assist the school's leadership team in designing, creating, implementing, and monitoring the school's annual academic and behavioral improvement plan. Furthermore, ensuring that all goals are realistic, attainable, and measurable for all groups of students.
Coachman Williams, Alisia	Assistant Principal	Facilitate and assist the school's leadership team in designing, creating, implementing, and monitoring the school's annual academic and behavioral improvement plan. Furthermore, ensuring that all goals are realistic, attainable, and measurable for all groups of students.
O'Neill, Marienid	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Assist the school's leadership team in designing, creating, implementing, and monitoring the school's annual academic and behavioral improvement plan. Furthermore, ensuring that all goals are realistic, attainable, and measurable for all groups of students.
Argibay, Tanya	Instructional Coach	Assist the school's leadership team in designing, creating, implementing, and monitoring the school's annual academic and behavioral improvement plan. Furthermore, ensuring that all goals are realistic, attainable, and measurable for all groups of students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Jacqueline Arnaez

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

24

Total number of students enrolled at the school

532

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

3

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

2

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	83	106	90	94	89	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	549
Attendance below 90 percent	34	46	30	39	38	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	221
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	29	14	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	32	20	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	19	16	9	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	4	17	12	20	27	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103

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	4	10	5	14	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/2/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	68	103	86	88	82	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	503	
Attendance below 90 percent	29	17	30	21	19	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	11	18	16	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	

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	2	5	11	4	8	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	

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	2	8	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	

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	68	103	86	88	82	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	503
Attendance below 90 percent	29	17	30	21	19	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	11	18	16	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73

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	2	5	11	4	8	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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	2	8	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	48%	58%	56%				57%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	61%						60%	60%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	62%						45%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	48%	54%	50%				57%	65%	63%
Math Learning Gains	72%						64%	66%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	73%						47%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	35%	59%	59%				45%	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	56%	60%	-4%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	49%	62%	-13%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2022					
	2019	60%	59%	1%	56%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	62%	65%	-3%	62%	0%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	54%	67%	-13%	64%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2022					
	2019	51%	64%	-13%	60%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	44%	49%	-5%	53%	-9%
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	37	61	45	41	60		40				
ELL	40	57	44	43	64	70	39				
BLK	49	73		46	80		19				
HSP	45	55	45	47	67	61	39				
WHT	42	52		44	70		38				
FRL	43	61	60	43	74	75	33				
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	32	33		26	19	25	24				
ELL	37	25		33	18		17				
BLK	37	15		24	10		9				
HSP	42	23	27	27	16	31	22				
WHT	53	56		39	38		44				
FRL	41	27	38	29	19	14	27				
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	21	45	41	23	42	36	12				
ELL	54	59	44	53	61	43	38				
BLK	42	53		47	53	30	29				
HSP	54	62	50	51	61	50	42				
WHT	72	62		72	69		55				
FRL	52	59	47	52	63	49	43				

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	53
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	27
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	426
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
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	48
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	53
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	48
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	49
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	52
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?

Spring 2022 FSA data reflects the following:

- English Language Arts (ELA) student proficiency levels 3-5; 3rd grade 42% and 4th grade 50%
- Significant ELA learning gains in all identified subgroups; SWD 61%, ELL 57%, Black/African-American 73%, Hispanic 55%, and FRL 61%
- Significant ELA learning gains in the lowest quartile for the identified subgroups of SWD 45%, ELL 44%, Hispanic 45%, FRL 60%
- Math student proficiency levels 3-5; 3rd grade 37%, 4th grade 56%, 5th grade 43%
- Significant math learning gains in all identified subgroups; Students with Disabilities (SWD) 60%, English Language Learners (ELL) 64%, White (WHI) 70%, Black/African American (BLK) 80%, Hispanic 67%, and Free Reduced Lunch (FRL) 74%
- Significant math learning gains in the lowest quartile for the identified subgroups of ELL 70%, Hispanic 61%, FRL 75%

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

Based on progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, the data reflects that the areas needing improvement are:

- Third and fourth grade English Language Arts
- Third and fifth grade Math

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

Our students lack the foundational skills in ELA and Math due to the residual effect of the Covid-19 Pandemic school closures. Growth was evident after returning to face-to-face instruction. Progress monitoring will address the learning gaps in both academic areas. Small group Tiered Instruction is incorporated into the daily schedule to target specific skills to meet proficiency.

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

Spring 2022 FSA data reflects the following:

- Significant ELA learning gains in all identified subgroups; SWD 61%, ELL 57%, Black/African-American 73%, Hispanic 55%, and FRL 61%
- Significant ELA learning gains in the lowest quartile for the identified subgroups of SWD 45%, ELL 44%, Hispanic 45%, FRL 60%
- Significant math learning gains in all identified subgroups; Students with Disabilities (SWD) 60%, English Language Learners (ELL) 64%, White (WHI) 70%, Black/African American (BLK) 80%, Hispanic 67%, and Free Reduced Lunch (FRL) 74%
- Significant math learning gains in the lowest quartile for the identified subgroups of ELL 70%, Hispanic 61%, FRL 75%

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

The contributing factors for improvement are as follows:

- Full implementation of face-to-face instruction
- Two ESSER teachers
- Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO) camps
- Dedicated TIERED Instructional block built into the master schedule

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

Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) will focus on ELA and Math to accelerate learning. Students will continue to attend Extended Learning Opportunity (ELO) camps. Dedicated TIERED Instructional blocks will continue to be included in the master schedule.

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 Learning Communities (PLCs) will focus on ELA and Math to accelerate learning. Teachers and administrators engage in biweekly PLCs to analyze common formative and summative assessment data and instructional practices.

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

By building teacher capacity and efficacy, we will ensure the sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

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

Spring 2022 Primary data

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Kindergarten: 38% of students in Kindergarten scored at or above a Level C as measured on Assessment Period 3 (AP3) of the Benchmark Assessment Systems (BAS)
 First Grade: 46% of students in first grade scored at or above a 55% as measured on the End-of-Year Primary Reading Assessment
 Second Grade: 32% of students in second grade scored at or above a 65% as measured on the End-of-Year Primary Reading Assessment

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

Primary grades Kindergarten through second:
 - As measured by the FAST-Reading assessment, the percentage of students in grades Kindergarten through 2nd scoring proficient will increase to 50% by the end of May 2023.

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

Intermediate grades third through fifth:
 - As measured by the FAST-Reading assessment, the percentage of students in grades 3 through 5 scoring proficient, at least a Level 3, will increase from 17% to 50% by May 2023.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

F.A.S.T. Progress Monitoring Data is administered three times per year in grades Kindergarten through fifth.
 Benchmark Advance Unit Assessments are administered every three weeks in grades Kindergarten through fifth.

Jacqueline Arnaez (jacqui.arnaez@browardschools.com)

Benchmark Advance is the State adopted evidence-based reading K-5 program that is B.E.S.T. standards aligned for universal Tier I instruction.

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

For Tiered instruction, the following evidence-based reading programs are being utilized:
 - Benchmark Advance Interventions (State Adopted)
 - Reading Horizons Discovery or Reading Horizons Elevate (2022-2023 BCPS Comprehensive Reading Plan- Does not meet strong, moderate, or promising levels of evidence for grades K-5; however, the following IES practice guide recommendations support the program as a multi-tiered intervention in the primary grades.)

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

Student proficiency in ELA needs to increase to 50% or higher for the 2022-2023 school year.

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.

Conduct regularly scheduled instructional walkthroughs to ensure that effective instruction is being provided to all students and evidence-based practices and programs are being implemented with fidelity.

Person Responsible Jacqueline Arnaez (jacqui.arnaez@browardschools.com)

Meet regularly to disaggregate data from screeners, progress monitoring, and diagnostic reading assessments to make informed decisions about maximizing student growth in reading.

Person Responsible Jacqueline Arnaez (jacqui.arnaez@browardschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Spring 2022 FSA Mathematics student proficiency levels 3-5 3rd grade 37% 4th grade 56% 5th grade 43%
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Primary grades Kindergarten through second: - As measured by the FAST-Math assessment, the percentage of students in grades Kindergarten through 2nd scoring proficient will increase from 39% to 60% by the end of May 2023. Intermediate grades third through fifth: - As measured by the FAST-Math assessment, the percentage of students in grades Kindergarten through 2nd scoring proficient will increase from 4% to 50% by the end of May 2023.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	F.A.S.T. Progress Monitoring Data is administered three times per year in grades Kindergarten through fifth. Topic assessments from enVision Math series will be administered in Kindergarten through fifth according to the Broward County Public Schools (BCPS) Math Scope and Sequence Curriculum Map.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jacqueline Arnaez (jacqui.arnaez@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Provide and monitor professional development and professional learning communities relating to standards-aligned in math, math instruction, and math interventions. Meet regularly to disaggregate data from SuccessMaker, progress monitoring, and diagnostic math assessments to make informed decisions about maximizing student growth in math.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Student proficiency in Math needs to increase to 50% or higher for the 2022-2023 school year.
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.	
Meet regularly to disaggregate data from SuccessMaker, progress monitoring, and diagnostic math assessments to make informed decisions about maximizing student growth in math. Conduct regularly scheduled instructional walkthroughs to ensure that effective instruction is being provided to all students and evidence-based practices and programs are being implemented with fidelity.	
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

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

Spring 2022 Primary data

Kindergarten: 38% of students in Kindergarten scored at or above a Level C as measured on Assessment Period 3 (AP3) of the Benchmark Assessment Systems (BAS)

First Grade: 46% of students in first grade scored at or above a 55% as measured on the End-of-Year Primary Reading Assessment

Second Grade: 32% of students in second grade scored at or above a 65% as measured on the End-of-Year Primary Reading Assessment

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

Spring 2022 FSA English Language Arts (ELA) student proficiency levels 3-5

3rd grade 42%

4th grade 50%

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)

The percentage of students in grades Kindergarten through 2nd scoring proficient, as measured by the FAST-Reading assessment, will be 50% or higher by the end of May 2023.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

The percentage of students in grades third through fifth scoring proficient, as measured by the FAST-Reading assessment, will be 50% or higher by the end of May 2023.

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.

F.A.S.T. Progress Monitoring Data is administered three times per year in grades Kindergarten through fifth. Benchmark Advance Unit Assessments are administered every three weeks in grades Kindergarten through fifth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Arnaez, Jacqueline , jacqui.arnaez@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?

Benchmark Advance is the State adopted evidence-based reading K-5 program that is B.E.S.T. standards aligned for universal Tier I instruction.

For Tiered instruction, the following evidence-based reading programs are being utilized:

- Benchmark Advance Interventions (State Adopted)
- Reading Horizons Discovery or Reading Horizons Elevate (2022-2023 BCPS Comprehensive Reading Plan- Does not meet strong, moderate, or promising levels of evidence for grades K-5; however, the following IES practice guide recommendations support the program as a multi-tiered intervention in the primary grades.)

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 the State adopted evidence-based reading K-5 program for universal Tier I instruction that is:

- B.E.S.T. standards-aligned
- provides print-rich, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction, and corrective feedback
- incorporates writing in response to reading
- includes accommodations (IEP, ELL, or 504)
- incorporates the principles of Universal Design for Learning
- includes specially designed instruction for Students with Disabilities (SWD)

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
Meet regularly to disaggregate data from screeners, progress monitoring, and diagnostic reading assessments to make informed decisions about maximizing student growth in reading.	Arnaez, Jacqueline , jacqui.arnaez@browardschools.com
Conduct regularly scheduled instructional walkthroughs to ensure that effective instruction is being provided to all students and evidence-based practices and programs are being implemented with fidelity.	Arnaez, Jacqueline , jacqui.arnaez@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.

At Stirling Elementary School, our mission and vision are dedicated to student achievement and proficiency. We motivate faculty, staff members, and students so that they feel valued by celebrating and recognizing outstanding performance and behavior. We value building and fostering positive student-teacher relationships.

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

The stakeholders assist in developing the School Improvement plan . The SAC Committee receives monthly updates about the school initiatives and reviews the school budget. The stakeholders also decide how the accountability funds are used to benefit our students.