

Broward County Public Schools

Dania 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	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	17
VI. Title I Requirements	20
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Dania Elementary School

300 SE 2ND AVE, Dania Beach, FL 33004

[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.

The mission of Dania Elementary is to provide ALL students with educational opportunities that will enable them to successfully reach their potential through the cooperative efforts of the home, school and community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Provide the highest quality education to all students.

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
Jackson, Lewis	Principal	Supervise the organization and academic processes of the school.
Markevich, Galina	Assistant Principal	Assist the principal with supervising the organization and academic processes of the school.
Edwards, Jamie	SAC Member	SAC Chairperson facilitates our SAC meetings and spearheads our School Improvement planning.
Fumero, Janet		Supervises ESE processes at the school.
Hall, Sandra	Reading Coach	Supervises the implementation of the Literacy program and assists teachers.
Hengge, Jennifer	Math Coach	Supervises the implementation of the math curriculum and assists teachers.
Magliocca, Patricia		ASD Coach oversees our autism program and assists teachers, students and parents.
page, elysia	School Counselor	Provides Life Skills and Wellness services to our staff, students, and families.

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.

SIP is primarily developed through the school's leadership team and presented to SAC for input.

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))

Each FAST assessment will allow us to regularly monitor SIP for effective implementation and make revisions as necessary based on results.

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	78%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	38	24	22	22	22	20	0	0	0	148
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	4	8	3	0	0	0	15
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	24	15	20	29	26	26	0	0	0	140
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	9	15	20	19	19	0	0	0	82
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	3	6	14	10	10	0	0	0	45

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	13	11	20	26	27	22	0	0	0	119

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	8	6	8	4	7	15	0	0	0	48
Students retained two or more times	6	4	8	0	6	10	0	0	0	34

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	

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	37	20	37	20	26	21	0	0	0	161
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	3	4	0	0	0	11
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	22	13	19	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	21	17	21	0	0	0	59
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	8	7	3	6	0	0	0	28

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	1	4	9	18	19	21	0	0	0	72

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	2	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2

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	37	20	37	20	26	21	0	0	0	161
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	3	4	0	0	0	11
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	22	13	19	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	21	17	21	0	0	0	59
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	8	7	3	6	0	0	0	28

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	1	4	9	18	19	21	0	0	0	72

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	2	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2

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*	48	56	53	52	58	56	53		
ELA Learning Gains				74			49		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				73			38		
Math Achievement*	56	62	59	56	54	50	40		
Math Learning Gains				79			28		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				68			27		
Science Achievement*	41	48	54	53	59	59	40		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					60	52			
Graduation Rate					45	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	66	59	59	60			57		

* 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	260
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	515
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
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	41			
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	42			
HSP	51			
MUL	75			
PAC				
WHT	62			

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%
FRL	49			

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	53			
ELL	62			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	58			
HSP	67			
MUL	79			
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	63			

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	48			56			41					66
SWD	40			44			41				4	
ELL	42			58							3	66
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41			53			42				4	
HSP	43			56			33				5	68
MUL	70			80							2	

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
PAC												
WHT	70			56			50				4	
FRL	45			52			32				5	67

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	52	74	73	56	79	68	53					60
SWD	41	64		46	62		50					
ELL	49	71	64	57	88		44					60
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36	69	83	44	70	69	38					
HSP	54	73	67	60	87		60					71
MUL	83			75								
PAC												
WHT	81	86		71	75							
FRL	46	73	82	51	76	64	50					62

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	53	49	38	40	28	27	40					57
SWD	42	36		45	42		29					
ELL	59	60		44	27		31					57
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41	35		28	7		34					
HSP	58	58	50	45	35		33					56
MUL	69			23								
PAC												
WHT	65	40		72								
FRL	47	46	29	36	27	17	37					46

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	46%	56%	-10%	54%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	39%	61%	-22%	58%	-19%
03	2023 - Spring	40%	53%	-13%	50%	-10%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	54%	62%	-8%	59%	-5%
04	2023 - Spring	48%	65%	-17%	61%	-13%
05	2023 - Spring	53%	58%	-5%	55%	-2%

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.

After examining the FAST mathematics PM 3 data from 2022-2023, the data component with the lowest performance in math was fractions. The following factors contributed to this gap: attendance, transient population, increased in A1 ELL students, low parental involvement, and gap in foundational skills. For science, the data component with the lowest performance as indicated by the FL NGSS 5th grade state science exam, was earth science. The following factors contributed to this gap: attendance, transient population, increased in A1 ELL students, low parental involvement, and gap in foundational skills.

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

The data component with the greatest decline from the prior year is science. We went from 54% proficient to 39% proficient. The following factors contributed to this gap: attendance, transient population, increased in A1 ELL students, low parental involvement, and gap in foundational skills.

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.

ELA (42%) has the greatest gap when compared to the state (53%). The following factors contributed to this gap: attendance, transient population, increased in A1 ELL students, low parental involvement, and gap in foundational skills.

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

Mathematics showed the biggest improvement in 4th grade during PM3 of the FL mathematics FAST test. Teachers created a spiral review based on previously weak standards and reviewed these questions on a daily basis.

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

ELA is the potential areas of concern.

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

Science and ELA are our highest priorities for school improvement for 2023-2024 school year.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 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.

The current FAST data, PM 1 for K-1 shows that 48% of students are on grade level (Tier 1), 14% are one grade level behind (Tier 2), and 35% are two or more levels behind, (Tier 3). The PM 1 data for 2nd grade shows 47% of students are on grade level (Tier 1), 12% are one year below, (Tier 2) and 41% are two or more levels below grade level (Tier 3).

The current FAST data, PM 1 shows that 20% of students in grades 3-5 are on grade level (Tier 1), 24% are one grade level below (Tier 2) and 55% are two grade levels below (Tier 3). Within ELA, Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary was the area with the highest percentage of Tier 3 students (61%).

Our focus will be on improving reading across genres and vocabulary through utilizing the curriculum, Benchmark Advance. This will be used as a Tier 1 Benchmark Advance has an intervention component that will be used for Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention. SIPPS and Reading Horizons will also be used as an intervention.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, Students in grades 3-5 who have been in attendance during both Survey 2 and Survey 3 will increase Level 3 proficiency scores in Reading from 42%(PM1) to 45%(PM3) as measured by FAST.

Monitoring:

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

The literacy coach will assist in giving additional training and will model lessons during the monthly grade level curriculum meetings, reading across genres, targeting vocabulary and integration of knowledge and ideas.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sandra Hall (sandra.hall@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.)

We will use the collaborative learning strategy to increase teacher learning of the curriculum. Teachers will share their best practices using the Frayer Model of vocabulary instruction and graphic organizers for comprehension, reading across genres, and integration of knowledge and ideas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We are selecting the collaborative learning strategy because research has shown it to be the most effective adult learning strategy.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

The current FAST data, Early Literacy PM 1 for K-1 shows that 48% of students are on grade level (Tier 1), 14% are one grade level behind (Tier 2), and 35% are categorized as needing urgent intervention, (Tier 3). The PM 1 Reading data for 2nd grade shows 47% of students are on grade level (Tier 1), 12% are one year below,(Tier 2) and 41% are two or more levels below grade level (Tier 3).

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

The current FAST data, PM 1 shows that 20% of students in grades 3-5 are on grade level (Tier 1), 24 % are one grade level below (Tier 2) and 55% are two grade levels below (Tier 3). Within ELA, Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary was the area with the highest percentage of Tier 3 students in each grade level; 61% in grade 3; 39% in grade 4 and 56% in grade 5.

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

In K-1, the percentage of students on grade level will increase from 50% to 75% by the May 2024 as evidenced by FAST PM 3.

In second grade, the percentage of students on grade level will increase from 42% to 80% by the end of May 2024 as evidenced by the FAST PM 3.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

In grades 3-5, the percentage of students on grade level will increase from 20% to 58% by May 2024 as evidenced by the FAST PM 3.

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.

The Literacy Coach will have monthly grade level curriculum meetings. The grade level teams will work collaboratively to share best practices and learn strategies to increase their instructional expertise in teaching vocabulary and integration of knowledge and ideas. The teachers will analyze the data from the Benchmark Advance Unit tests and the FAST PM 1 and PM 2 to examine which standards need to be retaught.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Hall, Sandra, sandra.hall@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?

All teachers in K-2 will be utilizing the district approved phonemic awareness program, Heggerty. Our reading intervention teacher in K-2 will be utilizing the district approved curricula, SIPPPS and Reading Horizons. She will implement these programs with Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. Our reading intervention teacher for grades 3-5 will be implementing the intervention portion of our Tier 1 Curriculum, Benchmark Advanced as well as SIPPS plus with Tier 2 and 3 Students. Classroom teachers will be using Reading Horizons and Benchmark Advance which are evidenced based curricula that align with BEST standards and the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidenced-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?

We are selecting the collaborative learning strategy because it has been shown to be the most effective adult learning strategy. Lauren Davis, Former Department Chair and Instructional Coach states “when teachers come together to share information, resources, ideas, and expertise, learning becomes more accessible and effective for students. Collaborating means purposefully building interpersonal relationships and working towards healthy interdependence, which occurs when teachers are comfortable giving and receiving help without forfeiting accountability.” (Schoology, 2020)

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
The Literacy Coach will have monthly grade-level curriculum meetings at which she will check in with teachers and provide any help needed and new information available.	Hall, Sandra, sandra.hall@browardschools.com
The grade-level teams will work collaboratively to share best practices and learn strategies to increase instructional expertise in teaching comprehension, vocabulary and reading across genres.	Hall, Sandra, sandra.hall@browardschools.com
The Literacy Coach will conduct biweekly walkthroughs for teachers needing additional assistance. She will meet with the specified teachers and provide feedback and resources to help them improve their craft.	Hall, Sandra, sandra.hall@browardschools.com

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.

An email will be sent to all Dania families and staff with explicit directions on how to access the School Improvement Plan on our website. The SIP will be provided in English, Spanish and/or Haitian Creole on request. Hard copies of each language will be available for perusal in the front office. The information on the SIP will also be provided in our quarterly newsletters.

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))

Dania Elementary will hold the Annual Title 1 Open House and three academic Family Nights throughout the year. Parents and community stakeholders are invited to our monthly SAC meetings and asked to participate in the development of the School Improvement Plan, the Parent and Family Engagement Plan, and the School Parent Compact. Teachers hold two parent teacher conferences per year to inform parents of their child's progress. Parents are also provided with Interim reports and report cards each quarter to keep them up to date on their child's progress. The Dania Elementary School Home Page is: <https://www.browardschools.com>

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)

All teachers at Dania Elementary will attend training on the Science of Reading. Our intervention and VE teachers will be trained in SIPPS and/or Reading Horizons. We will also hold tutoring camps for grades 1-5 in ELA and Math as well as science in grade 5.

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))

Dania Elementary works closely with the district's Homeless Education Assistance Resource Team (H.E.A.R.T). The purpose of H.E.A.R.T. is to identify homeless students, remove barriers to their education, including school enrollment, provide them with supplemental academic and counseling casemanagement services as well as linkages to their school social worker while maintaining school as the students' stable environment. Nutritional programs and health education are an integral part of our school, specifically through the Physical Educational curriculum and federal initiatives of the Broward County Public Schools Food & Nutrition Department.