Broward County Public Schools

Village Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Village Elementary School

2100 NW 70TH AVE, Sunrise, FL 33313

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Wanda Haynes

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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 Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (46%) 2018-19: D (36%) 2017-18: C (43%)
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

Village Elementary School

2100 NW 70TH AVE, Sunrise, FL 33313

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	98%

School Grades History

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

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 Village Elementary Community encourages high expectations of academic excellence and lifelong learning by motivating scholars to become responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To inspire achievement through collaboration, innovation, and high expectations.

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
Haynes, Wanda	Principal	Responsible for the overall operations of the school, serving as the instructional leader. Monitors data and provides feedback and guidance to instructional staff. Creates a strong school culture centered around shared leadership and collaboration.
Coutain , Nicole	Reading Coach	Responsible for the overall development of literacy initiatives in the school. In collaboration with other staff members, works to create a Walk to Read program that addresses student reading deficiencies by targeting specific staff to use intervention programs specific to student needs.
Jordan , Sheldon	Math Coach	Responsible for the overall mathematics instruction of the school, by ensuring there is a school wide problem solving strategy in place to provide overall consistency from grade to grade. Working to develop a strong math intervention program to address student deficiencies.
Dailey, Kizzy	Assistant Principal	To provide support to the principal primarily related to operational needs of the school. To conduct observations and provide feedback to instructional staff. Responsible for serving as the administrative designee for the RTI Team.
Fleming, Rebecca	School Counselor	Responsible for providing guidance on the SEL needs of the school and its students. Oversees the ESOL testing and administration of services for those students
Mcnair , Shena	Teacher, ESE	To provide guidance and direction with ESE students and the services they need. Serves as the RTI Team Leader in helping with the coordination and entering of student records as well as scheduling meetings and communicating with parents.
Burke, Jacqueline	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Provides support to primary classes as an intervention teacher; coaches primary teachers by providing professional development, observation and feedback, as well as planning support.
Harvey-Spence, Sonia	Curriculum Resource Teacher	To provide intervention support for students in ELA and mathematics in grades K-5.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/1/2017, Wanda Haynes

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.*
2

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.*
2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
26

Total number of students enrolled at the school
516

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.
3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	98	95	97	90	95	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	596
Attendance below 90 percent	41	32	34	35	31	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	224
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	1	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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	8	19	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	4	8	3	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/1/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	98	95	97	90	95	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	596
Attendance below 90 percent	41	32	34	35	31	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	224
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	1	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	1	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	8	19	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	4	8	3	36	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	98	95	97	90	95	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	596
Attendance below 90 percent	41	32	34	35	31	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	224
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	1	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	1	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	8	19	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	4	8	3	36	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	42%	58%	56%				36%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	61%						45%	60%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%						49%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	42%	54%	50%				34%	65%	63%
Math Learning Gains	56%						37%	66%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%						29%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	19%	59%	59%				20%	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	29%	60%	-31%	58%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	39%	62%	-23%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-29%				
05	2022					
	2019	38%	59%	-21%	56%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

				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	33%	65%	-32%	62%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	42%	67%	-25%	64%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
05	2022					
	2019	22%	64%	-42%	60%	-38%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

				SCIENCE			
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	20%	49%	-29%	53%	-33%
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	18	56	47	25	56	54	8				
ELL	43	68	50	43	57	58	27				
BLK	39	59	49	40	56	58	17				
HSP	47	80		35	50						
FRL	43	61	47	42	58	59	22				

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	7	20		4	10		8				
ELL	20	22	30	25	14		4				
BLK	26	25	24	25	23	26	19				
HSP	46			23							
FRL	27	27	25	26	23	33	20				

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	24	43	54	26	35	31	9				
ELL	33	51	53	40	46	29	20				
BLK	33	45	50	32	37	29	23				
HSP	53	50		21	29						
FRL	35	44	50	33	37	29	20				

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	48
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	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	385
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38

Students With Disabilities	
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	51
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	47
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	53
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	48
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?

Students have made significant gains across both core content area groups (ELA and Mathematics). Learning gains in both content areas were strong. Students with disabilities, while having strong learning gains, fall short on overall proficiency. Lowest quartile gains were also strong.

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

Based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, science proficiency is the greatest area in need of 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?

There is a need for a school wide targeted focus on science instruction to ensure that students develop a strong science foundation in the earlier grades to be able to build upon existing knowledge. Additionally, students who struggle with reading skills need to be given hands on application experiences to put science knowledge in context.

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

ELA learning gains showed the greatest improvement with a 35% increase over 2021 data.

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

As a school, we instituted a Walk to Read program servicing students in Grades 1-5. This program targeted student reading deficiencies as well as provided enrichment for students who were at grade level. By utilizing iReady diagnostic data, we were able to determine specific weaknesses with students, identify programs to target those weaknesses, and provide teachers with the PD necessary to implement the program.

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

In order to accelerate learning, we need to continue the Walk to Read program utilizing data we have at this time. We have instituted a school wide data monitoring program where students are actively monitoring their data. By tracking their data and taking ownership of their data, our goal is for students to be motivated to improve it. We will also continue our bi-weekly Collaborative Hour meetings with teachers and coaches to share best practices, review student work, and forward plan for success.

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.

As a school, we will ensure that all teachers have been trained on the new math textbook series. During Collaborative Hour, we will make sure that time is devoted to training on calendar math, small group instruction, reading intervention series, as well as sharing of best practices of student work.

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

In addition to continuing the Walk to Read program as a vital part of our reading intervention, we will implement a Math Path Intervention to address math deficiencies. We will look into ways to build strong foundations with our ESE students to ensure that they are able to master foundational math skills particularly in number sense and operations.

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.**	Based on the data review, Students with Disabilities are below the Federal Index for two consecutive years.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	By June 2023, the ESSA subgroup of Students with Disabilities will meet or exceed the Federal Index of 41% based on the results of the 2023 FAST assessment.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	All students will maintain a data folder for tracking progress across subject areas as it relates to their common formative assessments (ELA unit assessments, Math topic assessments, and science mini benchmark assessments). Additionally, Leadership Team members will also maintain a data tracking database to monitor data by teacher and grade level.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kizzy Dailey (kizzy.n.dailey@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Our teachers will focus on implementing explicit and systematic standards-based instruction to increase student achievement in ELA, Math and Science.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Students with disabilities need continued exposure to standards based instruction at all grade levels. They need to be provided with strategies to assist in increasing their understanding of grade level material.

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.

Students in Grades 3-5 will be grouped and assigned to classes designed to provide explicit focus on their needs.

Person Responsible	Wanda Haynes (wanda.haynes@browardschools.com)

Provide teachers with professional development on unwrapping ELA standards, standards-based instruction, and standards-based tasks.

Person Responsible	Nicole Coutain (nicole.coutain@browardschools.com)

Provide teachers with professional development on unwrapping mathematics and science standards, standards-based instruction, and standards-based tasks.

Person Responsible   Sheldon Jordan (sheldon.jordan@browardschools.com)

Leverage collaborative hours (professional learning communities) to model research-based math and science instructional strategies and to plan & analyze math tasks by examining student work.

Person Responsible   Sheldon Jordan (sheldon.jordan@browardschools.com)

Leverage collaborative hours (professional learning communities) to model research-based ELA instructional
strategies and to plan small group instruction.

Person Responsible   Nicole Coutain (nicole.coutain@browardschools.com)

Conduct leadership learning walks (with both administration and coaches) to monitor the implementation of the standards-based instruction in all content areas.

Person Responsible   Wanda Haynes (wanda.haynes@browardschools.com)

Use both qualitative data (through observations) and quantitative data (using Formative data) to work with coaches to make adjustments to the collaborative hours to better meet the teachers' needs.

Person Responsible   Wanda Haynes (wanda.haynes@browardschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	School data indicates that science proficiency has been at a low level for Grade 5 students over multiple years.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	By June 2023, 40% of Grade 5 students will score at or above proficiency on the 2023 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Students will be administered a baseline benchmark assessment in September 2022. Micro assessments will be administered using the science micro assessments. In January 2023, students will be administered a mid-year assessment to view growth from baseline. All students will maintain a data folder for tracking progress across subject areas as it relates to their common formative assessments. Additionally, Leadership Team members will also maintain a data tracking database to monitor data across classes.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Wanda Haynes (wanda.haynes@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	The 5th Grade science teacher will focus on implementing explicit and systematic standards-based instruction to increase student achievement in Science.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Students need continued exposure to standards based instruction in science as well as hands on experiences to help connect science concepts to real world application.

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.

Students in Grade 5 will be grouped and assigned to homogeneous classes designed to provide explicit instruction based on their needs and ability level.

Person Responsible	Wanda Haynes (wanda.haynes@browardschools.com)

Provide teachers in Grades 3-5 with professional development on unwrapping science standards, standards-based instruction, and standards-based hands on tasks.

Person Responsible	Sheldon Jordan (sheldon.jordan@browardschools.com)

Leverage collaborative hours (professional learning communities) to model research-based science instructional strategies and to plan & analyze science tasks by identifying specific hands on activities to complement science instruction.

Person Responsible	Sheldon Jordan (sheldon.jordan@browardschools.com)

Conduct leadership learning walks (with both administration and coaches) to monitor the implementation of the standards-based instruction in the area of science instruction at all grade levels.

Person Responsible	Wanda Haynes (wanda.haynes@browardschools.com)

Use both qualitative data (through observations) and quantitative data (using Formative data) to work with coach to make adjustments to the collaborative hour to better meet the teachers' needs.

Person Responsible	Wanda Haynes (wanda.haynes@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

Students in Grades 1-2 will participate in a Walk to Read Intervention program beginning in September 2022 designed to target specific ELA domains of weakness.
Students in Grade K will participate in the Walk to Read intervention program beginning in January 2023, following the administration of Early STAR PM2 and data analysis of results.

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

Students in Grades 3-5 have been intentionally grouped into classes based on ability in order to provide specific and targeted instruction to students based on ability level.

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 2022, 55% of students in Grades K-2 will be identified as At/Above Benchmark on the Early STAR/STAR Asessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

By May 2022, 55% of students in Grades 3-5 will be identified as At/Above Benchmark on the FAST Asessment.

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.

There will be multiple layers of monitoring on the area of focus: Conduct leadership learning walks (with both administration and coaches) to monitor the implementation of the standards-based instruction in all content areas. Students will be administered a baseline benchmark assessment in September 2022 (Early STAR/STAR or FAST). Micro assessments will be administered using the Benchmark Advance Unit Assessments. In January 2023, students will be administered the mid-year assessment (Early STAR/STAR or FAST) to view growth from baseline. All students will maintain a data folder for tracking progress in ELA as it relates to their common formative assessments and progress monitoring assessment. Additionally, Leadership Team members will also maintain a data tracking database to monitor data across classes in ELA.

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

Haynes, Wanda, wanda.haynes@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. §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?

During our Walk to Read Intervention Program, the following programs are in use: Benchmark Advance Intervention/Enrichment materials; Fountas and Pinnell Phonics Word Study; Reading Horizons; and Fountas and Pinnell Leveled Literacy 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?

In a review of past data (iReady, FSA) and current data (Early STAR/STAR and FAST), decisions were made to identify specific areas of weakness for each reading domain in order to assign students to groups for intervention. Teachers delivering Tier 3 interventions are all reading endorsed.

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
Review and analyze student assessment data to determine academic groupings of students related to reading domains of weakness.	Coutain , Nicole , nicole.coutain@browardschools.com
During Collaborative Planning Hour, provide professional development review on reading intervention programs for teachers and provide specific and explicit training on programs utilized by ELL paraprofessionals.	Coutain , Nicole , nicole.coutain@browardschools.com
Provide opportunities for Literacy Coach to attend state led professional development training and webinars on best practices in reading and practices for effective coaching.	Haynes, Wanda, wanda.haynes@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.

As a school, we begin our year with Smart Start school culture lesson plans that address the foundational aspects of establishing a strong, positive and caring school culture rooted in processes and procedures. Schoolwide expectations are centered around the Power of 3 (Take Care of Yourselves; Take Care of Others; Take Care of Our School) to begin setting a positive tone from the start. Additionally, we have a "school house" culture where our students and staff are all assigned to house designed to promote friendly competition around areas we want most from our students (attendance, uniforms, meeting data targets). Monthly we hold house celebrations either as a school or within small houses. It is also used when we compete in Field Day or House Duel (a jeopardy like competion). We have a school monetary system called Panther Bucks. Students earn dollars for attendance, uniforms, meeting data targets, good behavior, etc.

They have an opportunity to shop in the store once a monthy to buy anything from school supplies to fun games to lunch with Administration.

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

Ms. Haynes: sets the expectation with students and staff around the monetary system; acknowledges students and/or classes on the morning announcements

Mr. Jordan and Ms. Burke: serve as top house leaders for the school in organizing the whole school house meeting activities

House Leaders: These are teachers from various grade levels in the school who serve as house leaders for their particular house. Their job is to motivate their house by recognizing student achievements within the house, helping to develop house chants and dances.