

Broward County Public Schools

Gulfstream Academy Of Hallandale Beach 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 | 15 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 20 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 20 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 23 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

Gulfstream Academy Of Hallandale Beach

1000 S W 3RD ST, Hallandale Beach, FL 33009

[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.

Our mission is to empower students in mathematics, reading, writing, and science academically with critical thinking skills and problem-solving skills. We promote social, emotional and physical development through positive self-imaging and wise decision-making skills.

Provide the school's vision statement.

"We are Better Together" as "We strive to move Colts to Stallions with Excellence".

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 |
|----------------------|---------------------|---|
| Campbell, Carlton | Principal | The principal is responsible for the academics of the entire school. The principal works closely with the assistant principals and coaches to oversee and approve the curriculum plan and the assessments for the school year. The principal meets regularly with support staff, assistant principals and teachers to ensure that everyone is in collaboration towards the common goal. The principal attends School Advisory Council meetings to gather pertinent information from stakeholders in reference to items that may need improvement. |
| Boyce, Candy | Assistant Principal | Oversee daily operations of K-3 for Curriculum and Behavioral aspects. Focuses on ensuring students have photos and IDs, Teacher Compliance, Technology, Sunshine Committee, Support Staff, SEL, Student Handbook, Forms, and Planners, Parent / Teacher Conferences, RTI, Faculty Handbook, Master Calendar, Morning Announcements, Community Partnership Schools, After School Programs, School Committees, and ESOL. |
| Fitzpatrick, Chandra | Assistant Principal | Oversee daily operations of 4-8 ELA and Science for Curriculum. Additionally, she manages the discipline and behavior of grades 4-6. She focuses on making sure that teacher mandatory trainings are completed. Also, she manages substitutes, support staff, safety and security, PTSA, Title I, and Verizon Innovative Learning School partnership. |
| Siggia, Elmo | Assistant Principal | Oversee grades 4-8 with Math and Social Studies curriculum. Manages grades 7-8 when it involves discipline and behavior. Manages the smart bond, facilities, ESE / Gifted, PLCs, extra curricular activities, community partnerships, Textbooks, Athletics, Discipline and TIER mentor program. |

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.

All stakeholders are invited to the monthly School Advisory Council meetings. Stakeholders include parents, teachers, students and community representatives. They are informed of meetings with flyers, parent links and school postings. Through our partnership with the United Way and as a Community Partnership School, we host many nights for the Hallandale community in which they are also informed about the different events that the school is hosting.

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 is reviewed at the monthly School Advisory Council meetings. All stakeholders are informed about the progress that the school is making toward the goals that are set during the new business portion of the meetings. The different data points on the Progress Monitoring FAST data are also discussed when results are posted at the following School Advisory Council Meeting. Stakeholders are always invited to ask follow-up questions and revisions are made based on the feedback.

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) | Combination School KG-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | Yes |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 89% |
| 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) Asian Students (ASN) 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: C |
| | 2019-20: B |
| | 2018-19: B |
| | 2017-18: B |
| 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 | 71 | 63 | 52 | 44 | 54 | 35 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 331 | |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 43 | 56 | 41 | 166 | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 19 | 20 | 68 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 4 | 14 | 35 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 26 | 66 | 65 | 41 | 42 | 60 | 59 | 64 | 64 | 487 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 37 | 48 | 34 | 54 | 57 | 79 | 75 | 55 | 439 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 33 | 18 | 85 | |

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 | 17 | 46 | 47 | 45 | 47 | 51 | 70 | 80 | 65 | 468 |

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 | 0 | 10 | 15 | 13 | 9 | 75 | 4 | 2 | 27 | 155 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 6 | 11 | 2 | 5 | 46 | 5 | 8 | 22 | 105 |

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 | 71 | 55 | 70 | 66 | 49 | 65 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 383 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 20 | 29 | 42 | 0 | 108 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 76 | 0 | 111 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 32 | 0 | 60 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 39 | 60 | 49 | 72 | 0 | 268 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 51 | 74 | 53 | 81 | 0 | 317 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 34 | 50 | 47 | 55 | 83 | 25 | 26 | 0 | 320 |

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 | 5 | 28 | 43 | 54 | 67 | 88 | 59 | 92 | 0 | 436 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 5 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 11 | 15 | 10 | 12 | 0 | 133 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 13 |

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 | 71 | 55 | 70 | 66 | 49 | 65 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 383 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 20 | 29 | 42 | 0 | 108 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 76 | 0 | 111 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 32 | 0 | 60 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 39 | 60 | 49 | 72 | 0 | 268 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 51 | 74 | 53 | 81 | 0 | 317 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 34 | 50 | 47 | 55 | 83 | 25 | 26 | 0 | 320 |

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 | 5 | 28 | 43 | 54 | 67 | 88 | 59 | 92 | 0 | 436 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 5 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 11 | 15 | 10 | 12 | 0 | 133 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 13 |

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* | 44 | 55 | 53 | 46 | 57 | 55 | 42 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 60 | | | 48 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 46 | | | 34 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 37 | 52 | 55 | 38 | 47 | 42 | 34 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 55 | | | 21 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 60 | | | 25 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 33 | 50 | 52 | 36 | 52 | 54 | 36 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 63 | 68 | 68 | 59 | 64 | 59 | 51 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | 73 | 72 | 70 | 68 | 57 | 51 | 58 | | |
| Graduation Rate | | 68 | 74 | | 50 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | 54 | 53 | | 66 | 70 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 56 | 53 | 55 | 66 | 75 | 70 | 52 | | |

* 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 | 50 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 352 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 53 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 534 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 97 |
| 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 | 21 | Yes | 4 | 2 |
| ELL | 47 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 44 | | | |
| HSP | 53 | | | |
| MUL | 39 | Yes | 1 | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 45 | | | |

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 | 50 | | | |

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 | 27 | Yes | 3 | 1 |
| ELL | 50 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 62 | | | |
| BLK | 47 | | | |
| HSP | 58 | | | |
| MUL | 42 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 53 | | | |
| FRL | 53 | | | |

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 | 44 | | | 37 | | | 33 | 63 | 73 | | | 56 |
| SWD | 17 | | | 12 | | | 17 | 46 | | | 6 | 25 |
| ELL | 41 | | | 40 | | | 27 | 50 | 68 | | 7 | 56 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 40 | | | 30 | | | 26 | 54 | 74 | | 6 | |
| HSP | 46 | | | 40 | | | 40 | 68 | 73 | | 7 | 56 |
| MUL | 33 | | | 45 | | | | | | | 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 | 43 | | | 44 | | | 31 | 60 | | | 4 | |
| FRL | 43 | | | 35 | | | 34 | 68 | 75 | | 7 | 55 |

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 | 46 | 60 | 46 | 38 | 55 | 60 | 36 | 59 | 68 | | | 66 |
| SWD | 15 | 41 | 36 | 14 | 45 | 47 | 14 | 25 | | | | 9 |
| ELL | 41 | 56 | 44 | 40 | 58 | 64 | 25 | 53 | 52 | | | 66 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 55 | 80 | | 64 | 50 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 37 | 55 | 48 | 28 | 49 | 54 | 24 | 58 | 42 | | | 70 |
| HSP | 51 | 61 | 46 | 43 | 57 | 64 | 43 | 63 | 79 | | | 68 |
| MUL | 42 | | | 42 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 54 | 66 | | 46 | 64 | | 43 | | | | | 45 |
| FRL | 46 | 60 | 49 | 37 | 54 | 61 | 34 | 59 | 65 | | | 65 |

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 | 42 | 48 | 34 | 34 | 21 | 25 | 36 | 51 | 58 | | | 52 |
| SWD | 19 | 38 | 30 | 19 | 16 | 18 | 7 | 29 | | | | 44 |
| ELL | 40 | 44 | 35 | 38 | 24 | 25 | 31 | 43 | 45 | | | 52 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 35 | 45 | 32 | 26 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 42 | 59 | | | 43 |
| HSP | 47 | 50 | 38 | 37 | 20 | 29 | 42 | 58 | 56 | | | 55 |
| MUL | 50 | 60 | | 58 | 30 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 43 | 42 | | 48 | 32 | | 50 | 45 | 55 | | | 33 |
| FRL | 41 | 46 | 33 | 32 | 20 | 24 | 31 | 47 | 57 | | | 50 |

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 | 31% | 56% | -25% | 54% | -23% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 32% | 49% | -17% | 47% | -15% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 36% | 49% | -13% | 47% | -11% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 51% | 61% | -10% | 58% | -7% |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 38% | 50% | -12% | 47% | -9% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 38% | 53% | -15% | 50% | -12% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 29% | 54% | -25% | 54% | -25% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 18% | 51% | -33% | 48% | -30% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 53% | 62% | -9% | 59% | -6% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 46% | 65% | -19% | 61% | -15% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 35% | 46% | -11% | 55% | -20% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 38% | 58% | -20% | 55% | -17% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 7% | 38% | -31% | 44% | -37% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 17% | 46% | -29% | 51% | -34% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 48% | 48% | 0% | 50% | -2% |

| GEOMETRY | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | * | 46% | * | 48% | * |

| BIOLOGY | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 91% | 63% | 28% | 63% | 28% |

| CIVICS | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 54% | 64% | -10% | 66% | -12% |

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.

When analyzing the ELA data we noticed that the component that had the lowest performance was the Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary. We believe that a contributing factor to that trend was the influx of ELL students that we gained halfway through the school year. As students work to learn the language, it can be easy for them to confuse many homographs that can impact their understanding of the text.

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

When comparing our FSA proficiency to our FAST proficiency the greatest decline can be seen in our ELA data. In 2022, our students were 46% proficient which is 8% higher than the 38% proficiency they earned this year. One factor that we believe contributed to that decline is the new testing format which switched for some grades from paper based to computer based testing. Also, this was the first time that students were tested on the new B.E.S.T. standards that were implemented during the transition from COVID.

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.

When looking at the state proficiency compared to the school proficiency 5th grade had the greatest gap. The state proficiency for 5th grade was 55% and our school proficiency was 32% for a 23% difference in ELA. One factor that we believe contributed to this is the lack of training regarding the rollout of the Benchmark Advance curriculum. The district has already begun to make changes to the training in line with the Science of Reading so that all components of the curriculum can be used effectively.

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

On PM1, 20% of our students were proficient in ELA. By PM3, 38% of our students were proficient in ELA for a gain of 18%. Our students with disabilities also increased from 9% proficient to 15% proficient in ELA which was a specific subgroup that we were targeting this past school year. In Math for PM1 only 10% of students were proficient. However, by PM3 37% of students were proficient for a gain of 27%. Our students with disabilities went from 4% proficient to 11% proficient in Math. One new action we took was providing our students with disabilities a Learning Strategies elective to provide them with small group instruction in core subjects.

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

One potential area of concern is the amount of absences that our students have throughout the school year. If students are not in school to receive instruction, they will not be as successful when it comes to showing mastery of the standards. In addition to regular absences, we also have many students who receive suspensions due to their behavior. This prohibits them from attending class and receiving the vital instruction that they need.

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

Our highest priority is to monitor the progress that students are making toward mastering the different standards through the multiple modes of data that our school has access to. For example, we implement iReady, Growth Measure, Success Maker, and compare that data to the FAST PM data to get a better understanding of what students' deficiencies and strengths are. This helps us to ensure that instruction is data-driven and targeted toward students' needs.

Our second priority is to ensure that students are taking accountability for their learning through student and teacher data chats. This allows students and teachers to be aware of the data, reflect on their data and set goals for improvement.

Our last priority is to ensure that we are meeting the needs of our community by also providing tutoring or extended learning opportunities. Due to the demographic in which we serve, not all families can afford to provide outside help to their students. By offering tutoring at school we are ensuring that the students receive the extra help that they need to be more successful in school.

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.

Gulfstream Academy of Hallandale Beach K-8 is proud to be a Community Partnership School through the United Way. As a result of our CPS status, we have access to resources that benefit our school and our community. For example, we have a member of the CPS team who is over monitoring all students that are exhibiting any Early Warning signs and reaching out to their family to provide services. This allows for families to receive additional support and ensures that any obstacles that were prohibiting the student from attending or being successful in school is addressed. The CPS team is also very active on different school committees such as the PBIS team and supports the school's efforts to reward positive behavior through incentives.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June 2024, the number of the students that are absent 10% or more days will decrease by 5% as per the 2023-2024 Early Warning Systems from 371 students to at most 352 students.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will take attendance with fidelity and the attendance liaison monitors the records to ensure that notice is given to both parents and the CPS team members when students are chronically absent. The CPS team provides extra support to parents in regard to registration for transportation or addressing homelessness. This helps to reduce the number of students absent to school.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elmo Siggia (elmo.siggia@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.)

Research shows that students are more likely to want to attend school when they are excited about going to school. In order to build an environment in which students are excited to go to school, students are informed about the different incentives that they can earn and are constantly reminded about the different events that the school is hosting to celebrate students' success. In order to participate, students understand that they have to be present to earn the rewards, which helps ensure they are motivated to attend.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

As a PBIS school, we understand that positive incentives are an effective way to see change in a behavior. By providing incentives, as well as addressing the root of the problem, the parents are appreciative of the support they receive from the school and the students are excited about learning

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.

Teachers need to be informed that they can reach out to the CPS team to discuss possible attendance issues. The Attendance Liaison needs to ensure that they contact both parents after the students have been flagged for attendance as well as the CPS team. The CPS team needs to communicate the possible solutions to ensure that teachers and the Attendance Liaison can follow up and monitor that the solution is working for the students.

Person Responsible: Candy Boyce (candy.boyce@browardschools.com)

By When: By the end of Quarter one, the CPS team will pull the attendance report and reach out to the families.

#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.

Our Students with Disabilities subgroup has been below the federal index level of 41% for two years. This past year it was under 32% according to the data review which makes this a high priority sub group for our school. This qualifies it as a crucial need for our school being that the students have not improved for two consecutive years.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on the 2021-2022 data by June 2024 students with disabilities will increase in ELA from 15% to 25%.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will continue to receive training in the best practices for our students with disabilities, such as providing them their accommodations and utilizing the ESE support facilitators.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elmo Siggia (elmo.siggia@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.)

Studies show that small group instruction can be twice as effective as whole group instruction in regard to reading. Therefore, one of the interventions that was utilized last year was to provide all of our middle school students with a learning strategies elective. This provided them with small group instruction and an ESE facilitator to ensure that students had an extra layer of support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy was utilized because it provided students with constant support and differentiated instruction. Since the class was a learning strategies class, the students were also being taught how to advocate for themselves in their general education classes and could ask for assistance in whatever class they were struggling in. This provided all students with the tools they needed to be successful.

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. After each FAST PM teachers will collaborate with the ESE Support Facilitators to look specifically at our Students with Disabilities.

Person Responsible: Elmo Siggia (elmo.siggia@browardschools.com)

By When: After PM1 teachers will collaborate with ESE support facilitators to discuss and identify the starting point for our Students with Disabilities.

2. The teachers will continue to monitor their performance on Unit Assessments, iReady lessons, as well as Into Literature selection tests. By identifying and focusing on our Students with Disabilities we will be able to ensure that they increase in ELA.

Person Responsible: Elmo Siggia (elmo.siggia@browardschools.com)

By When: After each Selection test teachers will meet with students to complete their Data folder and discuss their progress towards their goals.

3. Teachers will continue to provide differentiated instruction to students and provide them with modifications and accommodations based on their IEP.

Person Responsible: Elmo Siggia (elmo.siggia@browardschools.com)

By When: By the end of quarter 1 teachers will meet and discuss the different accommodations utilized that best assisted students and share other best practices.

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).

During School Advisory Council meetings stakeholders have an opportunity to propose items to be purchased with accountability funds. All items purchased with the funds must be aligned with the school improvement plan goals. Teachers who are on the front line and interacting with students daily, make suggestions of different resources that they feel would help students to be successful and those resources are then proposed to the SAC committee for voting. Stakeholders are informed of the ways that the items purchased are being utilized in and out of the classroom and data reports are shared with them so that they are aware of how the programs implemented are affecting the goal of student proficiency.

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

When reflecting on our Early Literacy and STAR scores, 50 percent or more of 1st grade and 2nd grade scored below the 40th percentile threshold with 1st grade at 52% and 2nd grade at 57%. We need to increase the overall proficiency of students in grades 1 and 2. This affects students' learning in literacy because the data shows that students are struggling with the foundational and linguistic comprehension skills needed to understand the texts they read.

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

Currently 61% of the students in grade 3 and 65% of students in grade 5 scored below the proficiency level on PM3 ELA portion of the FAST assessment. We need to increase the overall proficiency of students in grades 3 and 5. Low performance in ELA will impact student learning and understanding in other core content subject areas, as students begin to shift from learning to read; to reading to learn.

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, the percentage of students in grade 1 scoring below the 40th percentile on Early Literacy or STAR proficiency will decrease from 52% to 47%.

By June 2024, the percentage of students in grade 2 scoring below the 40th percentile on Early Literacy or STAR proficiency will decrease from 57% to 52%.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By June 2024, the percentage of students in grade 3 scoring below the proficiency level on the ELA portion of the FAST assessment will decrease from 62% to 57%.

By June 2024, the percentage of students in grade 5 scoring below the proficiency level on the ELA portion of the FAST assessment will decrease from 69% to 64%.

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.

High quality instruction will be monitored by administration and curriculum coaches. Teachers will be working on creating strong tier 1 instruction using the BEST standards. Teachers will be familiar with content in order to spiral through the standards in a lesson rather than teaching standards in isolation. Continuous strengthening of the BEST standards will occur during professional learning communities and district professional development. FAST PM1 and PM2 will be analyzed and used to ensure that data is being used to drive classroom instruction. Administration and curriculum coaches will facilitate

data chats with teachers to discuss data trends to aid the teachers in planning to increase the rigor of instruction for proficient students and remediate struggling students. Teachers will conduct student data chats, so students become accountable for their learning.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Fitzpatrick, Chandra, chandra.fitzpatrick@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?

GAHB K-8 is utilizing the evidence -based practices of the Science of Reading through the use of Benchmark Advance. As students receive instruction in the foundational skills they are closing the achievement gap in any decoding deficiencies they may have. While students are working on Units, they are receiving background knowledge that has a horizontal alignment (spiraling of standards) and vertical alignment (building knowledge on the same topics throughout the years). This allows students to work towards mastery of the B.E.S.T. ELA standards as they progress through the Benchmark Advance program while building their linguistic comprehension. This is a promising way to ensure that our students receiving the assistance they need which should lead to the product of reading comprehension.

There are components in Benchmark Advance that focus on the foundational skills as well as the decoding necessary for students to receive the product of comprehension. This ensures that all students are getting their needs addressed. In addition, students in K-5 have access to iReady reading which has shown a proven record of effectiveness for our targeted population.

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?

One program that we decided to utilize in addition to Benchmark Advance is iReady. This program utilizes differentiated instruction through a blended learning model. By providing students with

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 |
|--|---|
| Administrators will become knowledgeable in the Science of Reading. Literacy coaches will attend ongoing trainings to improve their knowledge in literacy. | Boyce, Candy, candy.boyce@browardschools.com |
| Literacy Coaches will conduct classroom walkthroughs and review data to provide instructional feedback to teachers to improve their instructional practice in literacy. Administrators and coaches will provide teachers with ongoing professional development and collaborative planning to increase the use of effective strategies used during instruction and use student data to drive the instruction. | Boyce, Candy, candy.boyce@browardschools.com |
| The school will use FAST assessment data, Benchmark Unit Assessments, and iReady usage and diagnostics to monitor student progress towards proficiency. Students will utilize data folders to ensure that they take accountability for their progress. Teachers will attend professional developments to ensure that they are teaching the curriculum with fidelity. | Boyce, Candy, candy.boyce@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.

While the School Improvement Plan is available on the school's website at <https://www.browardschools.com/Page/62574>, the School Improvement Plan, School Accountability Funds, and Title I information is discussed monthly at School Advisory Council meetings. After each PM data point, the data is shared and discussed with stakeholders so that the progress towards the goals can be monitored.

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))

GAHB K-8 works to build positive relationships with our families and community by providing two way communication with all stakeholders. To engage families in students' learning, the school hosts multiple parent nights throughout the year. This supports our mission and the needs of students as it helps to inform parents of best practices they can utilize at home to support student learning. Parents are kept informed about all events at the school through parent links and the school website. In addition, pertinent information such as teacher qualification status and student test scores are shared in parent letters that are disseminated with the students.

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)

GAHB K-8 strengthens the academic programs by providing extended learning opportunities before, during and after school in which Students with Disabilities are given priority access. Students in grades 6-8 who earned a proficient score on the FAST test are offered accelerated courses such as Biology, Geometry, Algebra, Debate and Spanish. The school works to provide a positive learning environment through the PBIS program which helps to improve the quality of learning as it lowers the number of behavioral disruptions.

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))

Through the ESSER grant, students are provided support and intervention in the core subject of reading and math. Other programs that we work in conjunction with is the HEART program, which helps students to keep a sense of normalcy as they are provided services that keep them at their home school. Lastly,