

Broward County Public Schools

# Tamarac Elementary School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Tamarac Elementary School

7601 N UNIVERSITY DR, Tamarac, FL 33321

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Richard Garrick**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: B (58%) 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (47%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a 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](http://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

---

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

# Tamarac Elementary School

7601 N UNIVERSITY DR, Tamarac, FL 33321

[ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	88%

## School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B	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 Tamarac Elementary School is to make a significant difference in the lives of young children by providing positive learning experiences and opportunities that promote 21st century skills and prepare for a future where our children will be college and career ready.

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

Tamarac Elementary will provide engaging learning environments where students' individual needs are met through quality direct instruction, meaningful practice, and peer collaboration. In partnership with parents, teachers, and the community, we will continue our commitment of providing a supportive and nurturing learning environment to all students.

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Garrick, Richard	Principal	The principal is the instructional leader of the school who provides a safe learning environment and oversees school operations. The principal ensures student social-emotional and academic needs are met.
Dorman, Kristen	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal provides support to faculty and staff, communicates with stakeholders, oversees the response to intervention process, and assists the principal in managing safety, security, and school operations.
Bodden, Tanya	Other	The ESE specialist is responsible for coordinating all required ESE meetings. She assists general education teachers of students with disabilities to implement the IEP and monitor progress of IEP goals.
German, Jeraldyn	Reading Coach	The literacy coach coaches teachers with implementing best practices in reading instruction. She assists teachers in analyzing progress monitoring data to inform literacy instruction. She participates in Response to Intervention meetings to assist in identifying appropriate interventions for students.
Maini, Sheri	Math Coach	The math coach is the school's math instructional leader. She coaches teachers and provides appropriate resources and curriculum materials that are supported by best practices.
Glass, Jessica	Curriculum Resource Teacher	The resource teacher will provide interventions to struggling students and support the teachers in delivering differentiated instruction and analyzing data for data chats.
Small-Williams, Benita	Curriculum Resource Teacher	The resource teacher will provide interventions to struggling students and support the teachers in delivering differentiated instruction and analyzing data for data chats.
Hilaire, Dione	School Counselor	The guidance counselor serves as the SEL liaison for the school, ensuring that the social-emotional needs of the students are met through whole group, small group, or individual lessons and/or counseling,
Feis, Rebecca	Other	The Autism Coach provides academic and behavioral support to the teachers and students in the Autism Special Program.

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Richard Garrick



**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.*

7

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

40

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

628

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

13

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

13

**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	103	93	93	105	92	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	599
Attendance below 90 percent	40	37	30	32	35	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	206
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	2	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
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	33	20	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	34	23	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	11	8	5	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	11	5	32	31	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	1	8	4	32	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/2/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	81	82	80	93	84	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	522
Attendance below 90 percent	4	10	6	10	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	23	38	30	18	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146

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	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	2	2	1	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	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	81	82	80	93	84	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	522
Attendance below 90 percent	4	10	6	10	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	23	38	30	18	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146

**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	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

**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	2	2	1	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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%				51%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	68%						59%	60%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%						51%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	54%	54%	50%				54%	65%	63%
Math Learning Gains	80%						62%	66%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	68%						46%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	30%	59%	59%				46%	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	44%	62%	-18%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2022					
	2019	55%	59%	-4%	56%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

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	40%	65%	-25%	62%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	41%	67%	-26%	64%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
05	2022					
	2019	71%	64%	7%	60%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

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	48	44	40	62	40	24				
ELL	50	59	47	58	80		14				
BLK	46	70	64	43	77	75	21				
HSP	60	63	43	64	81	57	18				
MUL	50			55							
WHT	48	76		50	83		73				
FRL	50	66	54	49	77	67	25				
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	24	47	40	17	16	10	11				
ELL	43	62		26	36		10				
BLK	42	46	50	19	26	33	14				
HSP	42	63		26	31		23				
MUL	60			40							
WHT	56	65		38	19		31				
FRL	40	49	47	20	22	28	17				
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	33	25	37	55	52	19				
ELL	51	65	50	58	71	61	54				
BLK	42	53	55	46	55	30	30				
HSP	58	60	33	58	65	56	60				
WHT	56	62	50	59	69		47				
FRL	48	57	54	51	61	44	40				

**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	59
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	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	473
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	53
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
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
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	60
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	53
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
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	66
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	57
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 achievement has improved from 2019 to 2022 from 51% to 52%. ELA learning gains improved from 59% to 68%. ELA lowest 25th percentile learning gains improved from 51% to 56%. Math achievement remained the same at 54% from 2019 to 2022, however improved from 25% to 54% from 2021 to 2022. Math learning gains improved from 62% to 80%. Math lowest 25th percentile learning gains improved from 46% to 68%. Science achievement decreased from 46% to 30%.

In ELA and math achievement, the lowest performing subgroup is students with disabilities. In science achievement, the lowest subgroup is English Language Learners. Among racial demographics, the black students performed lowest in ELA and math achievement and Hispanic students performed lowest in science achievement.

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

Science achievement indicates the greatest need for improvement.

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

Science achievement historically falls on the responsibility of the fifth grade teachers. All teachers need to be held accountable for instructing science to all students from K-5.

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

Math learning gains showed the largest improvement from 2021 to 2022.

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

After return to 100% face-to-face instruction, students had the opportunity to engage in hands-on math math practice with manipulatives. Students also participated in Acaletics to improve problem solving and math fluency.

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

Acaletics will continue to be implemented this school year.

**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.**

Teachers will be provided professional development opportunities of best practices in all subjects areas through Professional Learning Communities and staff professional development on employee planning days.

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

School-wide progress monitoring will be implemented for all students in all subjects to ensure student performance is continuing to improve and reach our school goals. Progress monitoring data will be utilized to determine which students will receive intervention through RTI and which students will be eligible to participate in ELOs (Extended Learning Opportunities).

**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.**

Based on FSA 2022 data, Tamarac Elementary 52% of the students demonstrated proficiency in English Language Arts compared to the district average of 55%, which indicates a need for improvement in instructional practices and standards-based planning.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By the end of May 2023, the percentage of students demonstrating proficiency in ELA will increase from 52% to at least 57% as demonstrated on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) .

**Monitoring:**

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

This area of focus will be monitored via fall, winter and spring Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST). In addition, Benchmark Advance Unit Assessments will also be utilized to progress monitor specific standards between testing windows.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Richard Garrick (richard.garrick@browardschools.com)

**Evidence-based**

**Strategy:**

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

The implementation of explicit and systematic standards-based instruction to increase student achievement in Reading.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Based on Marzano Focus Teacher Evaluation Model, planning to close the achievement gap using data is highly effective. Analysis of the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST), indicates that many students are lacking in Phonemic Awareness and Phonics. Therefore, systematic standards-based instruction is necessary to fill these gaps for early intervention.

**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.

Heggerty Phonemic Awareness program will be implemented in grades K and 1 as a Tier I supplement.

**Person Responsible**

Jeraldne German (jeraldne.german@browardschools.com)

Reading Horizons will be used as a Tier 3 intervention with K-5 students who have deficits in the area of phonemic awareness and phonics.

**Person Responsible**

Kristen Dorman (kristen.dorman@browardschools.com)

Foundations will be used as a Tier 2 intervention with K-2 students who have deficits in the area of phonemic awareness and phonics.

**Person Responsible**

Kristen Dorman (kristen.dorman@browardschools.com)

LLI will be used as a Tier 2 and 3 intervention with K-5 students who have deficits in multiple areas of reading.

**Person Responsible** Kristen Dorman (kristen.dorman@browardschools.com)

ESSER teachers will implement research-based programs with identified students scoring below proficiency as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking in English Language Arts.

**Person Responsible** Kristen Dorman (kristen.dorman@browardschools.com)

ESSER teachers will implement research-based programs with identified students not predicted to demonstrate proficiency on the 3rd grade Florida Assessment of Student Thinking PM 3 in English Language Arts in May 2023 based on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking in English Language Arts PM 2.

**Person Responsible** Kristen Dorman (kristen.dorman@browardschools.com)

Benchmark Advance Intervention Resource will be used as a Tier 2 and 3 intervention with K-5 students who have deficits in multiple areas of reading

**Person Responsible** Kristen Dorman (kristen.dorman@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.**

Based on FSA 2022 data, Tamarac Elementary 54% of the students demonstrated proficiency in mathematics compared to the district average of 59%, which indicates a need for improvement in instructional practices and standards-based planning.

**Measurable****Outcome:**

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

By the end of May 2023, the percentage of students demonstrating a Level 3 - 5 in Math will increase from 54% to at least 60% as demonstrated by the F.A.S.T.

**Monitoring:**

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored via fall, winter and spring F.A.S.T. In addition, students in grades Kindergarten through Fifth Grade will be progress monitored at the end of each Topic utilizing Savvas enVision's Topic Assessments. Cumulative Topic Assessments will be used as additional progress monitoring.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Richard Garrick (richard.garrick@browardschools.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

The implementation of explicit and systematic standards-based instruction using the modified gradual release model to increase student achievement in mathematics.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Based on Marzano and Hattie, high levels of student engagement and instruction following the concrete – representational- abstract model, have a high effect size on student achievement. According to the F.A.S.T, % of the current Kindergarten through Fifth Graders scored a Level 1, indicating these students are highly likely to need substantial support for the math course. Therefore, systematic standards-based instruction is necessary to fill these gaps for early intervention.

**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.

Kindergarten through Second Grade teachers will implement Calendar Math on a daily basis to develop number sense, as well as geometry vocabulary, measurement and data skills.

**Person Responsible** Kristen Dorman (kristen.dorman@browardschools.com)

Third through fifth grade students will participate in Acaletics Math every morning to extend skills to problem solving.

**Person Responsible** Kristen Dorman (kristen.dorman@browardschools.com)

Manipulatives training will be provided to K-5 teachers so they can effectively implement the C-R-A model for math.

**Person Responsible** Sheri Maini (sheri.maini@browardschools.com)

All grade levels will administer and monitor progress via Savvas enVision Topic Assessments and Cumulative Assessments.

**Person Responsible** Kristen Dorman (kristen.dorman@browardschools.com)

All grade levels will provide students with a minimum of 45 minutes per week in Successmaker via Savvas. Teachers will monitor usage time, number of exercises completed, and percent correct, as well as discuss progress and goals with students and their families.

**Person Responsible** Sheri Maini (sheri.maini@browardschools.com)

Teachers and students will participate in the school-wide fluency plan which will include fact fluency folders, academic games and center activities, including REFLEX.

**Person Responsible** Sheri Maini (sheri.maini@browardschools.com)

ESE students receiving services will be instructed via a research-based program including Touch Math, Moving with Math, and Do the Math. Teachers and support staff will implement the Math Diagnostic and Intervention System (MDIS) from Savvas Realize and/or the programs listed above to meet the needs of students performing below grade level.

**Person Responsible** Tanya Bodden (tanya.bodden@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**

K-2 instructional practice will include a targeted focus on phonics and phonemic awareness.

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

Grades 3- 5 instructional practice shows a need for foundational reading skills including phonics and phonemic awareness. In addition to supporting foundational skills in intermediate, there is also a need for intervention with fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension.

**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, the percentage of students demonstrating proficiency in ELA will increase from 43% to 48% as demonstrated on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) .

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

By May 2023, the percent of students demonstrating proficiency in ELA will increase from 52% to 57% as demonstrated on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST).

**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.

Progress monitoring will include a Fall FAST (baseline), Winter FAST (mid-year), and a Spring FAST (summative) in the content of ELA. Along with FAST, Benchmark Advance Unit Assessments will be administered and utilized to progress monitor specific standards between the seasonal testing windows.

#### **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Garrick, Richard, richard.garrick@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 evidence-based practice/program being implemented to achieve the measurable outcome in grades K-2 are Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI), Reading Horizon, Benchmark Advance Intervention, and Foundations. The programs mentioned will provide Tier 2 intervention with K-2 students who have deficits in the area of phonemic awareness and phonics.

In grades 3-5 the evidence based-practices/programs being implemented to achieve measurable outcome are Foundations, Benchmark Advance Intervention, and Reading Horizons. These selected programs will target the areas of phonemic awareness and phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and/or comprehension

Reading endorsed teachers will provide thirty minutes of daily instruction and use the programs assessment tool to monitor the progress of the students receiving intervention.

#### **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?

The evidence based practices programs provide reading instruction and strategies to meet the needs of students at the school level and determining appropriate instructional adjustments. The programs align with the components of reading (oral language, phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension) and/or the standards strands of reading and communication) that will be assessed on FAST PM3.

**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
-------------	-----------------------------------

Under literacy leadership, reading endorsed teachers will be assigned and tasked to implement interventions that are of research-based programs with identified students with a reading deficit. The same students are also not predicted to demonstrate proficiency on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking PM 3 in English Language Arts in May, 2023.

Garrick, Richard,  
richard.garrick@browardschools.com

Literacy Coaching will support teachers in modalities that include discussion, modeling, and/ or helping to implement differentiated instructional practices in the classrooms, according to students' needs.

Coaching will also include meeting with teachers to analyze and develop actionable steps to support reading instruction based on the needs of the students.

German, Jeraldyn,  
jeraldyn.german@browardschools.com

Professional Learning communities will use data take from the FAST PM 1 assessment to identify students who have a deficit in the different areas of reading. With the data collected, the collaborating team will meet to create a specific goal tailored to a grade-level. As a professional team, weekly meeting will include the discussion of best practices and progress monitoring.

German, Jeraldyn,  
jeraldyn.german@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.**

Tamarac Elementary builds and sustains partnerships by providing high quality instruction for our students and increasing collaboration with our parents and community through parent links, flyers, emails, Class



Dojo, and parent-teacher conferences.

Recruiting staff, parents, community members and businesses to participate on our School Advisory Council is a priority to increase broad stakeholder roles and address equity.

Tamarac Elementary has reengaged our Sunshine Committee to promote a positive school culture and environment amongst all staff members.

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

Richard Garrick, Principal and Kristen Dorman, Assistant Principal - Responsible for sending communication through Parent Link

Faculty - Responsible for Class Dojo and posting announcements in Canvas (when applicable)

BethAnn Boegler, Sunshine Committee Chair - Responsible for coordinating events for Sunshine Committee

PTA President - Responsible for recruiting SAC members and PTA membership

Jessica Glass, SAC Chair - Responsible for recruiting SAC members

Jessica Glass, Equity Liaison - Responsible for implementation of Equity Plan