Stirling Elementary School

2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Stirling Elementary School

5500 STIRLING RD, Hollywood, FL 33021

[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.

Stirling Elementary School's mission is to academically and socially prepare all students by promoting intensive
academic and behavioral programs in a changing, diverse society. We will strive to meet these challenges through data-driven intervention programs, improving academic areas in all subgroups, prioritizing school safety, and increasing our commitment to parental and community involvement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Stirling Elementary School's vision is that all students will exemplify positive character traits, outstanding behavior, and strive for academic excellence.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Arnaez, Jacqueline	Principal	Facilitate and assist the school's leadership team in designing, creating, implementing, and monitoring the school's annual academic and behavioral improvement plan. Furthermore, ensuring that all goals are realistic, attainable and measurable for all groups of students.
Coachman Williams, Alisia	Assistant Principal	Facilitate and assist the school's leadership team in designing, creating, implementing, and monitoring the school's annual academic and behavioral improvement plan. Furthermore, ensuring that all goals are realistic, attainable and measurable for all groups of students.
Argibay, Tanya	Instructional Coach	Facilitate and assist the school's leadership team in designing, creating, implementing, and monitoring the school's annual academic and behavioral improvement plan. Furthermore, ensuring that all goals are realistic, attainable and measurable for all groups of students.
O'Neill, Marienid	Instructional Coach	Facilitate and assist the school's leadership team in designing, creating, implementing, and monitoring the school's annual academic and behavioral improvement plan. Furthermore, ensuring that all goals are realistic, attainable and measurable for all groups of students.

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.

Developing the SIP involves all stakeholders such as the school leadership team, teachers, school staff, parents, and community partners. During our monthly SAC meetings, a portion of the SIP is reviewed and revised with feedback from all stakeholders as needed according to the SAC guidelines.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The school leadership team regularly monitors the SIP for effective implementation and impact to improve student achievement to ensure continuous improvement by collecting, disaggregating, and analyzing state and district progress monitoring data. During our monthly SAC meetings, achievement data and the SIP are reviewed and revised as necessary for continuous improvement.

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	76%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B

	2018-19: B
	2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	35	45	47	45	38	41	0	0	0	251
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	5	1	0	0	0	7
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	17	48	42	34	17	21	0	0	0	179
Course failure in Math	0	31	35	40	24	24	0	0	0	154
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	17	48	42	34	17	21	0	0	0	179
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	31	35	40	24	24	0	0	0	154
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	38	24	31	9	13	0	0	0	117

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	8	49	45	44	23	33	0	0	0	202

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	4	6	5	11	2	2	0	0	0	30
Students retained two or more times	4	6	5	11	2	2	0	0	0	30

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	34	46	30	39	38	34	0	0	0	221
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	5
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	29	14	12	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	32	20	20	0	0	0	72
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	19	16	9	6	6	0	0	0	59

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	17	12	20	27	23	0	0	0	103

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	10	5	14	2	1	0	0	0	36
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	3

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	34	46	30	39	38	34	0	0	0	221
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	5
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	29	14	12	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	32	20	20	0	0	0	72
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	19	16	9	6	6	0	0	0	59

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	17	12	20	27	23	0	0	0	103

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	4	10	5	14	2	1	0	0	0	36
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	3

(Grade Level spans columns K–8)

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*	45	56	53	48	58	56	44		
ELA Learning Gains				61			29		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				62			37		
Math Achievement*	42	62	59	48	54	50	30		
Math Learning Gains				72			20		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				73			20		
Science Achievement*	42	48	54	35	59	59	23		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					60	52			
Graduation Rate					45	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	41	59	59	27			41		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	215
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	426
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	27	Yes	1	1
ELL	36	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	42			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	48			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	41			

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	43			
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	53			
HSP	48			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	49			
FRL	52			

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	45			42			42					41
SWD	20			22			39				5	43
ELL	36			32			42				5	41
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	46			35			39				4	
HSP	43			41			38				5	42
MUL												

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	47			53			43				4	
FRL	40			42			41				5	42

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	48	61	62	48	72	73	35					27
SWD	37	61	45	41	60		40					20
ELL	40	57	44	43	64	70	39					27
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	49	73		46	80		19					
HSP	45	55	45	47	67	61	39					28
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	42	52		44	70		38					
FRL	43	61	60	43	74	75	33					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	44	29	37	30	20	20	23					41
SWD	32	33		26	19	25	24					17
ELL	37	25		33	18		17					41
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37	15		24	10		9					
HSP	42	23	27	27	16	31	22					40
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	53	56		39	38		44					
FRL	41	27	38	29	19	14	27					37

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	44%	56%	-12%	54%	-10%
04	2023 - Spring	58%	61%	-3%	58%	0%
03	2023 - Spring	41%	53%	-12%	50%	-9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	38%	62%	-24%	59%	-21%
04	2023 - Spring	54%	65%	-11%	61%	-7%
05	2023 - Spring	38%	58%	-20%	55%	-17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	34%	46%	-12%	51%	-17%

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.

The data components that showed the lowest performance for the intermediate level were grade 3 at 43% at or above level 3 as measured by the third progress monitoring assessment period (PM 3) of the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) Cambium ELA.

The data components that showed the lowest performance for the primary level were grade 1 at 35% at or above the 40th percentile as measured by the third progress monitoring assessment period (PM 3) of the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) STAR Reading.

The contributing factors to last year's low student performance were the new testing platforms and patterns of non-attendance.

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

The data component comparison from the Spring 2022 to the Spring 2023 is unreliable due to different state assessments. In the Spring of 2022, primary students were assessed using the Primary Reading Test, and intermediate students were assessed on the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) ELA. However, during the Spring of 2023, the primary students were assessed on FAST STAR Reading, and the intermediate students were assessed on FAST Cambium.

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 data component with the greatest gap compared to the state average was first grade. The FAST STAR Reading PM 3 state average for first-grade data reflected a 57% proficiency, while 35% of Stirling Elementary School first-grade students were proficient. The contributing factors that may have led to this gap are as follows:
- An increase in ELL students with limited English proficiency who entered during the Spring semester
- Inconsistency of Tier I ELA instruction due to attendance concerns
- High student mobility
- Students lacking foundational skills requiring additional TIER II and TIER III instruction

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

The grade level with the highest proficiency on PM3 of the FAST ELA Cambium assessment was fourth grade (58%).
The new actions that contributed to this improvement are as follows:
- Small group tiered instruction incorporated into the daily ELA schedule to target specific skills to meet proficiency
- ELA Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO) Camps

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

Reflecting on the Early Warning Signs (EWS) data, a major area of concern is that 251 students were absent 10% or more days. Also, there are 202 students that have two or more early warning indicators.

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

For the 2023-2024 school year, Stirling Elementary School's highest priorities for school improvement across all grade levels are as follows:
- Increase proficiency in ELA
- Decrease absenteeism
- Student-oriented goal setting

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.

At Stirling Elementary School, our mission and vision are dedicated to student achievement and proficiency. We strive to foster relationships with all students, encouraging a sense of connectedness, establishing a safe, positive climate for learning, where students are motivated to attend school daily. Most importantly, this empowers every child with the social skills and motivation needed to enjoy academic and personal success.

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

By June of 2024, students identified as having chronic absenteeism, absent 10% or more days, will decrease from 42% to 30% as measured by the Early Warning Indicators.

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

• Review the non-attendance report from Opti-Spool every school week. Students will be identified, and teachers should be notified of which students might be at risk.
• Identify students with 5 unexcused absences within a 30-day period. Determine if there is an extenuating circumstance with the family for appropriate interventions if needed.
• Teachers will monitor attendance using the online attendance book and BASIS. Consult with support staff for help identifying the root causes of the student's absenteeism.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jacqueline Arnaez (jacqui.arnaez@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.)

Engage Students and Families
• Utilize "Attendance Success Plans" and "Attendance Contracts" for students with excessive absences (excused or unexcused). Help families set attainable goals and establish successful home routines.
• Contact the student's parents by phone, email, or virtual meeting when there is a concern about the student's attendance. Communication with parents should be positive and supportive.
• Refer the student to appropriate support as soon as possible when barriers are identified (homelessness, food scarcity, physical or mental health issues, illness of family member, etc.).

Recognize Good and Improved Attendance
• Recognize students who are improving their attendance. Short-term attainable goals can help establish successful routines for students struggling with additional external barriers.
• Routinely recognize good and improved attendance schoolwide. Social expectations regarding meaningful attendance become a part of the school culture and encourage students to attend regularly.

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

Using attendance as an Early Warning Indicator, Tier 2 interventions can help prevent a student from falling into chronic absenteeism or help stabilize 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 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.

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

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

Spring 2023 Primary ELA Data

Kindergarten- 59% of kindergarten students scored at or above the 40th percentile on PM 3 of the FAST STAR Early Literacy Assessment

First Grade- 35% of first-grade students scored at or above the 40th percentile on PM 3 of the FAST STAR Reading Assessment

Second Grade- 47% of second-grade students scored at or above the 40th percentile on PM 3 of the FAST STAR Reading Assessment

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

Spring 2023 Intermediate ELA Data

Third Grade- 43% of third-grade students scored at or above a Level 3 on PM 3 of the FAST Cambium ELA

Fourth Grade- 58% of fourth-grade students scored at or above a Level 3 on PM 3 of the FAST Cambium ELA

Fifth Grade- 48% of fifth-grade students scored at or above a Level 3 on PM 3 of the FAST Cambium ELA

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

Kindergarten-
By PM 3 of the FAST STAR Early Literacy Assessment, 55% of Kindergarten students will score at or above the 40th percentile

First & Second Grades-
By PM 3 of the FAST STAR Reading Assessment, 55% of first and second grade students will score at or above the 40th percentile

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Third through Fifth-
By PM 3 of the FAST ELA Cambium Assessment, 55% of third through fifth grade students will score at or above a Level 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.

Kindergarten through fifth grade progress monitoring data is as follows:
- FAST progress monitoring data is administered three times per year
- Benchmark Advance unit assessments are administered every three weeks
- iReady ELA Diagnostic Assessments two or three times per academic year
- iReady Growth Progress Monitoring Assessments administered in between diagnostic windows for TIER II & III students
- STAR Reading Assessment administered quarterly to students in grades 3-5

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

Arnaez, Jacqueline , jacqui.arnaez@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?

Benchmark Advance is the state-adopted evidence-based reading K-5 program with BEST Standards aligned for universal Tier I instruction.

For tiered instruction, the following evidence-based reading programs are being utilized:
- Benchmark Advance Interventions (state adopted)
- Reading Horizons Discovery or Reading Horizons Elevate- From the 2022-2023 BCPS Comprehensive Reading Plan, it "addresses all reading standards related to the lower strands of Scarborough's Reading Rope Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Word Reading and includes decodable text to help students increase their fluency and automaticity."
- SIPPS K-5 Moderate Evidence- From the 2022-2023 BCPS Comprehensive Reading Plan, "the program's systematic scope and sequence provides a structured literacy approach to instruction through explicit routines focused on phonological awareness, spelling sounds, and sight words."

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?

Benchmark Advance is the state-adopted evidenced-based reading K-5 program for universal Tier I instruction that is:
- BEST Standards aligned
- Provides print-rich, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction, and corrective feedback
- Incorporates writing in response to reading
- Includes accommodations (IEP, ELL, or 504 students)
- Incorporates the principles of Universal Design for Learning
- Includes specially designed instruction for students with disabilities (SWD)

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
Meet regularly to disaggregate data from screeners, progress monitoring, and diagnostic reading assessments to make informed decisions about maximizing student growth in reading.	Arnaez, Jacqueline , jacqui.arnaez@browardschools.com
Conduct regularly scheduled instructional classroom walk-throughs to ensure that effective instruction is provided to all students and evidence-based practices and programs are being implemented with fidelity.	Arnaez, Jacqueline , jacqui.arnaez@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 methods of dissemination of the SIP to stakeholders is as follows:
- Monthly SAC meetings
- Quarterly newsletter
- Title I events
- Open House
- Website: https://www.browardschools.com/stirling

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))

Stirling Elementary School prides itself in cultivating positive relationships with parents, families, and community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission. Building strong parent-school relationships is pivotal to our students' academic success. Stirling Elementary School delivers exceptional customer service starting at the main doors with our morning staff greeters, efficient and helpful office staff, friendly cafeteria crew, resourceful administrative staff, and dedicated teachers. We have created a family-like community within our school. At Stirling Elementary School, we convey our communication using various methods:
• Monthly Parent Link emails are sent home in both English and Spanish
• Quarterly PTA newsletters inform parents about the PTA events taking place at Stirling Elementary
• Parents can access more information and resources through our school website
• Student planners are provided to every student
• Teachers have online classroom applications that keep parents abreast of their child's learning which builds parent-teacher-student solid relationships. These online applications can translate information into various languages.
• Parents can contact teachers via email, class applications, or through CLEVER
• Website: https://www.browardschools.com/stirling

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))

Stirling Elementary plans to strengthen the academic program, increase the amount and the quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum in the following ways:
• Small group instruction incorporated into the daily ELA schedule to target specific skills
• ELA Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO) camps
• Students will take ownership of their learning by establishing and tracking measurable goals

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))

This plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and Local resources to strengthen academic programs. These funds provide for ELO camps, ESSR teachers, and instructional materials.