# Lloyd Estates Elementary School

**2023-24**

**Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)**

# Table of Contents

# Lloyd Estates Elementary School

## 750 NW 41ST ST, Oakland Park, FL 33309

## [ 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:<br><br>1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;<br>2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;<br>3. Have a school grade of D or F; or<br>4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years. |

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections | Title I Schoolwide Program | Charter Schools |
|---|---|---|
| I-A: School Mission/Vision | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1) |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3) | |
| I-E: Early Warning System | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-A-C: Data Review | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(3) | |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection | ESSA 1114(b)(6) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4) |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii) | |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g) | |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

**Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

# I. School Information

## School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

Our mission is to develop young citizens who understand the world around them, value the perspectives of others, communicate and collaborate with a culturally diverse population and understand the impact they can make on local and global communities.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Our vision is to empower students to gain skills and knowledge that will support them as lifelong learners to participate in and contribute to the global society.

## 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 |
|------|----------------|----------------------------------|
| Allen, Shawn | Principal | The principal attends to students' academic and social emotional well being; builds relationships with staff, students, parents, and the community; makes sound management decisions; evaluates staff; oversees the schools budget and ensures that district and school's policies and procedures are adhered to; tracks student and teacher's data and develops a plan and inservice (training) with stakeholders to ensure that the learning cycle is followed and all stakeholders receive proper training where needed. |
| Guirand, Marilyn | Assistant Principal | The Assistant Principal assists the Principal provides instructional leadership to staff including curriculum planning, review and implementation; and professional development. Assists in the day-to-day building administration and the safety and welfare of students, staff, volunteers, and activities Supports the Principal in setting the overall direction, coordination, and evaluation of the staff within the school. Carries out supervisory responsibilities in accordance with the districts' policies and applicable laws. |
| Reidy, Carolyn | Other | To provide on-site procedural and curricular assistance to all school-based personnel with regard to the education of students with disabilities. |
| Sutton, Randy | Science Coach | The Science Coach (K-5) is responsible for supporting the school science program and initiatives. The coach is responsible for coaching, supporting, and guiding teachers in best practices for science instruction. |
|  | School Counselor | School counselors promote and enhance achievement with an annual comprehensive school counseling plan that ensures every student receives school counseling services. They also provide resources for staff, students, families and others to ensure that a family-friendly environment is established and ensure that students have access to a safe school climate necessary for academic and social/emotional growth. |
| Gomez , Lillian | Reading Coach | The Literacy Coach supports all K-5 staff in the implementation of the district's reading plan and program. The Coach works directly with teachers in grades K-2 providing classroom-based demonstrations, collaborative and one-on-one support, and facilitating teacher inquiry and related professional development. The Coach focuses on enhancing teachers' ability to provide instruction that builds students' sense of engagement in the ownership of learning. |
| Hanson, Sonakaye | Instructional Coach | The Literacy Coach supports all K-6 staff in the implementation of the district's reading plan and program. The Coach works directly with teachers in grades 3-5 |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| | | providing classroom-based demonstrations, collaborative and one-on-one support, and facilitating teacher inquiry and related professional development. The Coach focuses on enhancing teachers' ability to provide instruction that builds students' sense of engagement in the ownership of learning. |

**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 SIP was developed with the input of all required stakeholders. Various representatives met to review data in order to complete the SIP. Based on data, we agreed on the areas for improvement and the action plans that we need to develop to close our students' achievement gaps.

**SIP Monitoring**

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

The SIP will be reviewed monthly with various stakeholders to check the effectiveness of all programs and interventions being implemented. Interventions will be revised based on data to ensure 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** | 95% |
| **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) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) |

| (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Hispanic Students (HSP)<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
|---|---|
| **School Grades History**<br>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: C<br><br>2019-20: C<br><br>2018-19: C<br><br>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 | 32 | 29 | 19 | 30 | 17 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 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 | 12 | 29 | 23 | 37 | 35 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 161 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 15 | 16 | 27 | 26 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 114 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 8 | 36 | 24 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 |

**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 | 18 | 21 | 36 | 31 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 142 |

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **K** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 2 | 2 | 21 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

**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 | 27 | 19 | 24 | 19 | 20 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 118 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 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 | 47 | 35 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 35 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 99 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 3 | 2 | 14 | 12 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |

**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 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 28 | 37 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 1 | 1 | 4 | 20 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 27 | 19 | 24 | 19 | 20 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 118 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 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 | 47 | 35 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 35 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 99 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 3 | 2 | 14 | 12 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |

**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 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 28 | 37 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Retained Students: Current Year | 1 | 1 | 4 | 20 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

## II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | 33 | 56 | 53 | 31 | 58 | 56 | 33 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 56 | | | 53 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 46 | | | 53 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 46 | 62 | 59 | 39 | 54 | 50 | 27 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 61 | | | 10 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 59 | | | 10 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 39 | 48 | 54 | 30 | 59 | 59 | 23 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 71 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 60 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 45 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 58 | 59 | 59 | 56 | | | 42 | | |

*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 | 41 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 205 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 47 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 378 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| 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 | 18 | Yes | 2 | 2 |
| ELL | 34 | Yes | 1 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 38 | Yes | 1 | |
| HSP | 40 | Yes | 1 | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | | | | |

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| FRL | 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 | 24 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| ELL | 44 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 49 | | | |
| HSP | 44 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | | | | |
| FRL | 47 | | | |

## 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 | | | 46 | | | 39 | | | | | 58 |
| SWD | 8 | | | 21 | | | 0 | | | | 5 | 55 |
| ELL | 28 | | | 37 | | | 29 | | | | 5 | 58 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 31 | | | 44 | | | 40 | | | | 5 | 48 |
| HSP | 33 | | | 43 | | | 34 | | | | 5 | 62 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 32 | | | 47 | | | 43 | | | | 5 | 53 |

| 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 | 56 | 46 | 39 | 61 | 59 | 30 | | | | | 56 |
| SWD | 3 | 29 | 20 | 19 | 43 | | 0 | | | | | 52 |
| ELL | 27 | 52 | 46 | 35 | 55 | 54 | 23 | | | | | 56 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 29 | 60 | 62 | 38 | 61 | 73 | 17 | | | | | 53 |
| HSP | 30 | 53 | 33 | 35 | 59 | 50 | 35 | | | | | 58 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 27 | 58 | 52 | 37 | 57 | 56 | 30 | | | | | 55 |

| 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 | 33 | 53 | 53 | 27 | 10 | 10 | 23 | | | | | 42 |
| SWD | 3 | 33 | | 6 | 8 | | 8 | | | | | 33 |
| ELL | 34 | 59 | 53 | 25 | 12 | 13 | 24 | | | | | 42 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 29 | 40 | | 30 | 10 | | 19 | | | | | 43 |
| HSP | 33 | 59 | 60 | 20 | 9 | 8 | 24 | | | | | 41 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 32 | 52 | 50 | 26 | 10 | 13 | 24 | | | | | 46 |

**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 | 36% | 56% | -20% | 54% | -18% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 32% | 61% | -29% | 58% | -26% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 25% | 53% | -28% | 50% | -25% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 53% | 62% | -9% | 59% | -6% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 45% | 65% | -20% | 61% | -16% |
| 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 component that showed the lowest performance was ELA. Based on the 2023 data, 31% of our students scored a level 3 or higher. The proficiency in ELA was also 31% in the year 2022. The contributing factors to last year's low performance were having a new curriculum, having newly adopted state standards, and having new teachers that were not familiar with academic content.

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

We did not show any decline in any academic areas. The percentage of students showing proficiency in ELA was 31% in the year 2022 and also in the year 2023. However, in 3rd grade 14 students showed substantial reading deficiency prior to the year 2022 and in the year 2022- 2023, the number of students increased to 36 students. The factor that contributed to the increase of students having substantial reading deficiencies is the lack of foundational instruction during the prior school years due to online/ hybrid learning models.

**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 that had the greatest gap is in the area of science. This information was based on our science SSA data that showed only 34% of our 5th grade students scoring proficiency on the science 2023 SSA. Science was not being taught with fidelity in the prior grade levels. The area of "Nature of Science" is the area that our students tend to struggle in yearly.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was in the area of mathematics. Based on the PM1 data, 7% of our students in grades 3-5 showed proficiency in math and that number increased to 46% in PM3. The new actions that were taken to improve the math data are listed below:
*Teachers engaged and delivered more differentiated instruction inside the classroom.
* Teachers modeled lessons and were closely monitoring students' understanding
before giving them independent practice.
*Teachers were able to reteach/remediate during small
group instruction targeting students' areas of need.
*Timed fluency drills were done bi-weekly.

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

One area of concern from the EWS data analysis is the number of students showing substantial reading deficiencies in third grade. This number has increased from 14 students in the year prior to 2022 to 36 students in the year 2022/2023.

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

Highest priorities for school improvement for the upcoming year are : 1) Reading proficiency in ESSA subgroup for our students with disabilities (SWD), 2) Improving student attendance, 3) Reducing the percentage of level 1 students in ELA, 4) and increasing the number of proficient students in the area of science.

**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 Other

**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 data, the area of focus that we've identified is student attendance. This area of focus was identified since the average of students that attended school more than 90% of school days was lower than the district's average.

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

During the 22-23 school year, 74.1% of our students attended more than 90% of school days. The average for elementary schools was 77%. Our goal by the end of the 23-24 school year is to maintain or exceed 74.1% (from 22-23).

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

The area of focus will be monitored by:
· Reviewing schoolwide attendance data with the Collaborative Problem-Solving Team and/or Response-to- Intervention Team.
· Monitoring and reviewing attendance data from BASIS. Metrics include excused and unexcused absences, attendance categories, and percent of days absent for each student.
· Monitoring attendance input from teachers and attendance clerks to ensure that all students have an attendance code for each school day.
. Providing Personalized Outreach

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Marilyn Guirand (marilyn.guirand@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.)

Absenteeism is a cross-cutting issue and cannot be solved by any one person, department or agency. We will create cross- departmental systems and infrastructure support for attendance and stakeholders (students, families, educators, agencies, and community partners) responsible for helping to reduce chronic absence. As a school, we will also start an attendance recognition program that will allow students to receive recognition for coming to school regularly.

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

These strategies will help improve our student attendance and the approaches used to improve student attendance will be data-driven. The attendance plan will also be followed with fidelity.

**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.

Promote regular attendance during morning announcements, lunch periods, afternoon announcements, a common bulletin board, and/or student assemblies.

**Person Responsible:** Marilyn Guirand (marilyn.guirand@browardschools.com)

**By When:** By the end of September 2023

Ensure that parent phone numbers and email addresses remain current. Outreach to parents when contact information needs to be updated.

**Person Responsible:** Marilyn Guirand (marilyn.guirand@browardschools.com)

**By When:** By the end of September 2023

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

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

Lloyd Estate Elementary's PM3 score in the area of English Language Arts (ELA) for our SWD population has shown an increase from 3% in the year 2022 to 11% in the year 2023. This subgroup has been the lowest performing subgroup for a number of years.

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

By June 2024, our SWD ELA proficiency will increase from 11% to 15% as measured by the FAST state assessment.

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

Progress monitoring will take place through the collection of data from Benchmark Advance Unit assessments, classwork, teacher observations, and data chats, along with differentiated instruction and lesson planning to support Structured Literacy with fidelity.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Shawn Allen (shawn.allen@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.)

Instructional Staff will continue to participate in professional development regarding the Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles. Instructional staff will also implement strategies using Ellevation, Heggerty, Reading Horizons, and LLI, in addition to designing differentiated centers for students to practice skills independently.

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

The evidence-based strategies were selected for this area since they will enable our teachers to provide the individualized instruction that is needed to close the achievement gaps in the area of ELA. Using the UDL principles will allow our SWD students to assess their own learning needs, monitor their own progress, and regulate and sustain their interest, effort, and persistence during a learning task.

**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.

The UDL guidelines will be distributed to all teachers. Implementation of the guidelines will be monitored.

**Person Responsible:** Carolyn Reidy (carolyn.reidy@browardschools.com)

**By When:** By the beginning of September 2023.

ELA data for our SWD students will be monitored frequently and instructional plans will be revised based on data.

**Person Responsible:** Carolyn Reidy (carolyn.reidy@browardschools.com)

**By When:** After each scheduled assessment.

**#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.

Lloyd Estate Elementary's PM3 score in the area of English Language Arts (ELA) for our SWD population has shown an increase from 3% in the year 2022 to 11% in the year 2023. This subgroup has been the lowest performing subgroup for a number of years.

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

By June 2024, our SWD ELA proficiency will increase from 11% to 15% as measured by the FAST state assessment.

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

Progress monitoring will take place bi-weekly through the collection of data from Benchmark Advance Unit assessments, classwork, teacher observations, and data chats, along with differentiated instruction and lesson planning to support Structured Literacy with fidelity.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Shawn Allen (shawn.allen@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.)

Instructional Staff will continue to participate in professional development regarding the Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles. Instructional staff will also implement strategies using Ellevation, Heggerty, Reading Horizons, and LLI, in addition to designing differentiated centers for students to practice skills independently.

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

This evidence-based strategies were selected for this area since they will enable our teachers to provide the individualized instruction that is needed to close the achievement gaps in the area of ELA. Using the UDL principles will allow our SWD students to assess their own learning needs, monitor their own progress, and regulate and sustain their interest, effort, and persistence during a learning task.

**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.

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

## 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 were shared with the stakeholders at a budget meeting in May 2023. Allocations are also placed on the SAC agenda each month.

## 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

* Teachers use Heggerty as a supplemental resource for Phonemic Awareness daily for 5 minutes..
* Benchmark Advance intervention resources will be used to provide remediation to Tier 1 instruction as needed during small group instruction.
* Differentiated Literacy Centers will be used to provide practice on Word Work for phonics, vocabulary, sight words, and writing. Students will rotate daily during small group intruction (two rotations of 15-20 minutes each).
* Evidence based programs Reading Horizons and LLI will be implemented to address interventions for Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction (during intervention block - 30 minutes per day).
* Writing will be taught through the Benchmark Advance curriculum. Interventions will be provided as needed.
* Teachers will use prior data to formed flexible groups. FAST results, classroom anecdotes, observations, other informal assessments and Benchmark Advance Unit tests will be used for progress monitoring and guide classroom instruction.
* ELlevation lessons to address needs of our ELL population.
* The break down of the sample 90 minutes ELA block will be utilized to make certain that small group instruction is taking place in classrooms.

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

Benchmark Advance intervention resources will be used to provide remediation to Tier 1 instruction as needed during small group instruction.

\* Differentiated Literacy Centers will be used to provide practice on Word Work for phonics, vocabulary, sight words, and writing. Students will rotate daily during small group intruction (two rotations of 15-20 minutes each).
\* Evidence based programs Reading Horizons and LLI will be implemented to address interventions for Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction (during intervention block - 30 minutes per day).
\* Reading comprehension strategies are delivered using the Text for Close Reading from Benchmark Advance.
\* Writing will be taught through the Benchmark Advance curriculum. Interventions will be provided as needed.
\* Teachers will use prior data to formed flexible groups. FAST results, classroom anecdotes, observations, other informal assessments and Benchamrk Advance Unit tests will be used for progress monitoring and guide classroom instruction.
\* Ellevation lessons to address needs of our ELL population.
\* The break down of the sample 90 minutes ELA block will be utilized to make certain that small group instruction is taking place in classrooms.

## 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

Instructional staff will use Structured Literacy researched based strategies and interventions into their classroom instruction for ELA. By June 2024 our Kindergarten students will increase their STAR data from 53% proficiency in the 2023 PM3 to 55% proficiency in the 2024 PM3, 1st grade students from 39% to 44%, and 2nd grade students from 46% to 50%.

### Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Instructional staff will use Structured Literacy researched based strategies and interventions into their classroom instruction for ELA. By June 2024 our ELA proficiency will increase from 31% to 41% as measured by FAST English Language Arts state 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.

FAST PM1 and PM2 data, Benchmark Unit Assessments, and IReady Growth Monitoring data will be utilized to progress monitor students throughout the year. Benchmark
Advance Unit assessments and other formative assessments as well as Scholastic programs will be analyzed Bi-weekly to determine students' progress. (Scholastic
FIRST, Literacy Pro, and Short Reads Digital). Data Chats with Leadership Team will be conducted

monthly to discuss
data and collaborate on the guidance of classroom instruction and interventions.

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

Allen, Shawn, shawn.allen@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?

The following evidence-based programs are being implemented as instructed in the District Approved K-12
Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan:
Benchmark Advance Assessments K-5
Letter Names, Letter Sounds, and Concepts of Print
Reading Horizons (Discovery & Elevate)
Leveled Literacy Intervention

**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 shows a strong evidence in ESSA and was adopted by the District to target Tier 1 core instruction.
* Reading Horizons - IES Practice Guide Recommendations support the program: Assisting Students Struggling
with Reading: Response to Intervention (RtI) and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades -
Recommendation 3: Provide intensive, systematic instruction on up to three foundational reading skills in small groups to students who score below the benchmark score on universal screening
* LLI - Strong evidence according to ESSA. Duration 12 to 18 weeks in primary grades; 18-24 weeks in intermediate grades based on progress monitoring data.

**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 |
|---|---|
| Leadership Team meets weekly to discuss progress monitoring data and take necessary steps to adjust instruction to meet students' needs. | Guirand, Marilyn, marilyn.guirand@browardschools.com |
| Literacy Coach conducts classroom visits to determine teachers' needs and provide guidance for effective classroom environment and instruction. Model lesson planning and instruction delivery as needed and provide constructive feedback towards the implementation of evidence-based practices. | Gomez , Lillian, lillian.gomez@browardschools.com |
| Teachers will use informal and formal assessment to guide classroom instruction. FAST Assessments will be administered three times per year to track student progress. | Guirand, Marilyn, marilyn.guirand@browardschools.com |
| Provide professional development opportunities for teachers to learn how to use core curriculum and intervention programs. | Allen, Shawn, shawn.allen@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 method for dissemination of this SIP and SWP to stakeholders occurs during the School Advisory (SAC) meetings. All stakeholders are invited and given the opportunity to discuss the SIP and SWP. In order to ensure the information is understood by all stakeholders, we have translators in place to translate the information that is being presented in multiple languages. The SIP is made publicly available on the school's webpage https://www.browardschools.com/lloydestates

**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))

Lloyd Estates Elementary will make use of multiple modalities to communicate with all of our stakeholders.
In order to communicate with our parents we use the school's website, parent-links, flyers, Canvas, and personal phone calls. We conduct a recruitment at our School Advisory Council (SAC) meeting whereby parents are invited to become active members of SAC, School Advisory Forum (SAF), and active volunteers to our classroom. In our parent meetings, we share the School Improvement Plan (SIP) and they
are encouraged to provide feedback. We are also looking forward to setting up a Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) this school year. The customer survey results from all stakeholders are reviewed yearly
and changes are made to correct the areas of concern.

**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)**

In an effort to strengthen the academic programs in the school, increase the quality of learning, and provide and enriched and accelerated curriculum, the school will adhere to a school-wide instructional plan. This includes detailed academic focus calendars, professional learning communities, professional learning, progress monitoring, and instructional coaching aligned to the area of focus in English Language Arts.

**If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))**

N/A

**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))**

N/A

**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))**

N/A

**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).**

N/A

**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))**

N/A

**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))**

N/A