

Broward County Public Schools

# Banyan Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

# Banyan Elementary School

8800 NW 50TH ST, Sunrise, FL 33351

[ 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 Banyan Elementary is to provide our students with a quality education within a safe and secure learning environment.

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

Our vision is to create a Pre K- 5 school that is highly regarded for its academic excellence and positive contributions to the community in which it operates.

### 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
Neunie, Nicole	Principal	The principal serves as the instructional leader. She supports teacher and staff development, while also providing feedback based on observations and walkthroughs. Ms. Neunie ensures that the school adheres to its vision and mission. She creates a climate and culture of academic excellence.
King-Roberts, Carol	Assistant Principal	Assist the principal with instructional leadership, managing school operations, maintaining safety, and creating an environment whereby students can learn and reach their highest potential.
Parker, La'Crista	Reading Coach	The Reading Coach is responsible for the following at school: Whole faculty development in school, presenting best practices and instructional strategies for reading, small group professional development, conducting book reviews, review of research on improving students' reading skills, planning needs based instruction with teachers, modeling lessons while teachers observe, coaching, looking at student work, scoring protocols and reflecting on post observation, data reporting and analysis, reviewing reading curriculum, observing teachers and providing constructive feedback, developing reading action plans with teachers and administration.
Kellingbeck, Farrah	Other	The ESE Specialist is responsible for the following at the school: Maintains IEPs, Quarterly Reports, Progress monitoring for case loads, prepares for and conducts parent and student conferencing according to school policy, assist regular education teachers with specially designed instruction when necessary, assist with planning for classroom and testing accommodations for students with disabilities, models strategies for inclusionary practices as appropriate, provides assistance with developing and adapting curriculum materials and education practices to meet the needs of students and teachers, develops and implements IEPs with measurable goals using progress monitoring, collects and reports progress monitoring data for all student goals, and makes data-driven instructional decisions to improve student outcomes.

**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 process for involving stakeholders and acquiring their input is done through the School Advisory Council. Stakeholders are solicited to provide input in all aspects of the development of the School Improvement Plan. Parents, staff, and students are surveyed annually and this data is also considered when developing the School Improvement Plan.

**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 is monitored frequently for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students with frequent progress monitoring. Progress monitoring includes but is not limited to FAST PM1 and FAST PM2, iReady Diagnostic Assessments, Envision Topic Assessments, and Benchmark Advance Assessments. Once data is analyzed it is used to revise the plan as necessary to ensure improvement.

**Demographic Data**

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	Yes
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	93%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	100%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	Yes
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**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	20	18	22	21	18	21	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3
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	5	5	12	31	14	13	0	0	0	80
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	8	11	26	19	12	0	0	0	76
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	11	14	18	10	9	0	0	0	62
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	5	12	12	30	17	15	0	0	0	91

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	1	1	10	11	5	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	5	1	2	0	0	0	0	8

**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	21	25	30	16	17	30	0	0	0	139
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	27	18	25	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	24	21	26	0	0	0	71
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	15	6	10	18	8	17	0	0	0	74

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	8	3	9	24	18	30	0	0	0	92

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	1	16	1	0	0	0	0	19
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	21	25	30	16	17	30	0	0	0	139
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	27	18	25	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	24	21	26	0	0	0	71
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	15	6	10	18	8	17	0	0	0	74

**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	8	3	9	24	18	30	0	0	0	92

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	1	16	1	0	0	0	0	19
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*	49	56	53	48	58	56	37		
ELA Learning Gains				64			34		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46			29		
Math Achievement*	54	62	59	51	54	50	25		
Math Learning Gains				78			11		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				73			6		
Science Achievement*	56	48	54	24	59	59	15		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					60	52			
Graduation Rate					45	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	68	59	59	69			26		

\* 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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	277
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
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	453
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	33	Yes	4	
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	55			
HSP	55			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	55			

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	37	Yes	3	
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	49			
HSP	61			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	54			

**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	49			54			56					68
SWD	30			30							3	
ELL	29			46			42				5	68
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	52			55			57				5	59
HSP	38			47			70				5	77
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	55			55							2	
FRL	49			52			61				5	66

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	48	64	46	51	78	73	24					69
SWD	30	31		29	78		19					
ELL	31	63		43	82		27					69
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	47	57	35	45	71	68	18					
HSP	45	75		61	93		31					60
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	46	63	43	44	78	75	17					65

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	37	34	29	25	11	6	15					26
SWD	16	29		13	7		0					
ELL	29	54		14	27		14					26
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	34	31	21	22	10	8	14					
HSP	33	36		28	7		8					32
MUL												
PAC												
WHT				36								
FRL	30	27	29	20	10	7	9					25

**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	50%	56%	-6%	54%	-4%
04	2023 - Spring	51%	61%	-10%	58%	-7%
03	2023 - Spring	43%	53%	-10%	50%	-7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	49%	62%	-13%	59%	-10%
04	2023 - Spring	40%	65%	-25%	61%	-21%
05	2023 - Spring	68%	58%	10%	55%	13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	53%	46%	7%	51%	2%

### 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 showing the lowest performance was ELA at 48%. Last year was the first year teachers taught the new standards in grades three through five. Students also had to adjust to taking assessments online. Trend data indicates that ELA proficiency scores were maintained in comparison to 2022, but were still below 2019 proficiency results.

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

The ELA data component did not show a decline, but was maintained in comparison to 2022 data, at 48%. Last year was the first year teachers taught the new standards in grades three through five. Students also had to adjust to taking assessments online.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

The data component with the greatest gap in comparison to the state average is the same for both ELA and Math, 6% points. Current data shows the greatest gap specifically in fourth grade math. Factors contributing to this gap include the use of new materials to teach new standards to our students.

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

The data component showing the most improvement was Science. Science increased by 29%. New actions included a 5th grade Science Instructional Focus Calendar. Additional support was also provided by the Broward Schools Science Department. Additional materials were also used daily to support students' understanding of science standards. Progress monitoring and adjustment to materials and content covered contributed to the increase in the science score.

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

Based on EWS data third grade had the highest number of students receiving a level one in reading and math. Providing teachers with support and coaching will be a priority in helping them to meet the needs of our students.

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

1. Fourth Grade Math (21% below the state average)
2. Third Grade Math (10% below the state average)
3. Third Grade Reading (7% below the state average)
4. Fourth Grade Reading (7% below the state average)
5. Fourth and Fifth Grade Writing

**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 Retention and Recruitment****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.

A positive culture and environment will continue to be developed to maintain teacher retention and recruitment. Increasing teacher retention supports student learning, and increases educator growth in teaching. Reductions in the turnover rate increase the opportunity to sustain school initiatives.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By June 2024, Banyan's teacher retention rate will increase by 10%.

**Monitoring:**

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

This area of focus will be monitored by using teacher surveys and conferencing individually with teachers.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Nicole Neunie (nicole.neunie@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.)

Creation of an environment where teachers are acknowledged and appreciated is critical to their retention. The Banyan Brag Award, as well as Banyan Teacher Bucks will be implemented. Teachers are nominated by their peers or administration to receive the Banyan Brag Award. Banyan Teacher Bucks will be given to teachers to acknowledge their efforts and to show gratitude for their hard work and due diligence in supporting our students.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Experienced teachers that are familiar with a school, and the needs of its students, are better positioned to educate and prioritize student needs.

**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.

Banyan Teacher Bucks will be implemented. Teachers will be provided Banyan Bucks based on participation in trainings, providing feedback, engagement, and followup with school initiatives and additional supports provided.

**Person Responsible:** Carol King-Roberts (carol.king-roberts@browardschools.com)

**By When:** By September 15, 2023 Banyan Bucks will be available.

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

### 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.

2023 ELA proficiency was maintained at 48%, but did not increase beyond 2019 ELA proficiency of 56%. Small group instruction improves academic achievement, increases student engagement, and allows teachers the opportunity to observe student learning and provide feedback.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, Grades 3 - 5 will increase reading proficiency from 48% to 52% based on the FAST Reading PM3.

### Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored for desired outcome using FAST Reading, Benchmark Advance Cumulative Assessments, and iReady progress monitoring.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

La'Crista Parker (lacrista.parker@browardschools.com)

### Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The evidence based intervention that will be implemented include materials from Benchmark Advance and Magnetic Reading Foundations.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Benchmark Advance is aligned with Science of Reading, and is a core language arts program that provides a cohesive structure for the development of literacy skills and content knowledge. Magnetic Reading Foundations helps students master foundational skills such as phonological awareness, fluency, and high-frequency words using explicit instructional routines and a systematic scope and sequence that enables them to become fluent readers.

### 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.

Through PLCs and District support professional development will be provided to support teacher with small group instruction including the use of materials to support small group instruction. The Literacy Coach will also model and provide feedback to teachers regarding their small group instruction.

**Person Responsible:** La'Crista Parker (lacrista.parker@browardschools.com)

**By When:** By January 2024, teachers will be observed and provided constructive feedback regarding small group instruction.

### #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.

Trend data indicates that students with disabilities demonstrated the least amount of growth in learning gains in Reading.

#### Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, students with disabilities in Grade 3 through 5 scoring proficient will increase from 25% to 29% as measured by FAST Reading PM3.

#### Monitoring:

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

Students will be monitored using the FAST Reading assessments, Benchmark Advance Cumulative Assessments, and iReady progress monitoring.

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Farrah Kellingbeck (farrah.kellingbeck@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.)

Benchmark Advance, Magnetic Reading Foundations, and Phonics for Reading will be implemented.

#### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Benchmark Advance is aligned with Science of Reading, and is a core language arts program that provides a cohesive structure for the development of literacy skills and content knowledge. Magnetic Reading Foundations helps students master foundational skills such as phonological awareness, fluency, and high-frequency words using explicit instructional routines and a systematic scope and sequence that enables them to become fluent readers. Phonics for Reading instruction is designed to increase accuracy in decoding and word recognition skills, which in turn facilitate comprehension.

#### 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.

Students will be provided additional supports either through before or after school camps. These students will be progress monitored to ensure growth in reading.

**Person Responsible:** Farrah Kellingbeck (farrah.kellingbeck@browardschools.com)

**By When:** By November 2023, students with disabilities will begin to receive their additional support in reading.

## 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)).

Each month during School Advisory Meetings school improvement funding is an agenda line item. This allows the principal to review funding allocations and ensure that resources are allocated based on needs. As funds are allocated the principal provides details and rationale for said allocations. After reviewing the details and rationale for allocating school accountability funds the School Advisory Committee would then vote to approve the use of accountability funds.

## 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

More than 50% of students in Grades K-2 assessed above level 3. However, small group instruction will be provided to offer students flexible and differentiated instruction. With the smaller number of students, students have more opportunities to participate. Teachers are able to monitor student progress and provide individualized feedback and support.

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

At least 50% of students in Grades 4 and 5 assessed at level 3 or higher. At least 50% of students in grade 3 did not assess at level 3 or higher. Small group instruction will be provided to offer students flexible and differentiated instruction. With the smaller number of students, students have more opportunities to participate. Teachers are able to monitor student progress and provide individualized feedback and support.

**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**

Students in Grade K will maintain proficiency of 70% or higher by May 2024 as measured by the Star Literacy Assessment. Students in Grade 1 will maintain proficiency of 70% or higher by May 2024 as measured by Star Reading. Student in Grade 2 will maintain proficiency of 70% or higher by May 2024 as measured by Star Reading.

**Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes**

Students in Grade 3 will increase proficiency from 43% to 50% or higher by May 2024 as measured by FAST Reading. Students in Grade 4 will maintain proficiency of 55% or higher by May 2024 as measured by FAST Reading. Students in Grade 5 will maintain proficiency of 52% or higher by May 2024 as measured by FAST Reading.

**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.

Reading will be monitored using Star Literacy (Kind.), Star Reading (1st and 2nd Grade) FAST Reading (3rd - 5th Grade), Benchmark Advance Quarterly Assessments, and iReady Diagnostic Assessments.

**Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

King-Roberts, Carol, carol.king-roberts@browardschools.com

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs**

**Description:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term “evidence-based” means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida’s definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Benchmark Advance is a comprehensive K-5 Reading Program with a balanced literacy approach to meeting the BEST Standards. Benchmark Literacy addresses the needs of above, on, and below level readers as well as English Language Learners, and special needs students. Accelerated Reader will assist teachers with tracking students independent practice and progress with reading.

**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?

Both programs and specific practice address the identified needs of students. Research and data show Benchmark Advance, Accelerated Reader, and small group instruction are effective with our target population.

**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
<p>Administration will conduct weekly walkthroughs to check usage of Benchmark Advance and the implementation of small group instruction. Following walkthroughs, administration will provide constructive feedback. Accelerated Reader will be incentivized to promote reading at home and in school. Students will be reading one book per week.</p>	<p>King-Roberts, Carol, carol.king-roberts@browardschools.com</p>
<p>In-house and District professional development in reading will be provided to teachers. Professional development will include components of the literacy block, effective use of Benchmark Advance materials, and utilization of small group instruction within the reading block.</p>	<p>Parker, La'Crista, lacrista.parker@browardschools.com</p>

## 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 SIP is available via the school webpage. The SIP is also reviewed during multiple School Advisory Meetings throughout the school year. Stakeholders are provided updates on progress monitoring, programs, and initiatives used to support the achievement of school goals. Information is provided to parents in multiple languages to increase parent participation and understanding.

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.**

List the school's webpage\* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The Family Engagement Plan is available on the school webpage. The school's Support Team Members assist with providing a positive culture and environment at the school which includes facilitating multiple family engagement events, and addressing parents with concerns on a daily basis. The PTA also provides activities and events throughout the year to increase parent and community engagement.

**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)**

The school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school by utilizing walkthroughs, providing feedback, coaching, implementing a schoolwide master schedule that includes bell to bell instruction and maximizes instruction, small group instruction and centers in reading and math to provide enrichment and accelerated curriculum, and additional programs such as Accelerated Reader and iReady.



**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