

Broward County Public Schools

Colbert Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	19
VI. Title I Requirements	22
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Colbert Elementary School

2701 PLUNKETT ST, Hollywood, FL 33020

[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.

Colbert Museum Magnet is committed to fostering a safe and nurturing learning community that provides an equitable and quality education experience for ALL scholars.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Educating today's students, to transform tomorrow's world, through continuous improvement in academia and social emotional learning.

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
McLeod, Dorsett	Principal	Operations of the school and Instructional Leader
Cooper-Moye, Eyvonda	Assistant Principal	School Operations and Instructional Leader
Neat, Chentel	Instructional Coach	Science resource, coaching and feedback, instructional leader

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.

Our SIP developments are conducted via our SAC committee and involve the input of teachers, staff, and the SAC Board which represents all of our student population, and community. We hold monthly meetings to discuss pertinent topics around school improvement, develop plans of execution, and form committees to carry out the necessary work to bring our visions to life.

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))

Data will be reviewed after each assessment to monitor the progress of each student over the course of the year. Goals will be reviewed quarterly to discuss and make necessary adjustments during SAC

meetings. We will also discuss and analyze data regarding SIP within our academic committees to ensure progress monitoring. Any trends in deficits discovered during the analysis process will prompt succession planning and monitoring for effectiveness.

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 KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	96%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
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) 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: 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	43	49	37	37	26	37	0	0	0	229
One or more suspensions	3	4	5	17	5	19	0	0	0	53
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	29	44	40	50	32	41	0	0	0	236
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	18	40	45	35	43	0	0	0	181
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	12	33	33	6	0	0	0	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	14	30	38	53	39	43	0	0	0	217

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	32	29	33	49	44	57	0	0	0	244
Students retained two or more times	10	16	19	6	23	43	0	0	0	117

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	56	32	42	28	43	46	0	0	0	247
One or more suspensions	4	0	2	3	21	12	0	0	0	42
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	27	49	47	0	0	0	123
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	25	60	56	0	0	0	141
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	1	3	4	6	7	0	0	0	22

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	3	4	6	28	52	54	0	0	0	147

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	3	8	25	2	2	0	0	0	41
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	56	32	42	28	43	46	0	0	0	247	
One or more suspensions	4	0	2	3	21	12	0	0	0	42	
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	27	49	47	0	0	0	123	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	25	60	56	0	0	0	141	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	1	3	4	6	7	0	0	0	22	

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	3	4	6	28	52	54	0	0	0	147

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	3	8	25	2	2	0	0	0	41
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	33	56	53	29	58	56	31		
ELA Learning Gains				47			38		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47			42		
Math Achievement*	37	62	59	34	54	50	38		
Math Learning Gains				47			34		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57			25		
Science Achievement*	26	48	54	25	59	59	27		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					60	52			
Graduation Rate					45	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	59	59	59	50			36		

* 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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	38
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	188
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	336
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	28	Yes	4	4
ELL	35	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	2	
HSP	41			
MUL	40	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	37	Yes	1	

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	25	Yes	3	3
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	47			

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%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	42			

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	33			37			26					59
SWD	19			21			11				5	67
ELL	28			33			23				5	59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32			33			23				5	74
HSP	35			45			35				5	53
MUL	40			40							2	
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	32			36			26				5	60

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	29	47	47	34	47	57	25					50
SWD	9	33		16	31	54	6					
ELL	35	50	45	43	50		33					50
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	24	44	41	29	44	59	20					50
HSP	39	54	60	44	51		35					49
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	67			67								
FRL	27	47	49	33	43	58	22					53

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	38	42	38	34	25	27					36
SWD	19	35		24	40		20					40
ELL	38	65	70	41	60		40					36
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	23	34	43	29	28	19	16					48
HSP	49	58		62	44		65					32
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	53			58								
FRL	31	39	38	40	34	24	26					36

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	35%	56%	-21%	54%	-19%
04	2023 - Spring	39%	61%	-22%	58%	-19%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	31%	53%	-22%	50%	-19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	42%	62%	-20%	59%	-17%
04	2023 - Spring	39%	65%	-26%	61%	-22%
05	2023 - Spring	40%	58%	-18%	55%	-15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	26%	46%	-20%	51%	-25%

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.

Our data showed SWD ELA achievement at 9% and African American at 24%. Each subgroup performed below the federal index. Contributing factors for SWD are students being tested on standards in ur special programs that weren't fully processed to be on access points at the time of testing, as well as the focus of IEP goals in isolation during time with ESE facilitator, which is time they miss from general instruction. The lowest proficiency by subject for last year was Science data coming in at 26% proficiency for students in grade 5. In analyzing the science data we noticed that the nature of science was still our lowest-scoring element in science across all students tested. We believe that the late start in ELO opportunities as well as the late start in pull-out support contributed to this low performance.

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

We did not experience any declines in ELA, Math, nor Science proficiency this school year.

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.

There was an 18% gap in both ELA and Math achievement last year. It is thought that the foundational gaps that we experience with our demographic of students as they start grade levels contributed most to the overall gap. While there was significant progress from start to finish, we do realize that it took many

intervention and support groups to achieve such progress, whereas this may not be the case when considering state averages.

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

Our ELA and Math were equivalent in improvement. Both increased by 6 percentage points. Our supports for teacher pedagogy and instructional practices is what we feel contributed most to our increases this year. Teachers were supported and monitored with increased fidelity with regard to instructional practices.

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

The amount of students identified as being absent for 10% or more of the year, and students with one or more suspensions are concerns as both impact academia. This is a priority for decreasing these numbers through proactivity and prevention methods.

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

Absenteeism 10% or more, one or more suspensions, Science achievement, ELA Achievement, and Math achievement.

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**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 SWDs were identified due to performing below 41% in achievement as well as our African American Population

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June 2024, at least 41% of SWD and African American students will be proficient in both ELA and Math as measured by the F.A.S.T. Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Data will be house on a spreadsheet for monitoring purposes across all assessments taken to monitor progress. We will triangulate Benchmark, F.A.S.T. and I-Ready data to make instructional decisions for all SWD and African American students via data chats. We will host collaborative sessions with teachers and the ESE Facilitator to ensure IEP goals are being met in connection with grade level goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Eyvonda Cooper-Moye (eyvonda.cooper-moye@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.)

Data analysis and progress monitoring have proven to be effective in meeting the needs of each scholar. It allows for data-based decision-making regarding instructional practices, ultimately impacting learning. This is evidenced and researched by Paul Bambrick Santoyo in the book Driven by Data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy is a leading pillar and has been effective for our general population. We believe intensifying this process regarding our SWD and African American students will only improve their performance and intervention.

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.

Initial data analysis of PM1 to identify and prioritize instructional strategies from Baseline data.

Person Responsible: Dorsett McLeod (dorsett.mcleod@browardschools.com)

By When: September 11, 2023

Interval analysis and decision-making based on I-Ready Diagnostic growth monitoring reports and AP1.

Person Responsible: Dorsett McLeod (dorsett.mcleod@browardschools.com)

By When: October 30, 2023

Continuous data analysis across subjects and monitoring of instructional practices and implementation in the classroom and pull out groups.

Person Responsible: Dorsett McLeod (dorsett.mcleod@browardschools.com)

By When: Continuous all year long.

ELO camps to reinforce strategies and best practice.

Person Responsible: Eyvonda Cooper-Moye (eyvonda.cooper-moye@browardschools.com)

By When: October 30, 2023

Professional Development for teachers paired with coaching support for teachers.

Person Responsible: Dorsett McLeod (dorsett.mcleod@browardschools.com)

By When: From Aug 2023 - May 2024.

#2. 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.

The early warnings were identified as we noticed a significantly higher number of students meeting the criteria for absenteeism 10%+ and one or more suspensions. We realize that this significantly impacts academia and needs improvement this school year.

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 students absent 10% or more of the year, and the number of students suspended one or more times will decrease by 50%.

Monitoring:

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

Our BTIP coordinator/IMT will monitor daily attendance and engage parents early on of students that are developing trends in absenteeism. She will gain information around any barriers and collaborate with our school counselor to provide any resources that will aid in the ease of getting scholars to school. Our support team will monitor our referral database and incentive logs to monitor student behaviors and referral rates to intervene prior to suspensions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Eyvonda Cooper-Moye (eyvonda.cooper-moye@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.)

Again, Our BTIP coordinator/IMT will monitor daily attendance and engage parents early on of students who are developing trends in absenteeism. Our support team will implement an incentive program tied directly to our school-wide expectations to deter suspendable behaviors. We will host quarterly SPBP assemblies as reminders for students as each quarter begins and create a competition to decrease referrals each quarter. Teachers will also utilize PBIS World as an intervention for students not meeting behavioral expectations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Relationship building has been identified as an effective strategy as well as effective communication. We noticed that the more our BTIP coordinator educated parents on absenteeism and its impacts, the more attendance increased. PBIS World as a resource has helped in the improvement of behaviors for our Tier 2 Rtl B scholars, thus it was decided to use this resource recommended by District personnel as a school-wide approach to intervene and deter behaviors. Goals setting in academia has proven to be an effective practice when communicated effectively and discussed regularly resulting in our choice to use this in behavior as well.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Search and rescue intervention and communication regarding absenteeism.

Person Responsible: Eyvonda Cooper-Moye (eyvonda.cooper-moye@browardschools.com)

By When: Throughout the year

Develop Cougar Bucks incentive plan aligned to the school wide expectations.

Person Responsible: Eyvonda Cooper-Moye (eyvonda.cooper-moye@browardschools.com)

By When: August 30, 2023

Share and discuss cases that are in danger of falling in any of the identified focuses and develop intervention plans.

Person Responsible: Dorsett McLeod (dorsett.mcleod@browardschools.com)

By When: Through out the school year.

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).

Funding and resource allocations are primarily discussed and reviewed via our SAC committee meetings based on the needs of the school at that time. In these meetings, we review balances, discuss needs, and vote on spending and resources to address identified needs. This committee has representation from all required SAC Board members and is always a voted choice for spending. If instructional materials are purchased the instructional leadership meets bi-weekly to monitor implementation and student progress as a result of the purchased materials being implemented. This assists in determining the value of the investment especially if considering for the following year.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

The area of focus for grades K-2 is isolated phonics instruction outside of the ELA block to reinforce the readiness skills needed to become fluent readers. Each grade level will use a combination of phonics instruction from the Benchmarks series and the SIPP's series as the leading resources. The areas of phonics and phonemic awareness are trending deficits for our students and based on research from the Science of Reading, will help our students become age-appropriate readers along the reading continuum. The data utilized for this area of focus came from the 22-23 F.A.S.T. data as well as Benchmark and the number of students in Tier 2 and 3 of the Rtl process.

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

The area of focus for grades 3-5 is differentiated small group instruction, center tasks, and independent practice. Research as well as practical application in the 22-23 year has proven that when done with fidelity, this practice has a significant impact on learning. We saw a 6% increase in proficiency in 22-23 when compared to 21-22. This means not only did this focus impact proficiency, but it also allowed non proficient students to grow significantly as well. We went from 71% of students scoring in the level 1 category to 46% in 3rd (-25), 47 - 41% in 4th (-6), and 61% to 41% in 5th Grade (-20). We believe that when teachers strategically plan to meet students where they are and accelerate their learning by differentiating instruction and tasks, students move closer to proficiency each year.

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, at least 50% of scholars in grades K-2 will score at or above grade level on the ELA portion of the F.A.S.T. PM 3.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By June 2024, at least 50% of scholars in grades 3-5 will score at or above grade level on the ELA portion of the F.A.S.T. PM 3.

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Our areas of focus will be monitored across three assessments; F.A.S.T. PM 1-3, I-Ready Diagnostic AP 1-2, and I-Ready Growth Monitoring. These assessments will be taken 5 weeks apart to continuously monitor the impact of instruction and application of knowledge. As we monitor the achievement on each assessment in search of trends in deficits as well as areas of strengths to build upon, this will allow

collaborative discussions of best practices during data chats to target areas of instructional practice and implementation that ultimately impact student achievement.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

McLeod, Dorsett, dorsett.mcleod@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?

K-5 will focus on the Science of Reading. The area of focus and practice for grades K-2 is isolated phonics instruction outside of the ELA block to reinforce the readiness skills needed to become fluent readers. Each grade level will use a combination of phonics instruction from the Benchmarks series and the SIPP’s series as the leading resources. The area of focus and practice for grades 3-5 is differentiated small group instruction, center tasks, and independent practice.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The Science of Reading is a research based theory and practice that has been adopted by our District as a literacy focus. This will identify proven practices to enhance early reading skills that is crucial to improving achievement of scholars. Phonics instruction outside of the Reading block allows additional time to reinforce foundational skills to build fluent readers. The more exposure and practice scholars have increases their chances of acquiring skills with fluency. Differentiated instruction was chosen because it has a proven record of impact on student learning as it meets scholars where they are and gradually accelerates the learning. This was a focus for us last year and produced results, so we look to enhance the fidelity of this practice for even greater results this year.

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
We will host a Science of Reading PD onsite to introduce teachers to the concept of building strong readers and as a guide for implementation.	Cooper-Moye, Eyvonda, eyvonda.cooper-moye@browardschools.com
We will host bi-weekly, onsite, Instructional Labs to assist teachers with the implementation of SIPPS, Benchmark, and I-Ready components.	McLeod, Dorsett, dorsett.mcleod@browardschools.com
We will hosts data chats after each assessment and conduct a triangulated data analysis across assessments to confirm and narrow our focuses for each student.	McLeod, Dorsett, dorsett.mcleod@browardschools.com
We will take each teacher through an instructional support coaching cycle that consists of collaborative discussion based on teaching practices, modeling expectations, feedback for improvement, and resource selection.	McLeod, Dorsett, dorsett.mcleod@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.

The budget and its sign-off are posted on our SAC link for view. It is also discussed/presented in detail at our SAC meetings including the Title I Budget. We provide Quarterly updates during SAC meetings regarding budget statuses. We also include this in quarterly newsletters and send it via Parent Link in multiple languages.

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))

The school hosts academic nights that invite the parents and community into the school to interact and learn from school-based staff. We have adopted Talk It Out Tuesdays where teachers reach out to at least 3 families on Tuesdays to communicate their child's progress and expected outcomes throughout the year, as well as what parents can do at home to help. Teachers also have at least 2 conferences to discuss goals and student progress with students. Communication is also written in students' agendas for home-to-school connections. Every interaction with stakeholders is intentional with regard to positive customer service, translation, and support. We also host a Title I Parent success training to educate parents on all things education.

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)

We have added I-Ready and Acaletics supplemental programs to strengthen academia in our school. The programs reinforce and assist in mitigating gaps in scholar knowledge and allow intervention to meet scholars where they are to graduate them to where they need to be. It also ensures students are working on quality tasks and ensures time on task while the teacher is working with differentiated groups, further solidifying the quality of instruction at all times. This also allows struggling scholars and SWDs to receive scaffolded instruction as an assist to close achievement gaps

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))

All components of the plan are aligned with state, federal, and local programs and resources. We pull specifically from these resources to mold and shape our actions as we make data and research-based decisions to intervene in academia. These programs and resources are referred to in all planning processes to ensure alignment.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Our support team collaborates and uses data such as attendance, referrals, and academic data to identify students for small-group counseling and 1 to 1 counseling. Groups are clustered based on this data to provide targeted services to students. We host Elite GEMS and 5,000 role models for young men and women mentoring. In these groups, students are equipped with life and social skills and engage in service products that service the whole child.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Not applicable. (elementary school)

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

We have a school-wide behavior plan that is rolled out each year that includes expectations and target areas based on referral data review to target the most common behaviors and locations of incidences. We have adopted a currency incentive system for positive reinforcement of student behaviors as a preventative method. We also randomly reward students with prizes for adhering to expectations in and outside of classrooms. We have a buddy program for at-risk and role model youth to pair with our special program students that teaches leadership, responsibility, and humanity.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

As we take teachers through support cycles of instruction, we offer modeling, we do recordings of instructional best practices for teachers to have at their fingertips, and we refer them to district-led PDs due to observational findings and collaborative discussions. We host bi-weekly instructional labs for staff regarding instructional expectations and all things education. We conduct individual data chats using an extensive protocol that guides teachers' learning of their students' abilities and collaborate on action plans to mitigate gaps. We have a T.I.E.R. mentoring program for developing teachers and take all teachers through growth plan processes over the course of the year.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

We implement vertical collaborative planning to ensure students are kinder ready prior to exiting our Pre-K and Head Start Program. Our early program curriculum progresses to skills likened to kindergarten that also gets them ready for our gen-ed programs.