

Broward County Public Schools

Sheridan Park Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	18
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	18
VI. Title I Requirements	21
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Sheridan Park Elementary School

2310 N 70TH TER, Hollywood, FL 33024

[no web address on file]

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Broward County School Board on 10/17/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Sheridan Park Elementary is to facilitate the development of lifelong learning in our students by providing a foundation of academic and social skills for the 21st century.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing today's students to be tomorrow's leaders.

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
Carro, Jacqueline	Principal	Oversees daily activities and operations of the school.
Darley, Sara	Assistant Principal	Assists the principal in overseeing daily activities and operations of the school.
Aziz-Prescott, Juliana	Instructional Coach	Oversees Autism Special Program
Appo, Gina	Math Coach	Oversees school math program and provides support to teachers and students.
Browne, Crina	Reading Coach	Oversees school's literacy program, RtI, PLCs, and ESOL contact.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Our School Advisory Council (SAC) consists of members from our school leadership team, teachers and staff, parents, and business partners in our community. During our monthly SAC meetings, we solicit feedback from all stakeholders when we develop documents such as our Schoolwide Positive Behavior Plan, Title 1 family nights, and our Family and Community Involvement Plan. Then, we incorporate as much of their feedback as possible in our final documents and share the final version during a following SAC meeting.

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))

As our students complete Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) PM3 assessment, we make necessary adjustments to our SIP by reflecting on what was effective in increasing student achievement and what we can improve. To identify areas in need of improvement, we analyze student data based on subgroups that did not perform well. These subgroups include our students scoring in the lowest quartile, as well as our Students with Disabilities (SWD) and our students who are English Language Learners (ELLs). With that data, we create a plan to support these students by utilizing our instruction coaches and our reading/math support personnel to provide interventions to close the achievement gap.

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	75%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	98%
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) Asian Students (ASN) 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: B
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	26	30	23	19	25	21	0	0	0	144	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	3	3	2	0	0	0	9	
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	10	34	20	22	16	22	0	0	0	124	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	17	18	13	7	15	0	0	0	70	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	49	34	31	29	30	0	0	0	178	

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	4	37	28	25	22	24	0	0	0	140

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	3	5	4	3	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	4	3	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	11

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	45	37	23	25	21	27	0	0	0	178	
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	2	2	5	0	0	0	12	
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	22	17	32	0	0	0	71	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	15	22	0	0	0	54	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	19	21	28	14	11	0	0	0	96	

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	7	13	10	25	25	28	0	0	0	108

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	11	8	17	1	1	0	0	0	41
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	45	37	23	25	21	27	0	0	0	178
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	2	2	5	0	0	0	12
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	22	17	32	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	15	22	0	0	0	54
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	19	21	28	14	11	0	0	0	96

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	7	13	10	25	25	28	0	0	0	108

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	11	8	17	1	1	0	0	0	41
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*	55	56	53	49	58	56	47		
ELA Learning Gains				56			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			42		
Math Achievement*	68	62	59	64	54	50	42		
Math Learning Gains				81			35		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				60			32		
Science Achievement*	44	48	54	40	59	59	39		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					60	52			
Graduation Rate					45	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	75	59	59	66			70		

** 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	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	294
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	458
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	39	Yes	2	
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN	55			
BLK	47			
HSP	60			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	53			

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	38	Yes	1	
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN	64			
BLK	60			
HSP	54			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	53			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	55			68			44					75
SWD	40			38			19				5	60
ELL	48			64			37				5	75
AMI												
ASN	40			70							2	
BLK	46			54			38				4	
HSP	57			67			47				5	77
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	58			79			42				4	
FRL	49			64			33				5	74

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	49	56	42	64	81	60	40					66
SWD	31	46	25	47	58	25	28					43
ELL	49	50	31	60	77	42	27					66
AMI												
ASN	58	69		72	92		30					
BLK	37	65	73	53	75	83	36					
HSP	52	52	32	66	81	45	43					62
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	51	53		68	82		44					
FRL	44	51	39	62	78	60	36					50

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	47	48	42	42	35	32	39					70
SWD	30	39	23	27	18	15	26					
ELL	41	41	36	41	35	25	28					70
AMI												
ASN	47	55		39	27							
BLK	36	53		26	19		13					
HSP	49	43	27	47	35		37					67
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	51	54		46	48		50					73
FRL	39	42	43	38	25	29	29					69

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	64%	56%	8%	54%	10%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	61%	1%	58%	4%
03	2023 - Spring	46%	53%	-7%	50%	-4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	65%	62%	3%	59%	6%
04	2023 - Spring	74%	65%	9%	61%	13%
05	2023 - Spring	62%	58%	4%	55%	7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	41%	46%	-5%	51%	-10%

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.

In 21-22, our areas of lowest performance were our Students with Disabilities (SWD) in grades 3-5 (38%), and our 5th grade reading proficiency (38%). We believe that low performance, in part, was due to a learning curve in adapting to our new reading curriculum (Benchmark Advance). A main trend is that our students perform higher in math than in reading. In 22-23, however, we increased our reading performance in both areas. Our SWDs scored 42% proficient in reading on the FAST, and our 5th graders scored approximately 64% proficient.

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

A component that showed the greatest decline in 21-22 was our 5th grade reading proficiency. We believe that decline was due to a learning curve in adapting to our new reading curriculum (Benchmark Advance), as well as learning gap caused by the pandemic. In 22-23, however, our 5th graders scored approximately 64% proficient on the reading FAST.

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.

In 21-22, our areas that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average were our Students with Disabilities (SWD) in grades 3-5 (38%), and our 5th grade reading proficiency (38%). We believe that low performance, in part, was due to a learning curve in adapting to our new reading curriculum (Benchmark Advance). A main trend is that our school struggled overall with reading performance in 21-22. In 22-23, however, we increased our reading performance in both areas. Our SWDs scored 42% proficient in reading on the FAST, and our 5th graders scored approximately 64% proficient.

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

Our areas of most improvement in 22-23 were in reading. Our reading achievement went from 49% to 63%. Our 5th graders scored approximately 64% proficient, an increase of 25 percentage points from 21-22. This increase was a result of targeted support from our reading coach and reading support teacher for our students performing below grade level in reading, as well as our teachers feeling more comfortable using the Benchmark Advance curriculum.

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

One potential area of concern is our students with disabilities. In 22-23, our SWDs were 42% proficient in reading. Although there was an increase, it was only an increase of 4 percentage points. Due to this minimal increase, we would consider our reading achievement for SWDs an area of concern.

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

1. Reading achievement overall grades 3-5
2. 3rd grade reading proficiency
3. 4th and 5th grade writing
4. Students with Disabilities reading achievement
5. Learning gains for our low-quartile

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 Teacher Attendance**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.

Throughout the year, we have specific months in which we struggle with teacher attendance. Specifically, October, December, and February are the months that we historically have the highest number of teacher absences. When our teachers are out, our students miss out on crucial instruction to help them be successful.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June 2024, our average teacher attendance per month will be 80% or higher.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored using the reports on the Smartfind platform that teachers use to report their absences.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sara Darley (sara.darley@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.)

To increase teacher attendance, we will implement an incentive for teachers who have excellent attendance. Each month, we will do a raffle in which teachers with 0 absences for that month will be entered for a chance to win a prize.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We believe this incentive strategy will motivate teachers to limit absences to emergency situations only.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

Introduce and implement attendance raffle

Person Responsible: Sara Darley (sara.darley@browardschools.com)

By When: September 2023 - June 2024

Monitor teacher attendance

Person Responsible: Sara Darley (sara.darley@browardschools.com)

By When: Monthly, beginning 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.

Our students with disabilities historically score lower than our students without disabilities. To ensure we are providing the most effective instruction, we need to lower the achievement gap for these students, specifically in the area of reading.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June 2024, our students with disabilities will increase their reading achievement from 42% to 50%, as measured by the reading PM3 FAST.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored by using FAST PM1, PM2 and PM3 data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Crina Browne (crinab.browne@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.)

To increase reading achievement for our students with disabilities, we plan to implement research-based interventions such as Reading Horizons, and the interventions included as part of the Benchmark Advance curriculum.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy was selected because it aligns with our state-approved curriculum. Reading Horizons and Benchmark Advance interventions are utilized by the district because they are evidence-based intervention programs.

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.

Ensure teachers and support facilitators are trained to implement Reading Horizons and Benchmark Advance science of reading interventions.

Person Responsible: Crina Browne (crinab.browne@browardschools.com)

By When: September 2023

Monitor SWDs' progress in response to the interventions they receive

Person Responsible: Crina Browne (crinab.browne@browardschools.com)

By When: Monthly, beginning August 2023

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)).

Of the areas of focus and action steps provided, there is no need for additional funding/resources other than those already provided by the district.

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

In 22-23, 42% of 1st graders and 26% of 2nd graders were not on track to be proficient readers in 3rd grade. Due to this percentage, there is a need to ensure teachers provide effective instruction in the areas of phonemic awareness and phonics. These components of reading are crucial in building a strong foundation for the intermediate grades. To remedy this, we will implement Heggerty as a tier 1 instructional tool in kindergarten, and we will utilize Reading Horizons in grades 1-2. We will monitor progress using the STAR reading assessment and the I-Ready reading diagnostic.

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

In 22-23, 48% of our 3rd grade students were not proficient readers according to the reading FAST PM3. To increase the number of students scoring a 3 or higher on the FAST PM3 assessment, we will ensure that students reading below grade level receive a Tier 2 or Tier 3 reading intervention based on their needs. These students will receive additional support from our ESE support facilitator (based on IEP), our reading coach, and our reading support teacher. We will monitor students' progress using Benchmark Advance Unit assessments, FAST assessments, the I-Ready Diagnostic and the I-Ready Growth Monitoring assessments.

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

By June 2024, the percentage of first-grade students scoring At/Above grade level on the Spring STAR Reading assessment will increase from 51% to 60%, as measured by the STAR Reading assessment.

By June 2024, the percentage of second-grade students scoring At/Above grade level on the Spring STAR Reading assessment will increase from 52% to 60%, as measured by the STAR Reading assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By June 2024, the percentage of students in grade 3-5 reaching proficiency in reading will increase from 63% to 65%, as measured by the FAST PM3 reading 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.

The areas of focus will be monitored using our various progress monitoring assessments such as the FAST, I-Ready Diagnostic, I-Ready Growth Monitoring, STAR Reading, and curriculum assessments. We will discuss student data during data chats, as well as our biweekly RtI meetings. We will strategically select students who need additional support and make adjustments as needed.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Browne, Crina, crinab.browne@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?

We are implementing state and district approved curriculum and interventions. The reading program we use is Benchmark Advance, which was adopted by BCPS as the main curriculum. We are utilizing Reading Horizons and our phonics intervention, which is the district-supported reading intervention program. We are also using this as a tier 1 instructional tool for 1st and 2nd grade. These programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan.

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 evidence-based practices and programs address the need for phonemic awareness and phonics instruction in the primary grades. Benchmark Advance, which aligns with the science of reading, also addresses our intermediate students' needs in building the vocabulary and comprehension. Our students showed excellent growth in reading from 21-22 to 22-23, while using these programs.

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
Ensure teachers are trained in science of reading, Benchmark Advance, and Reading Horizons.	Browne, Crina, crinab.browne@browardschools.com
Schedule and monitor progress monitoring assessments	Darley, Sara, sara.darley@browardschools.com
Select students in need of additional support during data chats and RtI meetings and monitor their progress	Browne, Crina, crinab.browne@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.

Our SIP is disseminated during monthly SAC and SAF meetings, PTA general meetings, and our school website at www.browardschools.com/sheridanpark

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))

We build positive relationships with parents, families, and community stakeholders everyday during arrival and dismissal, during our monthly SAC/SAF Meetings, our various family nights, and our school events for which we recruit volunteers. We also have our FACE plan available as a part of our SIP at <https://www.browardschools.com/domain/10696>.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

We plan to strengthen the academic program and increase the amount and quality of learning through our inclusive scheduling process, and by ensuring all teachers are trained on Benchmark Advance, the science of reading, and Reading Horizons.

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))

Not applicable.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

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

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

Our school counselor conducts monthly character lessons in our PK-5 classrooms and she provides support to all students as needed.

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).

Our schools implements RtI for behavior as needed. Students exhibiting behavioral concerns will be referred to RtI and placed in a Tier 2 intervention (daily behavior plan). Students' progress will be monitored through our biweekly RtI meetings.

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))

All of our teachers received training on the science of reading and Benchmark Advance. Our ESPs also receive training every year. At our school we conduct our own informal professional development as well where teachers and staff have opportunities to share best practices with one another.

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

We conduct matriculation meetings for our specialized pre-k students who are entering kindergarten, where we decide if each student would need to be in a supported kindergarten classroom or not. Our kindergarten teachers also visit with our pre-k students to build a relationship with them before they enter kindergarten.