

Broward County Public Schools

North Side Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	21
VI. Title I Requirements	24
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

North Side Elementary School

120 NE 11TH ST, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33304

[no web address on file]

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Broward County School Board on 10/17/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

North Side Elementary is committed to delivering a high quality learning experience in a safe and equitable environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Educating all learners to succeed in tomorrow's world.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Porcena, Heilange	Principal	Lead the faculty & staff members through the premises of the mission & vision statements, set goals, ensure stakeholders are implementing practices to reach goals, and monitor plan for efficacy.
Qaiyim, Kaia	Assistant Principal	Lead the faculty & staff members through the premises of the mission & vision statements, set goals, ensure stakeholders are implementing practices to reach goals, and monitor plan for efficacy.
Kethireddy, Arnita	Instructional Coach	Collaborative development of the Instructional focus calendar, lesson planning/ delivery, modeling, appropriate resources and data analysis in ELA.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The process for involving stakeholders consists of communicating student performance results to all stakeholders before, during and after scholars complete assessments. School leaders will also provide stakeholders with instructional resources being utilized, next steps in instruction that have schoolwide impact on student achievement, and also the tools used to progress monitor student progress. Stakeholders are also provided opportunities to give input in the development of the plan for closing student achievement gaps.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The School Improvement Plan will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing student achievement and closing the achievement gap for scholars that demonstrate lack of progression. Student progression will be analyzed after each standards based formative assessment. Based on student needs modifications to instruction and interventions will be provided by student needs, while being monitored for efficacy.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	96%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: F
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	29	25	9	32	15	16	0	0	0	126
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	6
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	10	13	15	24	9	28	0	0	0	99
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	10	11	21	8	41	0	0	0	91
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	2	21	2	9	0	0	0	36

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	5	13	12	28	11	32	0	0	0	101

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	14	4	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	29	22	25	23	28	17	0	0	0	144
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	23	26	12	0	0	0	61
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	20	36	20	0	0	0	76
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	12	9	7	4	0	0	0	34
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	5	20	31	16	0	0	0	74

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	20	1	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	29	22	25	23	28	17	0	0	0	144	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	23	26	12	0	0	0	61	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	20	36	20	0	0	0	76	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	12	9	7	4	0	0	0	34	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	5	20	31	16	0	0	0	74

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	20	1	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	39	56	53	38	58	56	35		
ELA Learning Gains				57			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46			64		
Math Achievement*	46	62	59	43	54	50	32		
Math Learning Gains				57			36		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54			33		
Science Achievement*	35	48	54	46	59	59	38		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					60	52			
Graduation Rate					45	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	42	59	59	52			40		

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	205
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	393
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	17	Yes	4	2
ELL	29	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	42			
HSP	50			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	44			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	24	Yes	3	1
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	47			
HSP	61			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	49			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	39			46			35					42
SWD	13			23			14				5	19
ELL	28			39			29				5	42
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38			46			35				5	45
HSP	54			46							2	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	40			51			34				5	49

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	38	57	46	43	57	54	46					52
SWD	4	32	31	8	26	33						35
ELL	35	55	38	40	60	56	42					52
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	55	46	41	55	52	39					53
HSP	64	70		50								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	39	55	44	41	56	60	46					49

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	35	51	64	32	36	33	38					40
SWD	12	31		15	31		31					19
ELL	26	70		31	45		50					40
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32	47	60	29	37	36	34					37
HSP	57			43								60
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	36	46		32	37	36	33					40

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	32%	56%	-24%	54%	-22%
04	2023 - Spring	43%	61%	-18%	58%	-15%
03	2023 - Spring	36%	53%	-17%	50%	-14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	39%	62%	-23%	59%	-20%
04	2023 - Spring	65%	65%	0%	61%	4%
05	2023 - Spring	29%	58%	-29%	55%	-26%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	34%	46%	-12%	51%	-17%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

In the 21-22 school year Proficiency in ELA was the lowest component. The school year of 20-21 was virtual due to the Covid 19 Pandemic. This is the greatest factor that affected our school community and population. There was a larger skill gap to close the following year.

Our current data from the 22-23 school year shows a rising trend in Proficiency in ELA--41% in grades 3-5 based on the F.A.S.T. PM3 Assessment.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

In the 21-22 school year, our proficiency in ELA and Math were on an increasing trend. The lowest quartile subgroup showed a declining trend. The school year of 20-21 was virtual due to the Covid 19 Pandemic. This is the greatest factor that affected our school community and population. Our lowest quartile students need face-to-face instruction for optimum results. Our population also struggled with attendance and the online platform.

Our current data from the 22-23 school year shows us on a rising trend in Proficiency based on the F.A.S.T. PM3 Assessment.

ELA--41%

Math--46%

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Compared to the State Report North Side Elementary had a gap in the Third Grade proficiency data. The third-grade students in the year 21-22 had missed face-to-face instruction during their second-grade year due to the Covid 19 Pandemic. Our population struggled with attendance during the virtual instruction therefore, students had gaps in their foundational skills.

During the 22-23 school year 43% of third-grade students scored a level 3 or higher based on the F.A.S.T. PM3 Assessment.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The ELA learning gains in the 21-22 school year and ELA Proficiency in 22-23 school year showed the most improvement. Effective Tier 1 strategies, conducting Tier 2 and Tier 3 with fidelity and consistent daily small group face to face instruction with standards aligned curriculum contributed to our success.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Our main area of concern is daily attendance for our students.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Standards aligned effective Tier 1 instruction
2. Effective, consistent Tier 2 instruction to meet student individual needs and close achievement gaps
3. Consistent progress monitoring, data analysis and standards aligned instructional planning for differentiated instruction to close achievement gaps.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our focus is increasing daily student attendance along with the continuing to establish a safe, equitable learning environment for all scholars. Skill gaps can close when student are in attendance for instruction and this results in higher learning gains for the year. scholars having a desire to attend school derives from an environment conducive for learning. North Side Elementary teaches the monthly character traits in classrooms K-5, teachers then select students that demonstrate the monthly character trait. Students are rewarded and acknowledged on the morning show and visually displayed for the year in main hallway of the campus. The has established school wide expectations and teachers teach respect, cooperation, responsibility, and safety. Students are taught, encouraged, and rewarded when the demonstrating "STAR" behavior, by receiving "star-bucks".

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June 2024, 90% of our student population will miss no more than 5 days of school in the school year.

Monitoring:

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

1. Daily attendance will be conducted
2. Social Worker will follow up on students with 3 or more absences
3. Community Liaison, Guidance Counselor, and Social Worker will confer with the family to provide wrap around community and district services to ensure student is able to attend school daily.
4. Spotlight on Attendance Bulletin board in the cafeteria celebrating and rewarding classes that meet the monthly attendance goals

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kaia Qaiyim (kaia.qaiyim@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Schoolwide Tier1 Behavior Program
Equity Activities & Lessons by way of the Equity Committee
Teacher Parent Conferences--to discuss student progress
Social Worker Follow ups--to provide wrap around services

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Increasing attendance increases our student achievement

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Schoolwide implementation during pre-planning week - Administration

Lesson delivery - classroom teacher

Student performance - classroom teacher

Class results - Administration

Rewarding students - classroom teacher

Person Responsible: Kaia Qaiyim (kaia.qaiyim@browardschools.com)

By When: By June 2024

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Students with Disabilities: Area of Focus is phonics and decoding text to increase learning gains in ELA

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June 2024, 45% of Students with Disability group will show learning gains on the F.A.S.T. PM3

Monitoring:

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

The students will be given an intervention in phonics using the Benchmark Advance, Reading Horizons and SIIPS programs. The embedded assessment in the program will be used. In addition the students will be given a weekly iReady lessons in Phonics. The scores will be monitored.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Benchmark Advance Phonics Intervention Tier 2

Reading Horizons Tier 3 -- K-2

SIIPS Tier 3 --3-5

iReady Phonics lessons K-5

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The phonics programs will teach foundational skills, help students decode words. This will help close skill gaps and achieve learning gains on the F.A.S.T.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Teacher professional development & training

Phonics instruction

Small group explicit instruction

1. Utilizing researched based and district approved materials students will be triple dosed in small group setting based on Individual Educational Plan.

2. Student will respond to written text

3. Students will receive a balance of informational and fictional text

4. Leadership team & ESE Support Facilitator will collect data w/next steps in instruction based on results

Person Responsible: Arnita Kethireddy (arnita.kethireddy@browardschools.com)

By When: Implementation of plan will continue through June 2024

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on the data reviewed, ELA is identified as a critical need requiring additional resources to ensure a steady increase in student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of Spring 2024, student proficiency will increase to 50% in ELA in grades 3rd-5th as demonstrated on the end-of-year assessment.

Monitoring:

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored through tracking individual student performance on standard-based formative assessments completed at end of each instructional cycle and student progression on the F.A.S.T.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heilange Porcena (heilange.porcena@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The evidence-based strategy being implemented consist of but are not limited to the following: small group direct instructions, scaffolding instruction, and high-quality standards-based student task used to demonstrate student understanding of newly acquired knowledge/understanding.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The strategies listed above were selected based the efficacy of results when implemented with fidelity. The strategies are also researched-based strategies that yield success.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

1. Baseline data of F.A.S.T. PM1 & iReady Diagnostic AP1 analyzed to identify proficient, borderline and lowest quartile groups.
2. District Decision Tree guidance and diagnostic tools used to identify area of need
3. Collaborative grade level planning for differentiated, standards aligned lessons using the District adopted curriculum.
4. Exemplar Tier 1 instruction modeled/practiced and executed
5. Tier 2 and Tier 3 lessons planned for students in need based on diagnostic data and implemented with fidelity for differentiated instruction.

6. Formative and interim data analyzed in PLC for progress monitoring and to drive instruction for remediation and enrichment.

Person Responsible: Heilange Porcena (heilange.porcena@browardschools.com)

By When: Plan will be continuous till June 2024

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

Based on District and School data, we have allocated the following resources :

1. iReady online program in Reading K-5
2. iReady online program in Math K-5
3. Wordly Wise Vocabulary Program 2-5
4. Reading Horizons Phonics & Word Study (Intervention) K-2
- 5 SIIPS--Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics and Sight Words (Intervention) K-5

The funding and resource allocation based on data and need will be discussed at our monthly SAC/PTA nights. Requested resources and programs are presented during a School Advisory Committee meeting based on student data and program efficacy that would address students' need. After the program or resource is shared a vote is held based on quorum.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

Kindergarten--36%--Area of focus is phonics and decoding

1st Grade--54%---Area of focus is vocabulary and build background knowledge and reinforce phonics

2nd Grade--46%--Area of focus is vocabulary and build background knowledge and reinforce phonics

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

3rd Grade--43%--Area of focus is vocabulary and build background knowledge and remediate with phonics

4th Grade--52%--Area of focus is vocabulary and build background knowledge and verbal reasoning

5th Grade--34%--Area of focus is vocabulary and build background knowledge and verbal reasoning

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

By June 2024 50% of the students in Kindergarten will achieve a score of 852 or higher on the S.T.A.R. Assessment.

By June 2024 50% of the students in 2nd Grade will achieve a Level 3 or higher on the S.T.A.R. PM3 Assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By June 2024 50% of the students in 3rd Grade will achieve a Level 3 or higher on the F.A.S.T. PM3 Assessment

By June 2024 50% of the students in 5th Grade will achieve a Level 3 or higher on the F.A.S.T. PM3 Assessment

Monitoring**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 impact student achievement outcomes.

1. F.A.S.T. Progress Monitoring Assessment
2. iReady Diagnostic
3. iReady Growth Monitoring
4. iReady daily lessons--weekly monitoring

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Porcena, Heilange, heilange.porcena@browardschools.com

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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?

1. Benchmark Advance
2. iReady online program
3. Reading Horizons Intervention
4. SIIPS intervention

The programs are aligned to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards, and K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The programs are designed to identify various needs of the students and provides resources for differentiated and effective Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction to increase student achievement.

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
<p>Effective Tier 1 Instruction:--Focus--Phonics & Decoding</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional Learning--Science of Reading Training; Benchmark Advance Training; B.E.S.T. Standards Training 2. Literacy Coaching-- Collaborative Planning; Modeling Tier 1 Lessons; Intervention Resources for Tier 2 & Tier 3 3. Assessment--Progress Monitoring assessment; Screenings; data analysis and identifying trends and patterns 	<p>Porcena, Heilange, heilange.porcena@browardschools.com</p>
<p>Effective Tier 1 Instruction:--Focus--Vocabulary; Language Structure ; Literacy Knowledge</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional Learning--Science of Reading Training; Benchmark Advance Training; B.E.S.T. Standards Training 2. Literacy Coaching-- Collaborative Planning; Modeling Tier 1 Lessons; Intervention Resources for Tier 2 & Tier 3 3. Assessment--Progress Monitoring assessment; Screenings; data analysis and identifying trends and patterns 	<p>Porcena, Heilange, heilange.porcena@browardschools.com</p>

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

North Side Elementary has monthly SAC/PTA nights to build positive relations with parents, families and other stakeholders. Each month the SIP goals and progress are shared with the parents. The parents are invited to provide input. Due to our highly ELL population, translators are provided at each informative night.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

North Side Elementary has monthly SAC/PTA nights to build positive relations with parents, families and other stakeholders. Instructional information, District resources, programs and information, and student performances are included in the night. Along with interims and report cards per quarter, parents and families are invited to teacher conferences to discuss student progress during the year.

<https://www.browardschools.com/northside>

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(ii))

The school plans to strengthen the academic program by increased effective Tier 1 instruction. Our focus is on reinforcing content vocabulary, using strategic critical questioning and classroom discussion to build background knowledge, verbal reasoning.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

The school uses community programs such as United Way's "Reading Pal" program and Impact Broward's "Foster Grandparent Program" to promote literacy and increase student achievement.