Chapel Trail Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Chapel Trail Elementary School

19595 TAFT ST, Pembroke Pines, FL 33029

[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.

We Inspire and Empower Confident and Innovative Learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Chapel Trail Elementary, Empowering 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
Suarez, Susan	Principal	-Promote a safe and enjoyable learning environment for all stakeholders. -Lead Instructional Leader on Campus -Monitor students and staff to ensure safety on campus. -Monitor disciplinary events on campus. -Monitor instructional practices on campus through classroom observations, classroom visits, data chats, and progress monitoring. -Provide support across the campus wherever it is needed. -Serve on the Leadership Team, safety team, and Behavior Threat Assessment Team -Monitor instructional practices of instructional personal and provide assistance and support as needed.
Schreidell, Richard	Assistant Principal	-Instructional Leader on Campus -Monitor students and staff to ensure safety on campus. -Monitor disciplinary events on campus. -Monitor instructional practices on campus through classroom observations, classroom visits, data chats, and progress monitoring. -Serve on the Leadership Team, safety team, and Behavior Threat Assessment Team
Lorow, Jordan	Reading Coach	-Instructional leader on campus -Provides support and training -Mentors teachers -Monitors student data and provides interventions and strategies to instructional staff -Provide small group instruction in Reading to students in Tier 3, as well as students who need additional support. -Provide support to teachers in the form of modeling and support in planning and delivering lessons. -Schoolwide Inservice Facilitator -Serve on the Leadership Team, safety team, and Behavior Threat Assessment Team -Serves as the 3rd Grade RTI Case Manager
Max, Kristen	Other	ESE Specialist Provide support and materials for teachers to utilize with our students with disabilities population. Observe students Serves as the 4th & 5th Grade RTI Case Manager Serves as the textbook coordinator -Serve on the Leadership Team, safety team, and Behavior Threat Assessment Team
Rodriguez-Soto, Lorenna	School Counselor	-Provide small group support to students in grades K-5th Grade. -Planning and delivering lessons to students in grade K-5th Grade. -Schoolwide Testing Coordinator -HEART Designee

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		-504 -Serve on the Leadership Team, safety team, and Behavior Threat Assessment Team -Serves as the 2nd Grade RTI Case Manager
Quintana, Iliana	Other	-Provide small group support for students with Autism. -Provide support to teachers in the form of modeling and support in planning for instruction and the use of techniques to best meet the needs of our students with Autism. -Gator Pals staff moderator ~ peer groups --Serves as the Kindergarten & 1st Grade RTI Case Manager

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.

School data is shared at each SAC meeting. We also discuss any barriers we may be facing. Student achievement and data are also discussed at faculty meetings and parent events. Through these collaborative conversations we determine areas that we need to focus on as a school to increase our student achievement.

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

The School improvement plan (SIP) will be the central guiding tool that drives all of our instructional decisions. We will revisit it frequently and share progress, data, and adjustments made at all faculty meetings, SAC meetings, and parent events.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	81%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	39%
Charter School	No

RAISE School	No
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) Multiracial Students (MUL) 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: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	22	22	24	30	19	24	0	0	0	141
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	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	7	16	19	29	15	26	0	0	0	112
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	10	21	28	15	37	0	0	0	111
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	7	4	2	8	17	20	0	0	0	58

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	12	18	27	20	30	0	0	0	111

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	2	2	3	4	0	1	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	2	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	6

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	24	21	21	18	20	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	20	22	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	35	37	0	0	0	89
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	10	13	4	5	4	4	0	0	0	40

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	6	6	2	12	21	20	0	0	0	67

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	5	1	6	0	2	0	0	0	15
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	24	21	21	18	20	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	20	22	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	35	37	0	0	0	89
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	10	13	4	5	4	4	0	0	0	40

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	6	6	2	12	21	20	0	0	0	67

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	5	1	6	0	2	0	0	0	15
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*	67	56	53	69	58	56	68		
ELA Learning Gains				70			61		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47			41		
Math Achievement*	69	62	59	68	54	50	53		
Math Learning Gains				71			31		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45			21		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	57	48	54	52	59	59	59		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					60	52			
Graduation Rate					45	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	61	59	59	44			50		

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	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	326
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	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	466
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	41			
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	57			
HSP	62			
MUL	61			
PAC				
WHT	86			
FRL	49			

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	32	Yes	1	
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN	75			
BLK	55			
HSP	57			
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	75			
FRL	51			

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	67			69			57					61
SWD	37			39			25				5	63
ELL	47			58			22				5	61
AMI												
ASN	82			91							2	
BLK	57			60			56				4	
HSP	64			66			51				5	61
MUL	57			64							2	
PAC												
WHT	89			81			77				4	
FRL	50			56			40				5	48

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	69	70	47	68	71	45	52					44
SWD	34	31	30	36	49	36	16					27
ELL	58	65	42	60	68	50	44					44
AMI												
ASN	82	83		76	75		60					
BLK	65	63	45	64	63	30	53					
HSP	64	71	49	66	71	50	47					36
MUL	76	67		53	67							
PAC												
WHT	81	68		81	78		68					
FRL	55	60	50	53	67	48	27					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	68	61	41	53	31	21	59					50
SWD	31	50	40	19	21	6	30					36
ELL	60	62	50	52	29	36	59					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
AMI												
ASN	84			74								
BLK	59	53		38	18		37					
HSP	67	61	42	52	30	30	59					50
MUL	76			62								
PAC												
WHT	71	63		63	46		68					
FRL	53	53	33	35	18	12	40					36

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	66%	56%	10%	54%	12%
04	2023 - Spring	74%	61%	13%	58%	16%
03	2023 - Spring	66%	53%	13%	50%	16%

| MATH | | | | | | |
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	70%	62%	8%	59%	11%
04	2023 - Spring	75%	65%	10%	61%	14%
05	2023 - Spring	62%	58%	4%	55%	7%

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	54%	46%	8%	51%	3%

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.

Overall our 22-23 data in ELA, Math, and Science were very similar. The lowest performance was 5th grade ELA dropping from 68% proficiency to 66% proficiency and 3rd grade Math dropping from 74% proficiency to 70% proficiency. When we look at the overall proficiency in ELA it decreased from 69% to 68.6%. In overall Math proficiency we increased from 68% to 69%.
The contributing factors were adjusting to the implementation of a new reading series, as well as a new inclusion model for providing ESE support facilitation to our students with IEPs.

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

Although overall in Math we increased from a 68% to a 69%, the data point with the greatest decline was 3rd grade math dropping from 74% to 70%. The factor that contributed to the decline could be the change in rigor coming from 2nd grade to 3rd grade, as well as taking the assessments online. Teachers had to identify whether the students were having difficulty with the concept or it was a test taking error. Teachers did not have access to supplemental programs as they had in the past such as i-Ready, where they could assign targeted practice in areas students needed additional support.

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.

When compared to the state average Chapel Trail scored higher than the State and District in every area:

ELA Overall:
Chapel Trail= 68.6% State=50% Broward=52%
Chapel Trail 3rd =66% State=50% Broward=53%
Chapel Trail 4th=74% State =58% Broward=61%
Chapel Trail 5th=66% State= 54% Broward=56%

Math Overall:
Chapel Trail= 69% State=56% Broward=57%
Chapel Trail 3rd =70% State=59% Broward=62%
Chapel Trail 4th=75% State =61% Broward=65%
Chapel Trail 5th=62% State= 55% Broward=58%

Science
Chapel Trail= 54% State=51% Broward=46%

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

Math in 4th grade showed the most improvement increasing from 69% proficiency to 75% proficiency. Our school received training from the district Math department at the end of the 21-22 school year specifically targeting small group instruction and differentiation. The teachers implemented these strategies for the 22-23 school year.

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

Our current enrollment for the 23-24 school year is 627 students.

One potential area of concern is 47 students, currently in grades 1-5, with two or more early warning indicators = 7% of students.

Our second potential area of concern is students scoring level 1 in ELA and Math.
345 students in grades 3-5 with 42 students (Currently in 4th & 5th grade) scoring a Level 1 in ELA =12%
345 students in grades 3-5 with 52 students (Currently in 4th & 5th grade) scoring a Level 1 in Math =15%

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

Our highest priorities for school improvement in the upcoming school year are to:
1-Increase proficiency and learning gains in our students with disabilities subgroup.
2-Effectively target and deliver high quality differentiated small group instruction in ELA and Math.
3-Provide effective, high quality hands-on instruction in Science.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. 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.

Based on data obtained from the 2022-2023 FAST Assessment, our Students with disabilities (SWD)subgroup was identified as an area of critical need. The Overall Federal Index indicated our SWD students earned 32%.

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

By May 2024, our SWD students will increase from 32% to at least 35% proficiency as measured by the Overall Federal Index.

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

Monitoring for this area of focus will be accomplished by tracking student progress in Benchmark Advance unit assessments, Benchmark Advance Interim assessments, and the FAST PM1, PM2, and PM3 assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Susan Suarez (susy.suarez@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.)

Implementing an inclusive model for providing ESE services.

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

Studies have shown the benefits that inclusive classrooms offer for children with disabilities and their peers. Instead of pulling children out of the classroom to offer them specialized instruction, in an inclusive classroom, special education teachers come into the classroom. This allows for general education teachers and specialists to work together in the same learning environment, benefiting all students, who are offered additional resources and support. This support often results in greater academic gains for students with disabilities as well as students without disabilities.

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.

Instructional specialists from the ESE Department will conduct classroom walkthroughs and provide feedback and support as needed.

Person Responsible: Susan Suarez (susy.suarez@browardschools.com)

By When: This will be completed by the end of the 1st Quarter.

Schedule ESE support facilitators to provide services in classrooms.

Person Responsible: Susan Suarez (susy.suarez@browardschools.com)

By When: By the week of August 28th, 2023. (2nd week of school)

Offer opportunities for teachers to learn ESE instructional strategies, collaborate, and share best practices.

Person Responsible: Susan Suarez (susy.suarez@browardschools.com)

By When: Continuously throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

#2. 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.

Chapel Trail has a supportive and fulfilling environment that is built on trust, respect and high expectations.
The dedication that the teachers, support staff and administration display daily is the core of our vision and mission.

Chapel Trail has built a positive school culture and environment by always evolving with the new standards, statewide testing and changes in curriculum. The numerous years of experience from the teaching staff makes it possible for success. Each teacher makes sure that the daily learning conditions meet the needs of all students. The staff spends countless hours in professional development, trainings, data chats, and RtI meetings to assure that each child's strengths and weaknesses are addressed.

Each staff member has a defined role and relationship in the success of every student. The Pre-K staff prepares the students for kindergarten. The paraprofessionals assist the teachers in small group instruction and supporting the needs of each student. The ESE staff members collaborate and with their teachers and
students to make sure that each child can succeed and meet the highest standards.

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

Through the effective implementation of inclusive ESE support and collaboration between the ESE Support Facilitator, Classroom teacher, student, and family, our federal index will increase by at least a3 points in the category of Students with disabilities.

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

Data for our students with disabilities population will be monitored weekly. Tools we will use to monitor student performance will be i-Ready, Benchmark Advance assessments, and FAST PM1, PM2, and PM3.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Susan Suarez (susy.suarez@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.)

As a school identified as a ATSI school, (Additional Targeted Support and Improvement) we will be focusing on providing targeted specialized differentiated instruction for our students with disabilities. We will continue to follow the inclusive model where the ESE support facilitator provides services in the classroom and collaborates with the homeroom teacher.
We will meet, observe, and share best practices with other schools in our district who are implementing the strategy successfully.
We will also ask that the district experts conduct walkthroughs to provide feedback and suggestions.

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

The inclusive model is an effective method to help bridge academic gaps and work collaboratively with the homeroom teacher.

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.

District staff, the ESE specialist, and administration will meet with the classroom teacher and the ESE support facilitator to build a positive collaborative partnership.

Person Responsible: Kristen Max (kristen.max@browardschools.com)

By When: We will meet monthly to discuss best practices, celebrations, & challenges. We will adjust as needed to build a collaborative partnership centered around increasing student achievement and effective best practices.

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).

Chapel Trail Elementary is identified as a ATSI (Additional Targeted Support and Improvement) school in the ESSA area for Students with Disabilities. We will allocate additional funding for training and materials to help ESE support facilitator. We will also ensure that all students with disabilities are invited to our afterschool extended learning opportunity camps.