

Broward County Public Schools

Park Lakes Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	19
VI. Title I Requirements	22
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	24

Park Lakes Elementary School

3925 N STATE ROAD 7, Lauderdale Lakes, FL 33319

[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.

Park Lakes Elementary is committed to motivate all students to develop their potential, become life-long learners and be contributing members of our community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our goal is to offer all students an opportunity to excel in academics and social-emotional learning through real-world literacy and state-of-the-art teaching. In collaboration with parents, community, and stakeholders; our scholars will become global citizens for College and Career Readiness.

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
Parris, Rhonda	Principal	A school principal leads the whole school community, including students, teachers, staff, parents, and community partners. They are the liaison between the school and the district leadership. School principals manage the administration of all work related to students, teachers, and staff.
Glasford, Terri	Assistant Principal	Assist the Principal in ensuring continuous improvement in measurable student performance and achievement, customer satisfaction, performance management, and compliance.
Johnson, Simone	Math Coach	They are required to organize, facilitate and attend professional development at the school site and district level. Math Coaches provide instructional support to all teachers and students by co-teaching, mentoring and modeling in classrooms.
Austin, Paula	SAC Member	The chair is responsible for notifying members of upcoming meeting and votes. The chair, or designee, will facilitate the SAC meetings and inform of the SAC of relevant issues related to school improvement activities. Classroom Teacher/SAC Chairperson.

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 Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, the stakeholders are the principal, assistant principal, math coach, and the committee members. The process includes monthly meetings where the stakeholders are presented with the areas of focus along with the data. The stakeholders are then provided opportunities to share their ideas and suggestions regarding the improvement of the school.

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))

We monitor progress using both quantitative and qualitative methods. Quantitative project tracking student data methods look at student growth and progress toward proficiency. Qualitative methods, on the other hand, will use survey data and regular team meetings to track the progress of the quality of instruction. The processes that will be used to monitor the SIP classroom walkthroughs, student progress, monitoring, opportunities for staff feedback, and parental and community input. The data will be shared bi-weekly and discussed with the leadership team weekly. Progress will be determined based on the agreed "Look For's" for each subject area identified by the leadership team. Adjustments will be made once data has been analyzed at the bi-weekly meetings.

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	98%
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) (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) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: 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	66	63	64	64	45	61	0	0	0	363	
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	4	1	4	0	0	0	13	
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	46	47	73	54	30	52	0	0	0	302	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	41	73	54	35	53	0	0	0	256	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	7	19	36	5	13	0	0	0	80	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	24	44	74	62	28	49	0	0	0	281

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	10	12	20	2	10	0	0	0	59
Students retained two or more times	1	2	4	3	0	9	0	0	0	19

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	78	56	62	50	57	55	0	0	0	358	
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	3	4	3	0	0	0	14	
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	46	52	53	0	0	0	151	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	56	50	48	0	0	0	154	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	12	33	36	27	28	0	0	0	140	

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	2	5	19	52	71	66	0	0	0	215

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	2	53	54	55	0	0	0	166
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2

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	78	56	62	50	57	55	0	0	0	358	
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	3	4	3	0	0	0	14	
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	46	52	53	0	0	0	151	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	56	50	48	0	0	0	154	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	12	33	36	27	28	0	0	0	140	

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	2	5	19	52	71	66	0	0	0	215

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	2	53	54	55	0	0	0	166
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2

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	51	58	56	47		
ELA Learning Gains				66			59		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53			71		
Math Achievement*	50	62	59	54	54	50	36		
Math Learning Gains				76			30		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				65			32		
Science Achievement*	44	48	54	37	59	59	33		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					60	52			
Graduation Rate					45	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	52	59	59	65					

* 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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	237
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	97
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	467
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
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	34	Yes	4	
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	48			
HSP	48			
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	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	40	Yes	3	
ELL	58			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	59			
HSP	56			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	59			

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			50			44					52
SWD	31			33			38				5	37
ELL	48			47			49				5	52
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	48			50			42				5	57
HSP	54			51			53				5	40
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	50			50			50				5	52

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	51	66	53	54	76	65	37					65
SWD	37	55	30	38	59	33	33					34
ELL	49	63	51	52	77	73	32					65
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	51	67	51	55	78	62	40					67
HSP	47	62	53	51	71	75	24					64
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	50			67								
FRL	52	66	51	55	79	66	37					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	47	59	71	36	30	32	33					
SWD	30	37	27	28	37	42	16					
ELL	48	63	71	36	37	47	33					
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	47	57	68	35	27	29	32					
HSP	46	76		42	43		39					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	48	58	68	36	30	32	35					

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	41%	56%	-15%	54%	-13%
04	2023 - Spring	64%	61%	3%	58%	6%
03	2023 - Spring	40%	53%	-13%	50%	-10%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	50%	62%	-12%	59%	-9%
04	2023 - Spring	57%	65%	-8%	61%	-4%
05	2023 - Spring	48%	58%	-10%	55%	-7%

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

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The greatest areas for improvement are SWD ELA, 25% percentile in ELA, and Science based on multiple assessment and ongoing data.

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

The component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was the learning gains of the lowest 25-percentile students.

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 learning gap in Science proficiency compared to the state average showed the greatest gap of 20% from the previous year. The contributing factor that contributed to the improvement was the laser focus on standards-based instruction.

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

According to the FSA 2021/2022 results Mathematics gains and the bottom 25% percentile showed the most improvement. Some of the contributing factors to the improvement in learning gains in Mathematics were additional support provided to the teacher during the initial instructional block and push-in support provided to targeted students.

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

Absenteeism is a potential area of concern that contributes to the number of students scoring a level 1 on the assessment.

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

1. Increase overall student proficiency.
2. Increase student proficiency for students with disabilities.

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 Early Warning System**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.

The number of students who are absent 10% or more days is closely correlated to the number of students scoring a level 1 on the FAST Assessment. This is a crucial need because if attendance improves then the number of students scoring a level 1 will decrease. To address the school-wide concern for literacy K-5 the school will increase the time of the instructional literacy block by providing direct instruction for 30 minutes.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to decrease student absenteeism by 20% by May 2024 as indicated by the Broward County Attendance Reporting System (Pinnacle).

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored by pulling monthly reports of students who display severe or chronic absences. Making contact with families to share attendance records and the impact it has on individual student achievement data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Terri Glasford (terri.glasford@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 being implemented for this Area of Focus is monthly attendance rewards for perfect attendance

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is to decrease the number of students experiencing chronic absenteeism.

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.

Beat the Bell-decrease tardiness

Person Responsible: Simone Johnson (simone.johnson@browardschools.com)

By When: September 11, 2023

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**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.

The school-wide ELA goal is to improve from 52% to 60% proficiency to increase student levels of understanding and comprehension across all academic areas (ie...Science and Social Studies)

Measurable Outcome:

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

According to the ELA FAST scores grade 3rd-5th Grade students performed at 52% proficiency. For the 2023-2024 school year, the school's ELA goal for improvement is 60%.

Monitoring:

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

The quality of instruction will be monitored daily, by walk-throughs, feedback, observations, and evaluating student evidence.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rhonda Parris (rhonda.parris@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 students will be provided small group instruction daily using the Benchmark Program Quick Checks according to students' areas of need (comprehension, fluency, and phonics).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting small group instruction is to address the various needs of the individual students. Provides an environment for learners to practice skills in a safe environment so that skills will be more rehearsed when applied in the "real" setting.

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.

Target students for differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible: Terri Glasford (terri.glasford@browardschools.com)

By When: October 1, 2023

#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.

As evidenced by the 2023 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST), students with disabilities scored

proficient in ELA was 29%. There is a sense of urgency to teach students foundational skills and comprehension strategies in grades K-5 to increase overall reading achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to increase the percentage of students with disabilities achieving proficiency in ELA from 29% to 40% by June 2024 as indicated by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST).

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring of students with disabilities ELA data will be conducted on a weekly/monthly basis. Unit assessments using the Benchmark Advance Curriculum and Assessment System in addition to I-Ready

will be administered to monitor students' progress with the standards taught. As a result of progress monitoring this data, professional learning communities' topic/focus will shift to support and meet the needs of the students. In addition, teachers will plan and adjust instruction based on data and student needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Simone Johnson (simone.johnson@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.)

We will continue to target SWD students for additional targeted small-group instruction focusing on ELA. The students will provided an extra double dose of instruction to address the specific area of student needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our SWD has made increases in all subject areas and would like to continue that progress toward proficiency. By increasing the amount of time students are engaged with text and direct instruction will provide students the opportunity to progress toward proficiency and develop background knowledge to support 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.

Develop a daily schedule that will allow an increase in the instructional block by 30 minutes.

Person Responsible: Terri Glasford (terri.glasford@browardschools.com)

By When: The schedule will be implemented by August 25.

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)).

Based on the PM3 Data on the Renaissance Assessment, more than 50% of students scored below grade level. As a result, teachers in grades K-2 will focus on standards-based instruction and early intervention. ELA instruction will be provided by utilizing the Science of Reading model in addition to the balanced-literacy approach (ie. Shared Reading, IRA, guided reading/writing, Writer's/reading workshop, etc). In addition, extended learning opportunities will be offered to students through push-in support, pullout support, and after-school camps/tutoring. Lastly, students who are not making adequate progress will be recommended to the Response to Intervention (RTI) team and possibly given an intervention to support learning.

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

Based on the PM3 Data on the Renaissance Assessment, more than 50% of students scored below grade level. As a result, teachers in grades K-2 will focus on standards-based instruction and early intervention. ELA instruction will be provided by utilizing the Science of Reading model in addition to the balanced-literacy approach (ie. Shared Reading, IRA, guided reading/writing, Writer's/reading workshop, etc). In addition, extended learning opportunities will be offered to students through push-in support, pullout support, and after-school camps/tutoring. Lastly, students who are not making adequate progress will be recommended to the Response to Intervention (RTI) team and possibly given an intervention to support learning.

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

Based on the results from the 2023 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking, 48% of the students in grades 3-5 were proficient. As a result, ELA instruction will be provided by utilizing the Science of Reading model in addition to the balanced-literacy approach (ie. Shared Reading, IRA, guided reading/writing, Writer's/reading workshop, etc.). In addition, extended learning opportunities will be offered to students through push-in support, pull-out support, and after-school camps/tutoring. Lastly, students who are not making adequate progress will be recommended to the Response to Intervention (RTI) team and possibly given an intervention to support learning.

Measurable Outcomes

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

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

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

By June 2023 our goal is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency in ELA by 10% as measured by the Early Literacy and STAR Reading Assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By June 2023 our goal is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency in ELA from 48% to 60% as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) PM3.

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.

Progress monitoring of students' ELA data will be conducted on a weekly/monthly basis. Unit assessments using the Benchmark Advance Curriculum and Assessment System and I-Ready will be administered to monitor students' progress with the standards taught. As a result of progress monitoring this

data, professional learning communities' topics/focus will shift to support and meet the needs of the students. In addition, teachers will plan and adjust instruction based on student needs.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Parris, Rhonda, rhonda.parris@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?

To achieve these goals, teachers will utilize the following evidence-based instructional resources to impact student learning.

- Benchmark Advance- Core curriculum
- Heggerty- Phonological Awareness
- Reading Horizons- explicit phonics instruction
- Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words (SIPPS)

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Benchmark Advance is the core curriculum designed for Tier 1 instruction. All students will receive Tier 1 standards based instruction. Heggerty is designed for students who need explicit instruction in the area of phonological awareness. These students are identified based on the letter names and sounds assessment. Reading Horizon is designed for students receiving Tier 2 instruction in the area of phonics. These students are identified based on the Cool Tools Assessment. Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words (SIPPS) will be provided to students who are receiving Tier 3 intervention. Students who are not responding to Tier 2 intervention will receive Tier 3 instruction. Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words (SIPPS) addresses the areas of vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.

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
Provide teachers with a day of planning to prepare lessons that increase the amount of time students are engaged in the text.	Glasford, Terri, terri.glasford@browardschools.com
Assessments- Benchmark Advance, Intervention Assessments, IReady Assessments	Johnson, Simone , simone.johnson@browardschools.com
Provide Professional Development that includes lessons that increase students' time engaged with text.	Glasford, Terri, terri.glasford@browardschools.com

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP Plan will be addressed and shared through our monthly SAC/SAF meetings. Monthly meeting dates, times, and agendas will be shared with families through flyers in their native language. The information will be shared via our school's website and social media pages.

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))

In addition to our monthly SAC/SAF meetings, there will be additional parent-family engagement programs and activities held quarterly to build positive relationships with parents, families, and community stakeholders. Parent-teacher conferences and report card nights will provide teachers the opportunity to share student academic progress.

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)

To strengthen the academic programs in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum for the Area of Focus is to offering additional pullout support groups and an enrichment afterschool tutorial program for students performing on and above grade level.

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))

Additional support groups and accelerated enrichment camps are developed under the Every Student Succeeds Act. Providing targeted support groups and enrichment camps will provide additional learning opportunities for all subgroups.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

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

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

Within the master schedule, grade levels have the opportunity to participate in the Life Skills class as a part of their rotation. Additionally, the school counselor has support groups where services are provided to meet the mental health, mentoring, and support strategies to improve student's skills outside of academics.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

In the elementary school setting, ensuring all students are receiving high-quality instruction is the foundation to postsecondary opportunities and the workforce.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

To prevent and address problem behaviors, CHAMPS is implemented school-wide. Teachers are required to implement a classroom behavior management system to address behaviors inside the classroom. Staff members serve as mentors to assist teachers in holding students accountable for their behaviors. For chronic or severe behavior concerns, teachers will begin the RTI process for behavior intervention. Parents are included in the decision-making process to address behavior concerns.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Professional development in behavior management, the Science of Reading, math instruction, and teaching science through reading are all areas of focus for teachers to be able to use data from academic assessments. Attending these professional learning sessions will assist with providing teachers the support to meet the demands of academic success. Providing coaching and support will help recruit and retain effective teachers.

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

Strategies used to assist preschool children transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs are addressed through community events like the annual Trunk or Treat. Also, our social media platforms are used to highlight happenings, offer tips and strategies to support students, and shine a spotlight on the effective teachers who service students daily.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes