Charles Drew Elementary School

2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Charles Drew Elementary School

1000 NW 31ST AVE, Pompano Beach, FL 33069

[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 Charles R. Drew Elementary Magnet school is to cultivate student and faculty growth, by providing each scholar with the opportunity to receive a quality education that meets their individual needs through differentiated instruction, rigorous & relevant curriculum, in a safe and secure learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Charles R. Drew Elementary Magnet School is focused on providing all scholars the BEST (Build relationships; Enhance Teaching and Learning; Student centered; through Teamwork) educational experience, that will prepare them to be College and Career ready to succeed in tomorrow's world.

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
Daniel, Kicia	Principal	Provides Instructional and Organizational Leadership that is necessary to oversee all programs and policies of the school to ensure high quality educational experiences and services for the students in a safe and enriching environment
Butler, Yolanda	Instructional Coach	To assess needs, develop training modules design instructional materials and/or perform demonstration teaching.
	Reading Coach	Collaborate with educators and school administrators to develop curriculum and lesson plans
Moncrieffe, Patricia	Math Coach	Provide instructional support to all teachers and students by co-teaching, mentoring and modeling in classrooms. Also provide support in continual assessment development and the collection, management, and analysis of data.
Sylvestre, Marlie	Science Coach	The Science Coach is responsible for monitoring the School wide Science Plan. The Science Coach will support the teachers with the implementation of the Science standards, aligning instruction and activities to meet the rigor and depth of the standards, provide ongoing feedback/ analysis of student work; Coordinate and Oversee the 5th Grade Enrichment Groups; Model the use of 5E model; Monitors students weekly/monthly formative assessments. The Science Coach will represent the schoolon the various District Coach forums and PLCs. The Science Coach will also work as the Magnet Coordinator to assist with recruiting and highlighting our STEM magnet program.
Mcwhorter, Shalonda	Assistant Principal	Assists in the planning, development, organization, coordination, and supervision of instructional programs and activities; interprets and implements the District approved curriculum program in light of individual school needs. Assists in providing leadership to the professional staff in determining objectives and identifying school needs as the basis for developing long and short range plans for the school. Assists the principal in the overall administration of the school and assumes leadership of the school in the absence of the principal. Assists in the supervision of student enrollment, records, attendance, and health requirements. Develops plans for emergency situations, in cooperation with staff and public safety agencies. Maintains a commitment to ongoing growth in self and others, supporting and participating in district and site professional growth programs. Relates to students with mutual respect while carrying out a positive and effective discipline policy. Supervises the reporting and monitoring of student attendance, with follow-

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		up student/parent contact where necessary. Has knowledge of local policies, state and federal laws relating to minors. Performs other related duties as needed.

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 Reading Coach supports all K-5 staff in the implementation of the site reading plan and program. The Coach works directly with teachers in a school providing classroom-based demonstrations, collaborative and one-on-one support, and facilitating teacher inquiry and related professional development. The Coach focuses on enhancing teachers' ability to provide instruction that builds students' sense of engagement in the ownership of learning. The Coach will also work with administrators and teachers to collect and analyze data, interpret, and use it to guide instructional decisions.

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

The SIP will be used regularly to track students progress and see if the school is meeting it goals

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	97%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK)

(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Hispanic Students (HSP) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: D 2018-19: D 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	36	38	31	31	20	21	0	0	0	177
One or more suspensions	0	1	6	9	5	5	0	0	0	26
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	14	22	41	41	20	24	0	0	0	162
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	16	35	25	14	28	0	0	0	118
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	1	29	10	6	0	0	0	47

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	13	21	40	43	18	25	0	0	0	160

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	5	4	0	9	4	1	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	4	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	9

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	43	33	29	20	31	36	0	0	0	192
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	5	5	7	0	0	0	19
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	30	27	36	0	0	0	93
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	23	28	24	0	0	0	75
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	14	19	32	22	23	0	0	0	110

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	5	11	28	37	46	0	0	0	127

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	43	33	29	20	31	36	0	0	0	192
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	5	5	7	0	0	0	19
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	30	27	36	0	0	0	93
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	23	28	24	0	0	0	75
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	14	19	32	22	23	0	0	0	110

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	5	11	28	37	46	0	0	0	127

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	28	56	53	33	58	56	30		
ELA Learning Gains				56			40		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			20		
Math Achievement*	46	62	59	49	54	50	35		
Math Learning Gains				76			38		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				71			20		
Science Achievement*	57	48	54	36	59	59	24		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					60	52			
Graduation Rate					45	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	48	59	59	40			32		

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](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	196
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	402
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	29	Yes	4	1
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	31	Yes	1	1
HSP	45			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	37	Yes	1	

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	33	Yes	3	
ELL	58			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	47			
HSP	56			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
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	28			46			57					48
SWD	15			35							3	38
ELL	32			59			72				5	48
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25			39			38				4	
HSP	30			55			78				5	49
MUL												

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	26			42			56				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	33	56	41	49	76	71	36					40
SWD	22	20		33	73		18					
ELL	42	67	58	60	83	79	33					40
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	28	49	35	46	74	61	39					
HSP	38	67	55	56	80	81	31					40
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	33	60	46	48	76	68	36					40

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	30	40	20	35	38	20	24					32
SWD	17	9		24	27		0					
ELL	33	52		48	54		23					32
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	28	34		30	28		26					21
HSP	29	48		45	55		20					34
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	29	38	17	35	35	10	24					32

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	36%	56%	-20%	54%	-18%
04	2023 - Spring	33%	61%	-28%	58%	-25%
03	2023 - Spring	15%	53%	-38%	50%	-35%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	39%	62%	-23%	59%	-20%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	65%	-3%	61%	1%
05	2023 - Spring	41%	58%	-17%	55%	-14%

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.

In comparison to last year data, 3-5 ELA reading had the lowest performances. 3rd grade proficiency decreased to 15%, 4th grade remained the same, and 5th grade had a 5 percent increase.

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

Grade 3 ELA had the greatest decline from the prior year. Factors for this decline was adjustment to the FAST assessment for both students and instructors

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 showing the greatest decline from the prior year was 3rd Grade ELA Proficiency from 33% in 2022 to 15% in 2023, a 18% percentage decline. The factors that contributed to this decline was that there was a lack of foundational skills, especially as it relates to vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.

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

Based on the 2023 assessment data, Charles Drew had the greatest gain in 4th grade Math and Grade 5 Science. Students in math and science showed over 20% gains from the previous years assessments. Actions taken: Coaches provided push in support to classroom teachers. Established in co-teacher model to ensure students needs were being met and bridging the gap for struggling students

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

1. Decrease the number of students not meeting the 90% attendance threshhold
2. Decrease the number of students meeting 2 or more criteria for Early Warning Indicators

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

3rd Grade increase student proficiency by 30% in ELA & Math
4th Grade increase student proficiency by 30% in ELA & Math
5th Grade increase student proficiency by 20% in all categories, ELA, Math, and Science.
K-2: Increase student's proficiency in ELA and Math.

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned 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.

Classroom instruction will be monitored by analyzing lesson plans, student artifacts, journals, formal and informal formative assessments such as, beginning of year data, cycle assessments, BAS, I-ready, cadre formative assessment. Learning walks, data chats will also be conducted to ensure that small group instruction is being implemented effectively

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

By May 2024, overall student achievement will increase by 25% in 3-5 ELA FAST PM3# and 30% increase in in 3-5 Math, and 10% increase in Science.

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

Students will be using research base resources such as Benchmark Advance and Envision as the primary instructional tool in addition to other supplemental resources to drive standard based whole and small group instructions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shantell Goldsby (shantell.goldsby@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.)

For ELA Charles Drew will be using Benchmark Advance intervention resources, Reading Horizon, and SIPPS. For Math we will be using enVision Florida, math diagnostic. enVision Reteach and Remediation along with other intervention systems.

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

Intervention resources were selected based on the Science of Reading and the district's Reading Decision Tree.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#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.

Based on the data, Students with Disabilities have scored below the Federal Index Points of 41% in proficiency for ELA, Math and Science.

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 will show a increase of 10% proficiency based on the FAST and SSA Assessments for ELA, Math and Science.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through I-Ready Diagnostic and Growth Mastery. Additionally, progress will monitored with PM2 Fast Assessment for ELA and Math. Science proficiency will monitored through quarterly summative assessments provided by the Science Coach.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shalonda Mcwhorter (shalonda.mcwhorter@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.)

ELA - Benchmark Advance Intervention, Reading Horizon, SIPPS
Math - enVision Florida Diagnostic and Intervention System
Science - Stemscopes Guided Practice

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

Interventions were selected based on the District Decision Trees for Reading and Math.

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 receive additional instruction during their ELA rotation.

Person Responsible: Shantell Goldsby (shantell.goldsby@browardschools.com)

By When: Push-in support will begin by September 2023.

#3. 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.

Based the recent school year, Charles Drew has had to recruit and hire new teachers due to a high number of teachers leaving the school due to funding and non-critical need school.

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

By the end of the 2023-2024, Charles Drew will retain 90% of all teachers and staff.

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

This will be monitord based on teacher retention throughout the school year and the following school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shalonda Mcwhorter (shalonda.mcwhorter@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.)

Teacher will receive daily, weekly, and month support from curriculum support coaches and administration. We will have quarterly teacher appreaction activities and networking opportunities amongts staff.

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

By providing additional support and activities and boost school moral, Charles Drew will be able to retain a higher number of teachers for the 2023-2024 academic year.

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.

-Teachers will have scheduled planning sessions with academic coaches.
-New teachers will be provided additional support from academic coaches and team leaders.

Person Responsible: Shalonda Mcwhorter (shalonda.mcwhorter@browardschools.com)

By When: By May 2023, Charles R. Drew will obtain 90% of teachers.

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).

The process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on the needs of Charles Drew Elementary in Pompano Beach, Florida, involves a comprehensive approach tailored to the school's specific circumstances. The initial step involves collecting and analyzing relevant data such as the FAST PM1 and I-Ready Diagnostic assessments pertaining to the school's student demographics, academic performance, and other pertinent factors. This data will be crucial in identifying the school's strengths and challenges.

Following data analysis, a thorough needs assessment for Charles Drew Elementary will be conducted. This assessment will involve close collaboration with school leadership, teachers, parents, and community members to gain a comprehensive understanding of the school's unique requirements. By identifying specific challenges such as low reading proficiency and access to technology, the needs assessment will lay the foundation for informed decision-making.

Once the needs are established, a resource allocation plan will be devised to address the needs of the students and thes school. This plan will outline the allocation of financial and non-financial resources, considering factors such as providing professional development for teachers, and updating classroom technology. Equity considerations will play a pivotal role, ensuring that resources are distributed fairly and that marginalized student populations receive the necessary support. Regular monitoring and evaluation will provide the means to assess the progress of the allocated resources and make adjustments as needed to achieve the school's improvement goals.

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

This year the focus for K-2 will be phonics and fluency. Based on the 2022-2023 STAR Early Literacy and STAR Reading, 42% of our first graders were below the 40th Percentile Rank. 63% of the 2nd

graders were below the 40th Percentile Rank. This indicates that the students are lacking the basic Foundational skills to become better readers.

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

This year the focus in 3-5 will be foundational skills and comprehension. Based on the 2022-2023 FAST Assessment for ELA, 69% of students in grades 3 - 5 scored below proficiency. This indicates that the students are lacking the foundational skills needed to read and comprehend text at/or above their grade levels.

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

50% of students in grades K-2 will score at/or above the 50th percentile on FAST PM3 by May 2024.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

50% of students in grades 3 - 5 will score at/or above a level 3 on FAST PM3 by May 2024.

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.

Desired outcomes for school's area of focus will be monitored with the FAST Assessment PM2 and the growth monitoring assessments for I-Ready. We will be able to use these assessments to determine how many students are on-track for proficiency before May of 2024. We will also use monthly cycle assessments, quarterly assessmnets, and meet weekly to review data and make necessary adjustments to instruction.

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

Daniel, Kicia, kicia.daniel@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?

In grades K - 2 we will be using Benchmark Advance, I-Ready, and SIPPS.
In grades 3 - 5, we will be using Benchmark Advance, I-Ready, and Reading Horizon.

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?

These programs were selected based on the Science of Reading and criteria provided from the district.

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
Teachers will be provided with professional development on instructional delivery, instructional strategies, lesson planning, data analysis, and small group instruction. These PDs will be conducted by the Academic Coaches.	Daniel, Kicia, kicia.daniel@browardschools.com
Academic Coaches will model instructional delivery in classrooms with students and teacher present. Academic Coaches will then observe teacher during instruction and meet for a follow-up discussion regarding the lesson. (Implementation of the Coaching Cycle)	Daniel, Kicia, kicia.daniel@browardschools.com
Monitor academic progress through monthly cyce assessments and meet with staff to review data and make adjustments to instruction.	Daniel, Kicia, kicia.daniel@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.

Charles R. Drew Elementary Magnet School will conduct an annual meeting designed to inform parents of participating children about the school's Title 1 program, school performance data, district initiatives and rights of parents. We will offer a flexible number of meetings (monthly school advisory council meetings, PTA meetings, Parent Conference Night, Science, Reading and Math Academies) in the morning or evening and may provide child care with Title 1 funds or school partnerships for such services related to parental involvement.
The SIP plan is disseminated through multiple ways. Parents will be able to access the SIP in multiple languages through both Charles Drew at www.browardschools.com/charlesdrew. A copy of the plan is available in the front office for parents and all stakeholders to access, as well a letter of the avaibility of the SIP will be sent home to parents as part of the 1st day packets.

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))

Charles R. Drew Elementary Magnet School will engage parents in an organized, ongoing, and timely manner, in the planning, review, and improvement of programs this part, including the planning, review, and improvement of the school parent and family engagement policy and the joint development of the schoolwide program plan under section 1114(b) except that if a school's program is exempt from

statutory or regulatory provisions, the school may use that process, if such process includes an adequate representation of parents of participating children

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, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum by having focused collaborative planning sessions that focus on how to maximize the instructional time and addresses the diverse needs of the learners. Additionally, intervention and tutorial programs will be developed and offered to students needing remediation or enrichment.

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

n/a