

Broward County Public Schools

Liberty 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	18
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	19
VI. Title I Requirements	21
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	22

Liberty Elementary School

2450 BANKS RD, Margate, FL 33063

[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.

Liberty's mission statement is: "to prepare our students to become critical thinking problem-solvers who will compete in a global society by facilitating an engaging & challenging learning environment in which they work cooperatively to gain real-world experiences through a rigorous curriculum including the application of science, technology, engineering and mathematics".

Provide the school's vision statement.

Liberty's vision statement is: "to educate today's students 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
Flournoy, Vicki	Principal	Serve as instructional leader, monitor student data, engage stakeholders and collaborate in the school's decision making processes. Implements and monitors safety procedures.
Styles, Donna	Assistant Principal	Serve as instructional leader, monitor student data, engage stakeholders and collaborate in the school's decision making processes. Implements and monitors safety procedures.
Nurrito, Lisa	Other	Ensures compliance and acts as the case manager for students with exceptional learning needs; work collaboratively with our Autism Coach to ensure teacher and student needs are met and students are instructed within a safe and effective learning environment; Chair of the School Advisory Council and facilitates the monitoring of the School Improvement Plan; monitors and facilitates the MTSS/ Rtl committee.
Bishop, Lauren	Reading Coach	Instructional coach; work with classroom teachers modeling best practices and delivering ELA updates, deliver staff development, monitor classroom data, facilitate Professional Learning Communities, extended learning opportunities camps, work with ESSER teachers.

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 school leadership team meets bi-monthly to review school achievement data and determine areas of focus. The team determines the areas with the greatest achievement gaps. Data and other pertinent information are shared and discussed during monthly School Advisory Council meetings. Our SIP is developed accordingly based on input from school staff, parents, and community members in order to ensure that the areas of need are addressed accordingly based on the most current achievement data.

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))

During monthly School Advisory Council meetings, the School Improvement Plan is monitored and stakeholder input is obtained. The school leadership team meets bi-monthly to review school achievement data and determine areas of focus. Revisions are made based on the most current student data to ensure continuous academic achievement.

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	89%
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) 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: C
	2019-20: C
	2018-19: C
	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	40	53	38	34	38	44	0	0	0	247	
One or more suspensions	1	2	2	3	5	13	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	29	31	31	29	30	48	0	0	0	198	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	20	26	35	34	40	0	0	0	155	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	53	44	55	55	44	0	0	0	253	

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	15	49	43	44	42	56	0	0	0	249

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	3	3	3	9	4	2	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	5

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	53	44	45	55	47	47	0	0	0	291	
One or more suspensions	1	2	0	8	8	10	0	0	0	29	
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	33	40	49	0	0	0	122	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	39	46	56	0	0	0	141	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	55	25	30	27	27	0	0	0	164	

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	29	7	33	56	64	0	0	0	189

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	1	22	1	1	0	0	0	27
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	53	44	45	55	47	47	0	0	0	291	
One or more suspensions	1	2	0	8	8	10	0	0	0	29	
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	33	40	49	0	0	0	122	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	39	46	56	0	0	0	141	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	55	25	30	27	27	0	0	0	164	

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	29	7	33	56	64	0	0	0	189

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	1	22	1	1	0	0	0	27
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*	45	56	53	48	58	56	41		
ELA Learning Gains				57			46		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51			44		
Math Achievement*	53	62	59	50	54	50	30		
Math Learning Gains				70			38		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				70			26		
Science Achievement*	35	48	54	25	59	59	31		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					60	52			
Graduation Rate					45	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	57	59	59	57			68		

* 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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	238
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	428
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	32	Yes	4	
ELL	41			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	47			
HSP	44			
MUL	45			
PAC				
WHT	56			

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	45			

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	28	Yes	3	1
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN	78			
BLK	48			
HSP	61			
MUL	49			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	50			

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	45			53			35					57
SWD	24			29			8				5	73
ELL	41			49			35				5	57
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41			50			36				5	63
HSP	47			53			24				5	51
MUL	38			52							2	

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	56			61			50				3	
FRL	42			48			32				5	58

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	48	57	51	50	70	70	25					57
SWD	17	29	30	20	38	54	9					
ELL	42	56	63	48	67	56	17					57
AMI												
ASN	73			82								
BLK	44	50	38	45	69	68	19					53
HSP	48	72	73	51	73	80	28					64
MUL	50	57		43	76		18					
PAC												
WHT	59	67		60	68		45					
FRL	42	53	47	45	71	67	20					56

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	41	46	44	30	38	26	31					68
SWD	12	38	39	14	32	19	13					
ELL	34	36	36	18	28	27	9					68
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38	45	37	28	35	18	25					71
HSP	37	33	40	29	41	40	31					71
MUL	50			32								
PAC												
WHT	53	61		35	39		53					
FRL	38	43	44	28	35	28	27					68

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	38%	56%	-18%	54%	-16%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	61%	-6%	58%	-3%
03	2023 - Spring	45%	53%	-8%	50%	-5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	58%	62%	-4%	59%	-1%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	65%	-3%	61%	1%
05	2023 - Spring	45%	58%	-13%	55%	-10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	34%	46%	-12%	51%	-17%

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, students performed lowest in English Language Arts (Intermediate). A contributing factor we are targeting is teachers needed additional professional learning opportunities in best practices for instruction.

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

English Language Arts Intermediate dropped 2% points in large part due to a need for differentiated instruction.

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.

Data indicates our school performed 8 percentage points below the state average in ELA. Teachers need additional support in differentiating instruction to meet the individual needs of students. A review of lesson plans indicate the great majority of teachers were providing the same instruction for all of their students..

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

Science proficiency increased 9 percentage points. Fifth grade teachers implemented a science intervention plan to address skills not taught in previous grade levels.

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

The percentage of Level 1 performance across grade levels is high.

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

1. Differentiate instruction in reading.
2. Differentiate instruction in mathematics.
3. Provide science instruction daily.
4. Engage in meaningful Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Teacher survey in August 2023 indicated morale was low through most of the 2022-23 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June 2024, 80% percentage of staff will indicate they are experiencing a positive increase in morale

Monitoring:

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

A staff morale survey will be provided quarterly to determine if morale is increasing.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Vicki Flourney (vicki.flourney@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.)

Incorporate Faculty Life Skills & Wellness activities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The strategy will promote relationship skills, resiliency, responsible decision making, and self-awareness and self management skills which will all support increased morale.

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.

Schedule Faculty Meetings that incorporate Life Skills & Wellness activities.

Person Responsible: Vicki Flourney (vicki.flourney@browardschools.com)

By When: August 14, 2023

Provide a quarterly survey to determine effectiveness of intervention.

Person Responsible: Vicki Flourney (vicki.flourney@browardschools.com)

By When: October 31, 2023

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

Differentiate instruction in reading and mathematics across grade levels.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June 2024, 70% of instruction in reading and mathematics will be facilitated through small group instruction.

Monitoring:

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

Classroom observations and review off lesson plans will be utilized to monitor desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Donna Styles (donna.styles@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.)

Differentiated Instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Individual students' needs can be met by differentiating instruction

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

#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.

The Students with Disabilities subgroup has performed below other subgroups for the last three years.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June 2024, the Students with Disabilities subgroup will increase in proficiency by 15% as measured by the PM3 FAST ELA.

Monitoring:

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

Data Review sessions will be conducted to monitor progress.

Classroom observations and lesson plans will be reviewed to ensure differentiated instruction is being utilized to target individual student needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Nurrito (lisa.nurrito@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.)

Differentiated instruction will be utilized to tailor instruction to the needs of students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By providing targeted instruction, students will receive remediation in the subject areas they are struggling in.

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 2 - Moderate 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

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Each month, the School Improvement Team meets to review available funding and determine areas of focus. After careful review of student data and analyzing available resources, the team collaborates to identify best practices, strategies and targets. Implementation and allocation of funds is based on student needs. Students are grouped to maximize resources.

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

Evidence of phonemic awareness and phonics deficiencies across grades Kindergarten through Second. Will continue to increase instruction in phonemic awareness and phonics foundational skills utilizing district-approved resources as well as provide daily ESSER support.

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

Evidence of phonics and comprehension skill deficiencies across grades Third through Fifth. Increased small-group instruction according to student-specific deficiencies. ESSER support increased

Measurable Outcomes

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

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

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

By June 2024, our lowest-performing students will demonstrate a 10% increase in overall ELA proficiency as evidenced by our statewide assessments.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By June 2024, our lowest-performing students will demonstrate a 10% increase in overall ELA proficiency as evidenced by our statewide assessments.

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.

Students will be assessed at the end of the learning cycle using a skills-based formative assessment. Progress Monitoring meetings will be conducted to review data and determine action plans for every grade level every 6 weeks.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Flournoy, Vicki, vicki.flournoy@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?

Classroom teachers and reading interventionists utilize programs such as Benchmark Advance, Reading Horizons, Wilson Foundations, and Leveled Literacy Interventions. These programs align with the district's Comprehensive Reading Plan and align to the BEST ELA standards.

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?

Intervention programs align with the district's Comprehensive Reading Plan and align to the BEST ELA standards.

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
Students will be progress monitored after each learning cycle using a skills-based formative assessment in addition to academic intervention progress monitoring tools and a Growth-Monitoring assessment. Data will be reviewed by the Progress Monitoring Team to determine action plans.	Flournoy, Vicki, vicki.flournoy@browardschools.com
Literacy Leadership and Coaching- Continuous leadership and coaching support, classroom walk-throughs, monthly PLC sessions, and regularly scheduled Professional Development opportunities.	Styles, Donna, donna.styles@browardschools.com
Professional Development/Learning Opportunities are provided to teachers at a minimum of once per month. Teachers engage in Professional Learning Communities that align with learning cycles twice per month to go through the CARE cycle.	Bishop, Lauren, lauren.bishop@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.

<https://www.browardschools.com/liberty>

SAC Meetings will include a review and update on our SIP progress. Translators will be present when possible.

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))

<https://www.browardschools.com/liberty>

Parents are encouraged to participate in the school's SAC, SAF, PTA and Positive Behavior Committee.

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)

Instructional staff will continue to participate in Professional Learning Communities and Professional Development opportunities. Designated instructional times will be utilized with fidelity alongside research-based and district-approved academic interventions and curriculum. Protecting the learning environment is a school-wide priority.

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))

Title I Funds will be utilized to provide extended learning opportunities for both acceleration and enrichment.

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: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$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.

No