

Broward County Public Schools

West Hollywood 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	20
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

West Hollywood Elementary School

6301 HOLLYWOOD BLVD, Hollywood, FL 33024

[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.

West Hollywood Elementary School will provide the opportunity and means for all students to achieve their maximum academic potential and develop social and life skills necessary to become engaged, global citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of West Hollywood Elementary School is to build a school community that will foster leadership, life long learners, college and career success, dynamic communicators, responsible and aware global citizens to adapt to our ever-changing 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
Palacios, Lina	Principal	Serves as an instructional leader, engages stakeholders, and collaborates in the school's decision-making process.
Sclafani, Veronica	Assistant Principal	Serves as an instructional leader, engages stakeholders, and collaborates in the school's decision-making process.
Bernot, Roxanne	Teacher, ESE	Serves as an instructional leader, engages stakeholders, and collaborates in the school decision-making process.
Myers, Mark	Math Coach	Serves as an instructional leader, engages stakeholders, and collaborates in the school decision-making process.
Murphy, Miranti	Reading Coach	Serves as an instructional leader, engages stakeholders, and collaborates in the school decision-making process.
House, Destiney	School Counselor	Serves as an instructional leader, engages stakeholders, and collaborates in the school decision-making process.

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 school leadership team, teachers, staff, parents, families, community leaders, and business partners are invited to participate in the development of the West Hollywood Elementary SIP and encouraged to join the School Advisory Committee (SAC). The SAC meets monthly to discuss the SIP. Stakeholders are given opportunity for input in the development process.

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 SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation by the school leadership team. Data will be continuously monitored via data chats between administration and teachers to monitor progress towards increasing the achievement of students in order to meeting the State's academic standards, as well as closing the achievement gaps of all student sub groups. This information is shared with the SAC to keep stakeholders involved and informed.

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	94%
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) 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: C
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	35	31	25	24	17	21	0	0	0	153	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	3	
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	11	36	42	27	23	28	0	0	0	167	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	24	39	22	19	24	0	0	0	128	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	7	10	33	13	15	0	0	0	78	

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	6	29	36	34	22	27	0	0	0	154

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	1	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	34	24	26	19	22	27	0	0	0	152	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	6	0	0	0	8	
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	25	24	34	0	0	0	83	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	23	23	29	0	0	0	75	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	0	18	10	10	7	0	0	0	47	

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	1	7	21	26	38	0	0	0	94

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	18	10	10	7	0	0	0	47
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	34	24	26	19	22	27	0	0	0	152	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	6	0	0	0	8	
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	25	24	34	0	0	0	83	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	23	23	29	0	0	0	75	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	0	18	10	10	7	0	0	0	47	

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	1	7	21	26	38	0	0	0	94

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	18	10	10	7	0	0	0	47
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*	41	56	53	40	58	56	31		
ELA Learning Gains				59			50		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				66			38		
Math Achievement*	55	62	59	47	54	50	26		
Math Learning Gains				64			25		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				73			15		
Science Achievement*	13	48	54	25	59	59	22		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					60	52			
Graduation Rate					45	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	52	59	59	45			54		

* 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	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	210
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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	419
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	23	Yes	1	1
ELL	38	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	1	
HSP	41			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				

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	43			

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	45			
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	51			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
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	41			55			13					52
SWD	15			39			0				5	42
ELL	32			51			18				5	52
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40			48			0				5	50
HSP	38			56			13				5	52
MUL												

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												
FRL	42			56			10				5	57

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	40	59	66	47	64	73	25					45
SWD	17	81	90	25	60		10					33
ELL	33	54	61	44	68	71	15					45
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	34	70		36	52		13					
HSP	39	55	61	48	67	72	18					49
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	40	57	82	49	62	60	24					48

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	31	50	38	26	25	15	22					54
SWD	14	42		17	31		10					
ELL	25	40		22	20		18					54
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	26	43		17	20		20					40
HSP	31	54		28	25		20					56
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	23			23								
FRL	30	49		25	25	20	25					57

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	26%	56%	-30%	54%	-28%
04	2023 - Spring	42%	61%	-19%	58%	-16%
03	2023 - Spring	48%	53%	-5%	50%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	53%	62%	-9%	59%	-6%
04	2023 - Spring	61%	65%	-4%	61%	0%
05	2023 - Spring	42%	58%	-16%	55%	-13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	12%	46%	-34%	51%	-39%

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.

Science is an area of need for improvement. Science scores decreased from 25% proficiency in 2022 to 16% in 2023. Science was integrated with Reading and not taught as a separate subject. Students lacked proficiency in the Science NGSS standards.

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

Science showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Science scores decreased by 9 percentage points from the prior year. The contributing factor is that Science standards were not taught as a separate subject, focusing on NGSS standards.

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.

The Science data had the greatest gap compared to the state average. Science was integrated with Reading and not taught as a separate subject. Therefore, students were not proficient with their knowledge of NGSS Science standards.

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

Mathematics showed the most improvement in its data with a 20% increase from 2021-2022 to 2022-2023 school year (47% to 67%). Targeted math instruction focusing on foundational and fluency skills mastery were implemented to close achievement gaps via ELO camps and small group instruction.

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

Two potential areas of concern from the EWS are the number of students absent 10% or more days from school and the number of students below proficient in the ELL-subgroup in ELA.

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

1. Increase the number of students who score a level 3 in the Science 2.0 Assessment.
2. Closing the academic gap in ELA for the ELL sub-group
3. Reduce the number of students absent 10% or more days throughout the school year.
4. Continue the implementation of ELO Camps.

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.

In order to establish a positive culture and environment, our area of focus is to improve our student attendance. 2022-23 data indicates 153 students fall into the category of 10% or more days absent. Students with chronic absences demonstrate low academic achievement. A team approach will ensure that students have a welcoming and supportive educational environment. This plan identifies school-based members, SMART Goals, foundational supports, and 3 Tiers of interventions and support to help promote and improve student attendance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June of 2024, chronic absenteeism at our school will decrease by 2%. Chronic absenteeism is when a student is absent 10% or more full days in a school year. Through the end of the 22-23 school year, 33.1% of our students were in the chronic category, which was higher than the elementary school average (29.5%).

Monitoring:

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

Attendance will be routinely monitored using BASIS and other reports available from the District to identify students with the most needs. For students whose parents are not responding to interventions, ensure that the primary teacher has logged frequent attempts at communication in BASIS under Tier 1 Behavior and Attendance Success Plans that may be used as evidence of school interventions if legal interventions are needed in the future. In August/September, students with a history of severe chronic absenteeism (absent 20% or more days in a school year) will be identified.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Veronica Sclafani (veronica.sclafani@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 intervention being implemented to engage students and families is to determine if a student and their family is, or should be, agency involved. If they are, work to set up a meeting to coordinate services. Refer students and families to appropriate service agencies (e.g. social services, human resources, counseling, housing, and health services).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Personal communications that is positive and supportive early in the school year may mitigate as needed for additional Tier 2/3 interventions later in the school year.

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. Recognize good and improved attendance.
2. Encourage teachers to communicate pattern of absences with parents
3. Provide personalized outreach.

Person Responsible: Destiney House (destiney.house@browardschools.com)

By When: This will occur throughout the school year as necessary.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**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 area of focus is to decrease the gap of our ELL students in second grade ELA. 73% of our second grade students scored below 40 percentile in the FAST Star Reading.

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 ELL second grade students scoring below 40 percentile will decrease by 10% or more.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored by analyzing data trends through teacher data chats.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Veronica Sclafani (veronica.sclafani@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.)

Our ELL interventionists will provide differentiated instruction using the WIDA lessons, ESOL Strategies Matrix, and Imagine Learning program.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale is that following the district ESOL strategies and utilizing approved district resources will create a positive mindset and culture for students to transition into the English language.

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. Identify ELL students scoring below proficient in PM3 ELA FAST
2. ELL Interventionists will pull out students to provide differentiated instruction.
3. ELL interventionists will communicate progress with the Reading teacher and set goals to close achievement gaps.

Person Responsible: Veronica Sclafani (veronica.sclafani@browardschools.com)

By When: Monitoring of ELL-ELA data will occur continuously throughout the year on a monthly basis.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**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.

Science scores decreased from the previous year and is the lowest achievement area based on the state assessments.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, the percentage of 5th graders scoring a level 3 or above on the Science FCAT will increase from 16% to 25%.

Monitoring:

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

Students in grades K-5 will take the Science Beginning, Middle, and End of the Year Science Assessments. In addition, they will also take the micro-assessments intermittently. Teachers will monitor how students are doing and adjust instruction accordingly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mark Myers (mark.myers@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.)

Stemscopes and the district provided resources will be used for science instruction in all grades. 5th grade students will also receive a double dose of science where they will review 3rd and 4th grade standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Schools that increased their science scores last year had a similar model.

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 3 - Promising 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.

4th and 5th grade is departmentalized to ensure science is taught every day

Person Responsible: Lina Palacios (lina.palacios@browardschools.com)

By When: September 2023

Hands on Science Activities will be done weekly in all grade levels.

Person Responsible: Veronica Sclafani (veronica.sclafani@browardschools.com)

By When: October 2023

Elementary Learning Science Department will support teachers with science planning

Person Responsible: Mark Myers (mark.myers@browardschools.com)

By When: ongoing

Science instruction will be part of after school camps for grades 3-5

Person Responsible: Lina Palacios (lina.palacios@browardschools.com)

By When: October 2023

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

Our area of focus for grades K-2 is decoding (phonological awareness, and sight word recognition). Following the evidence-based Science of Reading approach, decoding is essential in the development of Literacy learning. The area of focus was identified through diagnostic and progress monitoring assessments (FAST Reading Progress Monitoring Assessments and Unit Benchmark Assessments), Rti Progress monitoring, and teacher observation. In Kindergarten, 46% of our students were not on track, scoring below 40 percentile in Star Early Literacy PM3. In First Grade, 52% of our students were not on track, scoring below 40 percentile in Star Reading PM3. In Second Grade, 73% of our students were not on track, scoring below 40 percentile in Star Reading PM3.

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

Our areas of focus for grades 3-5 are decoding and language comprehension. Following the evidence-based Science of Reading approach, decoding and language comprehension are essential in the development of Literacy learning. The areas of focus were identified through diagnostic and progress monitoring assessments (FAST Reading Progress Monitoring Assessments and Unit Benchmark Assessments), Rti Progress monitoring, and teacher observation. In Grade 3, 52% of students scored below a level 3 on the 2023 statewide, standardized ELA PM3 assessment. In Grade 4, 53% of students scored below a level 3 on the 2023 statewide, standardized ELA PM3 assessment. In Grade 5, 71% of students scored below a level 3 on the 2023 statewide, standardized ELA PM3 assessment.

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 of 2024, 50% of Kindergarten students will score 40% or higher on the PM3 STAR Early Literacy.

By June of 2024, 50% of first grade students will score 40% or higher on the PM3 STAR Reading.

By June of 2024, 50% second grade students will score 40% or higher on the PM3 STAR Reading.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By June of 2024, 45% of third grade students will score level 3 or higher on the PM3 FAST-ELA for grade 3.

By June of 2024, 45% of fourth grade students will score level 3 or higher on the PM3 FAST-ELA for grade 4.

By June of 2024, 45% of fifth grade students will score level 3 or higher on the PM3 FAST-ELA for grade 5.

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.

West Hollywood Elementary instructional leadership team and teachers will consistently monitor student progress in the area of focus through Benchmark Advance Unit Assessments, Rti Progress Monitoring tools, formative classroom assessments, and informal teacher observations. The leadership team will monitor progress via classroom walkthroughs and data chats. The leadership team will meet weekly to ensure that core instruction and interventions are implemented with fidelity. Monitoring of FAST PM1, PM2, PM3 as well as i-Ready growth monitoring will measure progress towards desired outcomes.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Sclafani, Veronica, veronica.sclafani@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?

Evidence based strategies within our Benchmark Advance and Science of Reading teacher-directed and small group instructional practices will be implemented to achieve desired outcomes. Strategies include teacher-directed small group instruction, independent practice or supported practice, as well as i-Ready technology integration. Tier 1 instruction is provided through Benchmark Advance Florida 2022. It is aligned to BEST ELA standards, Florida's definition of evidence-based practices, and K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-Based Reading Plan. Teachers provide instruction through whole group and small group instruction. Mastery of standards are assessed every 2-3 weeks through unit assessments. Students are also assessed three times a year through FAST STAR Early Literacy, STAR Reading (Grades K-2), and FAST Cambium Assessment (Grades 3-5). If a student scores below 40%, then the student is referred for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. Evidence-based Programs utilized for Tier 2 and Tier 3 are Benchmark Advance Interventions and Reading Horizons. Ongoing professional development and collaborative sessions focusing on the integration of Benchmark instruction will be provided to teachers.

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?

Students that score below 40 percentile or level 3 in FAST ELA Assessments will be monitored for Response to Intervention (Rti). If the student does not demonstrate progress on FAST ELA and the Benchmark Advance Unit Assessments, then an Rti referral will be created to address the area of need. Benchmark Advance Intervention and Reading Horizons are multi-sensory and systematic instructional programs that address foundational skills related to the lower standards of the Scarborough's Reading Rope and aligns with the Science of Reading best practices. These programs have shown proven record of effectiveness for the target population. Horizons is an evidence-based program which strengthens the essential foundational skills and language comprehension acquisition, in order to close the reading gaps. Teachers will participate in the Science of Reading professional development and grade level teams collaborative sessions in order to implement Benchmark Advance lessons to fidelity as well as deepening knowledge of content pedagogy.

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
Administer the FAST assessments and desegregate the data to determine students that are below level. Data chats with teachers will focus on learning gaps.	Palacios, Lina, lina.palacios@browardschools.com
Classroom walkthroughs to ensure that programs are implemented to fidelity.	Palacios, Lina, lina.palacios@browardschools.com
Teachers will participate in Science of Reading Professional Learning Series provided by the district. Teachers will apply the Science of Reading BCPS: Part 2 K-12 CERP Elementary Decision Tree 2023-2024 to determine areas of student needs and identify additional interventions to close learning gaps. Teachers will implement the interventions and track data to monitor progress.	Sclafani, Veronica, veronica.sclafani@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.

Methods of dissemination to stakeholders include public meeting flyers, parent link/marquee announcements, and school website. The SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated via monthly parent meetings, written communication, and school website. Our SIP is provided in a language that parents can understand with our Parent and Family Engagement Plan via direct access at <https://www.browardschools.com/westhollywood>.

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))

Our Parent and Family Engagement Plan describes our plan to conduct monthly parent meetings to build positive relationships with parent, families, and other community stakeholders. Parents are introduced to our School-Parent Compact and ESSA integration during our Title 1 Community meeting. Monthly parent meetings will be conducted thereafter to inform parents of student progress and support the needs of students. The Family Engagement Plan is accessible via the school website.
<https://www.browardschools.com/westhollywood>

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)

Academic programs will be strengthened via parent meetings and activities such as curriculum-based monthly Family Nights.

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))

N/A