Deerfield Park Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Deerfield Park Elementary School

650 SW 3RD AVE, Deerfield Beach, FL 33441

[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.

Mission Statement

Deerfield Park Elementary is committed to providing each student with high quality instruction, in a safe learning environment so that they can reach their full academic and social potential. By infusing the Performing Arts, our students will be prepared to meet and exceed the demands of the 21st Century and become productive leaders in our society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision

Deerfield Park Elementary is dedicated to providing a caring and supportive environment for students to excel academically and in the Performing Arts Programs.

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
Darby, Thomas	Principal	To provide the leadership and management necessary to administer and supervise all programs, policies and activities of the school to ensure high quality educational experiences and services for the students in a safe and enriching environment. Responsibilities include (but are not limited to) 1. Exercise proactive leadership in promoting the vision and mission of the District's Strategic Plan. 2. Utilize collaborative leadership style and quality processes to establish and monitor the school mission and goals that are aligned with the District's mission and goals through active participation of stakeholders' involvement in the school improvement process with the School Advisory Council (SAC) and School Advisory Forum (SAF). 3. Achieve expected results on the school's student learning goals. 4. Direct energy, influence and resources toward data analysis for instructional improvement, development, and implementation of quality standards-based curricula. 5. Demonstrate that student learning is a top priority through leadership actions that build and support a learning organization focused on school success. 6. Work collaboratively to develop, implement and monitor an instructional framework that aligns curriculum with state standards, effective instructional practices, student learning needs and assessments. 7. Recruit, retain, develop and evaluate an effective and diverse faculty and staff. Maintain high visibility at school and in the community. 8. Cultivate, support, and develop others within the school, including providing recognition and celebration for student, staff, and school accomplishments. 9. Establish open lines of communication and processes to determine stakeholder needs, level of satisfaction, and respond to/resolve valid stakeholder concerns. 10. Demonstrate ethical and professional leadership at all times.
Fulton, Keandra	Assistant Principal	To assist the principal in providing vision and leadership to develop, administer and monitor educational programs that optimize the human and material resources, including time and space, available for a successful and safe school program for students, staff and community. The Assistant School Principal will effectively perform the performance responsibilities using the following knowledge, skills and responsibilities: Ability to: demonstrate the knowledge and practice of current educational trends,

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		research and technology; understand the unique needs, growth problems and characteristics of school students; read, interpret and implement the State Board Rules, Code of Ethics, School Board Policies and appropriate state and federal statutes; and coach, supervise and evaluate personnel in accordance with collective bargaining agreements. The Assistant School Principal will need to demonstrate effective communication and interaction skills with all stakeholders, have the ability to use group dynamics within the context of cultural diversity and be knowledgeable of Florida educational reform, accountability and effective school concepts.
Desire, Marchard	Reading Coach	The goal of the Literacy Coach is to improve and sustain student achievement by promoting a culture for literacy learning to include all stakeholders, by enhancing and refining literacy instruction and intervention, providing targeted instructional coaching and building capacity for literacy across the curriculum. The Coach, Literacy shall: 1. assist teachers in reflecting on and analyzing their practice and reviewing student work to inform instruction and enhance student achievement 2. support teachers in implementing explicit, systemic, and rigorous literacy instruction, through collaborative lesson planning, modeling, co-teaching, and conferencing. 3. build teacher capacity for developing and implementing formative assessments including non-evaluative, reflective conversations with teachers using evidence of classroom practice and student learning. 4. serve on the school's professional development team to ensure professional learning is aligned to standards, initiatives, and best practices and facilitate promote collegiality through collaborative work and reflective practices with teachers and administrators. 5. support teachers with the effective integration of digital applications, tools, strategies and classroom related technologies to support students in their literacy learning. 6. assist teachers in organizing and selecting supplemental resources for intervention and enrichment instruction. 7. valuable ILT member that interacts in a positive manner with ILT members in leadership 8. all other duties as assigned by the Principal or designee
Petrova, Datelina	Math Coach	The Mathematics Coach will provide personalized support that is based on identified needs of individual teachers and differentiated supports that foster the growth and development of teachers. In addition to strategic content focused mentoring, coaches will support teachers to develop skills in critical areas such as establishing a positive classroom culture and climate, implementing instructional strategies, analyzing student work, differentiating instruction and supporting English Language learners and student with special needs. Also, coaches will work collaboratively, build skills, analyze data, examine needs related to professional practice and

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		engage in peer coaching with teachers. The Coach, Mathematics shall: 1. assist teachers in reflecting on and analyzing their practice and reviewing student work to inform instruction and enhance student achievement. 2. model innovative teaching methodologies and research-based, effective instructional practices through techniques such as co-teaching and demonstration lessons. 3. serve on the school's professional development team to ensure professional learning is aligned to standards, initiatives, and best practices. 4. participate in monthly content related professional learning. 5. participate successfully in ongoing professional learning to increase the individual's skills and proficiency related to the job responsibilities. 6. assist teachers in making connections between state standards and the currently adopted instructional framework and communicating to both parents and the community. 7. intricate team member on the ILT- positive interactions

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 stakeholders are involved during the School Advisory Council (SAC) monthly meetings. During the SAC and faculty meetings, stakeholders are presented the schools areas of focus along with the data from progress monitoring (FAST), and diagnostic assessments (i-Ready). Input is solicited from all stakeholders to provide feedback on the areas of focus and suggestions to help the school achieve the goals set. The feedback and suggestions from stakeholders throughout the year helps with the development of the SIP.

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))

All stakeholders will be made aware of the SIP Goals ant the monlth meeting to provide a better understanding of the instructional and non-instructional supports needed. Next, a monthly review/update will be provided to stakeholders to determine progress being made, and to acquire feedback from

stakeholders to assist with attainment of our SIP Goals. Then, weekly schoolbased leadership meetings will occur to review SIP goals and to analyze assessment data for all scholars. In addition, instructional plans and pullout/push-in groups will be monitored to determine the effectiveness of instruction. Based on data the SIP will be revised as necessary, which will include curriculum adjustments or pacing, and refining instructional strategies to provide the best outcomes for our scholars.

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	98%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: 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	29	37	41	45	23	23	0	0	0	198
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	1	4	10	0	0	0	17
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	28	30	39	40	38	0	0	0	186
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	17	24	33	29	35	0	0	0	138
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	20	21	34	24	39	0	0	0	138

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	7	26	31	42	37	44	0	0	0	187

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	3	5	14	21	4	6	0	0	0	53
Students retained two or more times	1	2	6	1	1	1	0	0	0	12

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	50	37	40	30	42	28	0	0	0	227
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	1	8	4	0	0	0	14
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	35	50	35	0	0	0	120
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	23	24	40	0	0	0	87
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	18	21	18	24	17	0	0	0	101

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	4	10	17	28	45	36	0	0	0	140

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	2	9	6	3	3	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	50	37	40	30	42	28	0	0	0	227
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	1	8	4	0	0	0	14
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	35	50	35	0	0	0	120
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	23	24	40	0	0	0	87
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	18	21	18	24	17	0	0	0	101

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	4	10	17	28	45	36	0	0	0	140

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	2	9	6	3	3	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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*	31	56	53	31	58	56	27		
ELA Learning Gains				45			40		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				29			25		
Math Achievement*	44	62	59	54	54	50	44		
Math Learning Gains				68			59		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54			38		
Science Achievement*	21	48	54	25	59	59	48		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					60	52			
Graduation Rate					45	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	21	59	59	30			55		

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	31
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	155
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
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	13	Yes	4	2
ELL	25	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	29	Yes	2	1
HSP	77			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	27	Yes	1	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	31	Yes	3	1
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	64			

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				
FRL	44			

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	31			44			21					21
SWD	9			16							3	
ELL	25			44			9				4	21
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27			39			17				4	
HSP	80			73							2	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	28			41			19				5	10

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	31	45	29	54	68	54	25					30
SWD	23	44		23	57		7					
ELL	30	41		50	68							30
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	27	41	30	50	62	50	21					
HSP	60			67								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	30	45	32	55	68	52	25					

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	27	40	25	44	59	38	48					55
SWD	35			33								
ELL	28	45		42	73		64					55
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	23	36	31	41	55	36	41					54
HSP	53			53								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	26	43	29	39	58	36	43					61

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	27%	56%	-29%	54%	-27%
04	2023 - Spring	31%	61%	-30%	58%	-27%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	37%	53%	-16%	50%	-13%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	44%	62%	-18%	59%	-15%
04	2023 - Spring	48%	65%	-17%	61%	-13%
05	2023 - Spring	40%	58%	-18%	55%	-15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	20%	46%	-26%	51%	-31%

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.

Based on FAST PM3 data, Deerfield Park only had 32% of students that were proficient in the area of ELA on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking. The trends that emerge across grade levels and subgroups in core content areas display a need to build literacy in the primary grades. One of the primary contributing factors is the inexperience and lack of knowledge of the science of reading by the teachers.

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

The greatest decline from prior year was in the area of Math. The proficiency shown in math was a decrease from 2022-2023 of 9% from 54% to 45% of students reaching proficiency. Some factors that contributed to this decline was the change to curriculum and adjusting to the transition of new state assessment.

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 area that had the greatest gap compared to the state average was ELA. Deerfield Park scored a 31% compared to the state wit 52% proficiency in the area of ELA. The factors contributing to

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

The area the showed improvement was ELA. The percentage of student proficient students increased for 28% to 31% ELA was the only area that did not decline compared to both math and science. Teachers received many professional development opportunities to build instructional practice in the area of reading. Teachers were also able to receive training on district approved intervention programs to help close the gap in the area of literacy.

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

The largest area of concern remains to be the number of student absent 10% or more with in a school year. Also, the number of students scoring level 1 on state assessments continues to be a concern. 35% of students are scoring a level 1 on state assessments in English Language Arts. As both areas of concerns, it demonstrates that we need to strengthen or MTSS system and providing interventions in small group setting to our struggling readers.

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

Our highest priorities for school improvement in the upcoming school year is developing an Attendance Plan and MTSS/ Problem solving. Creating procedures for ongoing monitoring to ensure there is evidence of implementation and impact.

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.

Based on our 2022-23 Early Warning System data, 40% of students in grades K-5 were absent 10% or more days within the school year. It is essential that procedures are implemented so students are in attendance to learn.

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

By June 2024, students who are severely chronically absent will reduce by 50% from 40% to 20%.

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

The guidance counselor will pull student attendance daily. She will contact parents after two unexcused absences. All students with 5 or more unexcused absences will be referred to the collaborative problem-solving team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Thomas Darby (thomas.darby@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.)

Collaborative problem solving and consistent parent contact provide evidence-based approaches to tackling chronic absenteeism. Schools that use these methods foster a more inclusive and proactive environment, ensuring that students have the best chance of regular attendance and academic success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Monitoring data, engaging students and families, and recognizing/celebrating improved attendance are all important evidenced based strategies to improve attendance.

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.

Phone call home after 2 unexcused absence - Guidance Counselor
Referral for Child study - Guidance Counselor
Parent Contract - Guidance Counselor
Student Attendance Contract - Guidance Counselor

Person Responsible: Thomas Darby (thomas.darby@browardschools.com)

By When: Bi-weekly

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

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.

Black/ African-American students have historically performed below district and state trend data. In 2020 and 2021, Black/ African-American students had a proficiency of 38% and 40% respectively in ELA. Black/ African-American students proficiency has only made minimal growth.

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

By June 2024, 60% of Black/ African-American students will achieve a learning gain on the FAST assessment.

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

The school will use various progress monitoring assessments including I-Ready and FAST PM! and PM2 data to monitor for desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marchard Desire (marchard.desire@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 school will use SIPPS intervention program for tier 2 and tier 3 students. In addition, all teachers will take professional development in the science of reading.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

SIPPS and the science of reading is evidence-based teaching approach.

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.

All teachers receive training in science of reading and SIPPS

Person Responsible: Marchard Desire (marchard.desire@browardschools.com)

By When: June 2024

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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

Students with disabilities have historically performed below the school's trend data. In 2020 and 2021, students with disabilities had a proficiency of 34% an 31% respectively in ELA. SWD proficiency has remained stagnant or declined.

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

By June 2024, 50% of students with disabilities in 3-5 grade will achieve a learning gain on the FAST assessment.

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

The school will use various progress monitoring assessments including I-Ready and FAST PM! and PM2 data to monitor for desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Thomas Darby (thomas.darby@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 school will use SIPPS intervention program for tier 2 and tier 3 students. In addition, all teachers will take professional development in the science of reading.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

SIPPS and the science of reading is evidence-based teaching approach.

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.

All teachers receive training in science of reading and SIPPS

Person Responsible: Marchard Desire (marchard.desire@browardschools.com)

By When: June 2024

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

School improvement funding allocations are reviewed by the school leadership team and during monthly SAC meetings for remaining stakeholders. During the school leadership and monthly SAC meetings, we analyze/ review student assessment data to determine the resources needed to meet the areas of focus. Funding is also use to support instruction through Extended Learning Opprotunity camps to prove academic support to struggling readers. Stakeholders have the opportunity to make recommendations on resources that with will be reviewed by school-based leadership for final approval. Furthermore, we ensure intervention and enrichment resources are included to meet the needs of all learners. Overall, the funds will be allocated to instructional materials, professional development, student incentives, and technology resources.

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

According to STAR PM3 data for the 2022-23 school year, 63% of Kindergarteners, 43% first graders, and 44% of second graders scored at or above grade level. Based on this data, we identified the foundational skills of phonemic awareness and phonics in ELA as the critical area of focus.

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

According to FAST PM3 data for the 2022-23 school year, only 32% of 3-5 graders scored a level 3 or above. Based on this data, Reading Across Genres/Vocabulary is the critical area of focus.

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 May 2024 at least 70% of K-2 students will score at the proficient level on the STAR PM3 assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By May 2024 at least 50% of 3-5 students will score at a level 3 or higher on the ELA FAST PM3 assessment.

Monitoring

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

Student progress in grades in K-5 will be monitored by the STAR and FAST PM1/PM2 and ongoing reading series unit assessments administered every three weeks.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Darby, Thomas, thomas.darby@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?

Deerfield Park Elementary will utilize the Broward County Schools adopted comprehensive reading series. This program is on the state adoption list and align with both the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan and the BEST ELA Standards.

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 district adopted curriculum series provides an explicit, differentiated, targeted, and systematic instructional framework for reading.

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
Literacy leadership - Leadership team will work cohesively with teachers, district staff, community/families to promote a culture of literacy that embedded across grade levels. Resources to include Florida's Just Read programs and Literacy Week activities. Information will be shared through various communication channels including during school events such as SAC and Literacy Night with parents. School-wide reading and motivation initiative will reward student growth and achievement in reading throughout the year.	Darby, Thomas, thomas.darby@browardschools.com
The reading coach will provide professional development for primary teachers on a bi-weekly basis for to improve instructional strategies in foundational skills and comprehension as determined by grade level progress monitoring data. In addition, the reading coach will also provide professional development for intermediate on a bi-weekly basis for to improve instructional strategies for targeted BEST standards during direct and small group instruction as determined by grade level progress monitoring data, including FAST PM1/PM2 and reading series unit assessments.	Desire, Marchard, marchard.desire@browardschools.com
Assessment - Literacy Coach and Instructional staff will analyze data from FAST PM1 and PM2 to target student instructional needs, including scaffolding and enrichment activities and provide feedback through data chats.	Desire, Marchard, marchard.desire@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 school actively utilizes a multi-faceted approach to disseminate the School Improvement Plan (SIP) to all stakeholders, ensuring transparency, inclusivity, and comprehensive understanding. We maintain a dedicated section on the school's website at https://www.browardschools.com/Page/141, allowing all stakeholders, from students and families to local businesses, continuous access to this vital information. Additionally, to foster open communication and timely updates, we host monthly School Advisory Council meetings where the entire school community is invited. Recognizing the linguistic diversity of our community, we are committed to ensuring that every stakeholder fully understands the SIP. To this end, translated versions of the SIP are readily available in the most prevalent languages within our community. Hard copies, inclusive of these translations, are also kept at the school office.

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))

NA

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)

Deerfield Park Elementary is strengthening its academic program and increasing the quality of learning in various ways. For Tier 1 instruction, an integrated curriculum that fosters deep conceptual understanding and real-world application is in use. Recognizing the diverse needs of our student population, including Black students and students with disabilities, we are utilizing SIPPS a researched based intervention program for our tier 2 and tier 3 students as well as other supplemental resources such as I-Ready. To amplify the quality and amount of learning time, we have an extended thirty minute school day initiative, embedding both academic and extracurricular blocks into this expanded schedule. This not only provides students more time for core subjects but also integrates arts, physical education, and holistic growth. Central to our improvement strategy is building a positive school culture. We are introducing restorative justice practices to replace traditional punitive measures, facilitating a more empathetic and supportive environment. Peer mentorship programs, such as safety patrol and 5000 Role Model where students guide and support one another, further our efforts in fostering a sense of community, mutual respect, and academic excellence.

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))

NA