# Deerfield Beach Elementary School

**2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan**

## Table of Contents

# Deerfield Beach Elementary School

650 NE 1ST ST, Deerfield Beach, FL 33441

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

## Principal: Andrew Gerlach

Start Date for this Principal: 2/8/2017

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2021-22 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 75% |
| **2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students*<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2021-22: C (50%)<br><br>2020-21: (32%)<br><br>2018-19: C (52%)<br><br>2017-18: D (39%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Southeast |
| **Regional Executive Director** | [LaShawn Russ-Porterfield](LaShawn Russ-Porterfield) |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | |
| **ESSA Status** | TS&I |

| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here. |
| --- |

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

## 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 Florida Department of Education 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.

# Part I: School Information

## School Mission and Vision

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

Deerfield Beach Elementary School is committed to inspiring, connecting, and challenging all students to reach their highest potential.

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

At Deerfield Beach Elementary, we are committed to our students, families, and the Deerfield Beach community by inspiring, creating, and fostering lifelong, respectful learners and leaders in a warm and welcoming environment that is safe, secure, and includes multi-sensory, hands-on, and innovative approaches to meet all learners.

## School Leadership Team

**Membership**
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.**:**

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities | |
|------|----------------|-------------------------------|---|
| Gerlach, Andrew | Principal | | The school principal will effectively perform the performance responsibilities using the following knowledge, skills, and abilities to: provide instructional leadership for all educational programs at the school, prepare and manage the school's budget and manage and inventory the school's assets; to read, interpret, follow and enforce the State Board Rules, Code of Ethics, School Board policies, and other state and federal laws; use effective interview techniques, coaching procedures, and evaluation procedures; enforce collective bargaining agreements; use effective public speaking skills, group dynamics, and interaction and problem solving skills; maintain a sensitivity to multicultural issues; perceive the impact of a decision on other components of the organization; communicate effectively, both orally and in writing, and through the use of technology; and analyze the use of data. The school principal will need knowledge and understanding of the unique needs and characteristics of school system. |
| Laplante, Aaron | Assistant Principal | | 1. Exercise proactive leadership in promoting the vision and mission of the Distract's Strategic Plan. 2. Utilize collaborative leadership style and quality processes to establish and monitor a school mission and goals that are aligned with the District's mission and goals through active participation of stakeholders' involvement in the school improvement process with SAC and SAF. 3. Assist in achieving expected results on the school's student learning goals. 4. Direct energy, influence and resources toward data analysis for instructional improvement, development, and implementation of quality standards-based curricula. 5. Demonstrate that student learning is a top priority through leadership actions and support a learning organization focused on school success. 6. Assist in recruiting, retaining, developing, and evaluating an effective and diverse faculty and staff. 7. Assist in establishing and coordinating procedures for student, teacher, parent and community evaluation of curriculum. |
| Gull, Julie | Other | ESE Specialist | The ESE Specialist Field Coach will provide personalized support based on identified needs of individual school-based ESE Specialist and differentiated supports that foster the growth and development of school-based ESE Specialists. Also, coaches will work collaboratively, build skills, analyze data, examine needs |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | related to professional practice and engage in peer coaching with school-based ESE Specialists. The position provides consistence in services throughout the Distract to meet student needs, sustain or improve students achievement through the development of appropriate IEPs, promote a culture of learning to include all stakeholders by enhancing the performance of ESE Specialists and providing targeted coaching while building capacity for ESE Specialists. |
| Davis, Asia | Guidance Counselor | | The Elementary Guidance Counselor shall establish small group counseling sessions, counsel students on personal and academic concerns and notify parents as deemed necessary, provide materials and suggestions for classroom oriented guidance activities, arrange student, parent, and teacher conferences, acquaint students new to school with teachers, facilities, and programs to help them adjust to their new environment, assist in the early identification of students for proper educational placement, such as exceptional child, federal and bilingual programs, work with parent groups in the area of child growth, development, and discipline, meet with teachers to present and explain the results of various testing programs, assist teachers in effective utilization of test results, gather information form all faculty members having contact with a student being considered for referral. |
| Rothberger, Deborah | Instructional Coach | | The Reading Coach will support all K-6 staff in the implementation of the site reading plan and program. The Coach will work 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 will focus 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. Responsibilities: 1. Guide teachers to collect and analyze data and develop action plans in response to determined student needs. 2. Provide individualized, classroom-based support to implement comprehensive program. This will include modeling of best teaching practices. |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|----------------|--------------------------------|
|      |                | 3. Work with the principals within the grantee site to create a school-wide focus on goals for reading achievement. 4. Oversee the school's assessment procedure, training, data collection and collaborate with the principal to complete reports due. 5. Complete monthly status reports for the district administrators and Reading First Coordinator. 6. Participate fully in professional development opportunities and professional research and reading. |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Wednesday 2/8/2017, Andrew Gerlach

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

8

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

33

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

593

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.**

3

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.**

5

**Demographic Data**

## Early Warning Systems

**Using prior year's 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 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 107 | 83 | 113 | 96 | 87 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 581 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 43 | 25 | 35 | 39 | 20 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 189 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 24 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 33 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 10 | 13 | 31 | 37 | 27 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 163 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 8 | 11 | 15 | 43 | 35 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 155 |

**Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 8 | 8 | 10 | 22 | 13 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 9/1/2022

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 73 | 115 | 89 | 91 | 97 | 93 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 558 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 27 | 34 | 24 | 19 | 19 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 143 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 3 | 17 | 30 | 28 | 30 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 140 |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 5 | 9 | 20 | 17 | 14 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 4 | 5 | 11 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 73 | 115 | 89 | 91 | 97 | 93 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 558 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 27 | 34 | 24 | 19 | 19 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 143 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 3 | 17 | 30 | 28 | 30 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 140 |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 5 | 9 | 20 | 17 | 14 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 4 | 5 | 11 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

**School Data Review**
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component | 2022 | | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 42% | 58% | 56% | 43% | | | 51% | 59% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 64% | 66% | 61% | 43% | | | 66% | 60% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 60% | 56% | 52% | 50% | | | 58% | 54% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 40% | 59% | 60% | 27% | | | 54% | 65% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 64% | 72% | 64% | 20% | | | 60% | 66% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 53% | 63% | 55% | 21% | | | 41% | 53% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 28% | 45% | 51% | 21% | | | 31% | 46% | 53% |

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**
**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 37% | 60% | -23% | 58% | -21% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 53% | 62% | -9% | 58% | -5% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -37% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 53% | 59% | -6% | 56% | -3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -53% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 52% | 65% | -13% | 62% | -10% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 51% | 67% | -16% | 64% | -13% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -52% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 51% | 64% | -13% | 60% | -9% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -51% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 30% | 49% | -19% | 53% | -23% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

## Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 SCHOOL GRADE 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 |
| SWD | 22 | 55 | 45 | 20 | 50 | 47 | 30 | | | | |
| ELL | 37 | 69 | 74 | 35 | 67 | 63 | 22 | | | | |
| BLK | 34 | 49 | | 31 | 65 | 60 | 20 | | | | |
| HSP | 44 | 68 | 59 | 41 | 65 | 55 | 32 | | | | |
| MUL | | | | 10 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 51 | 71 | | 60 | 66 | | 33 | | | | |
| FRL | 35 | 60 | 57 | 34 | 63 | 52 | 24 | | | | |

| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE 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 |
| SWD | 19 | 37 | 50 | 17 | 19 | 17 | 7 | | | | |
| ELL | 42 | 62 | | 25 | 30 | | 19 | | | | |
| BLK | 32 | 42 | 55 | 16 | 13 | | 7 | | | | |
| HSP | 47 | 55 | | | 30 | 30 | | 20 | | | |
| WHT | 53 | 29 | | 38 | 20 | | 38 | | | | |
| FRL | 40 | 42 | 50 | 24 | 17 | 25 | 15 | | | | |

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 12 | 54 | 56 | 25 | 51 | 39 | 9 | | | | |
| ELL | 46 | 59 | 44 | 53 | 55 | 35 | 25 | | | | |
| BLK | 36 | 60 | 59 | 44 | 57 | 39 | 21 | | | | |
| HSP | 49 | 65 | 50 | 54 | 58 | 44 | 27 | | | | |
| WHT | 62 | 75 | 73 | 65 | 65 | 30 | 46 | | | | |
| FRL | 46 | 64 | 59 | 52 | 57 | 41 | 29 | | | | |

## ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 52 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 66 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 417 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 42 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **English Language Learners** | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 54 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

| English Language Learners | |
|---|---|
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Asian Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Black/African American Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 43 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Hispanic Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 54 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Multiracial Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 10 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 1 |

| Native American Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Pacific Islander Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| White Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - White Students | 57 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 49 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Data Analysis**
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

**What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?**

The trends that emerged was that our overall our ELA learning gains went up by 21% from the previous year. Our lowest 25th percentile also made a 10% gain increase. In our subgroups, our students with learning disabilities proficiency increased by 2 points, but our learning gains increased by 18 points. Our data showed that our ELL's ELA achievement decreased by 5 points and learning gains decreased by 7 points. Both SWD and ELL's made gains in math and science.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?**

Our greatest need for improvement is our economically disadvantaged students to improve overall ELA proficiency. We also want to work with our ELL's and SWD to increase their overall ELA proficiency.

**What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?**

Contributing factors were attendance and the amount of student tardies. We are addressing this concern with staying on top and monitoring students attendance and sending out guidance or social referrals when there is a concern for specific students.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

The two components that showed the most improvement were ELA Learning Gains and ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains.

**What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

We revamped data collection and what we use the data for. We also integrated new ELO's, and instructional cycle, and i-Ready. We also incorporated multiple push-in instructional groups.

**What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?**

We will continue to implement every facet of our 2022-2023 State SIP and continue to progress monitor and adjust based on School City Data, I-Ready data, teacher/student feedback, and BAS levels.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

The professional development opportunities to support were a new Benchmark Assessment training to ensure that staff are testing students equally and fairly, Professional Learning Communities are used to learn and utilize the new Benchmarks Advance reading curriculum and how to correctly use it in conjunction with the current ELA Florida standards, and teachers are utilizing the Microsoft Academy programs. Professional Learning opportunities for math are being provided by the seasons of learning through the county as well as in the PLC based per grade level. Our math contact is providing center activities and PD based on data and standards.

**Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.**

We have increased staff to provide additional support to our SWD learners as well as our ELL/ESE students. This provides our students with more tiered instruction. Teachers will continue to use our instructional cycles to help drive instruction as well as small group instruction.

**Areas of Focus**
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

**:**

| #1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**<br>**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | SWD Proficiency for ELA and Math<br><br>Students in this category performed definitively below our school average. These students need to continue to develop and meet the state expectations. |
| **Measurable Outcome:**<br>**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | Overall, the SWD sub-group will increase their proficiency levels by 10% as measured on the ELA and Math FAST assessments in May of 2023. |
| **Monitoring:**<br>**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | SWD subgroup will receive push-in instruction based on deficient standards as measured by School-City instructional cycle assessments. This data will also drive our ELO curriculum, Walk to Read groupings, and our whole and small group instruction. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Andrew Gerlach (dgerlach@browardschools.com) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:**<br>**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** | SWD subgroup will receive push-in instruction based on deficient standards as measured by FAST assessments, Benchmark Advanced unit tests, and teacher informal observations. This data will also drive our ELO curriculum, Walk to Read groupings, and our whole and small group instruction. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**<br>**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.** | By using the first two diagnostic FAST assessments, Benchmark Advance unit assessments, and Savvas Success Maker data to measure student progress and deficiencies, grade levels and administration and prescribe appropriate and effective lessons to be address those areas. |

**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.

Teacher will participate in data chats on a weekly rotation during their team meetings.

| **Person Responsible** | Andrew Gerlach (dgerlach@browardschools.com) |
|---|---|

Coaches will check on progress monitoring with teachers on consistent basis using Benchmark Advanced and Savvas Success Maker.

| **Person Responsible** | Deborah Rothberger (deborah.rothberger@browardschools.com) |
|---|---|

Teacher will provide differentiation of Prodigy and EnVision lessons for students, and targeted support through Success Maker and Benchmark Advanced toolbox with Coach Support.

| **Person Responsible** | Aaron Laplante (aaron.laplante@browardschools.com) |
|---|---|

Teacher will provide Walk to Read interventions daily.

| **Person Responsible** | Deborah Rothberger (deborah.rothberger@browardschools.com) |
|---|---|

Push in lessons will be provided by paraprofessionals, support staff and administrators daily.

| **Person Responsible** | Andrew Gerlach (dgerlach@browardschools.com) |
|---|---|

ELO Camps will be provided for lowest quartile and SWD students with a focus on data based targeted standards 10-12 weeks, 2x/week.

**Person Responsible**          Jessica Desrosiers (jessica.desrosiers@browardschools.com)

Instruction will be grouped by ability and needs (not ages/grade), based on progress monitoring data.

**Person Responsible**          Deborah Rothberger (deborah.rothberger@browardschools.com)

| #2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. | Economically Disadvantaged students proficiency for ELA and Math  Students in this category performed definitively below our school average. These students need to continue to develop and meet the state expectations. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. | Overall, the Economically Disadvantaged students sub-group will increase proficiency levels by 10% as measured on the ELA AND Math FAST assessments in May, 2023. |
| **Monitoring:** Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. | The Economically Disadvantaged students subgroup will receive push-in instruction based on deficient standards as measured by FAST assessments, Benchmark Advanced unit tests, and teacher informal observations. This data will also drive our ELO curriculum, Walk to Read groupings, and our whole and small group instruction. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Andrew Gerlach (dgerlach@browardschools.com) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. | The Economically Disadvantaged students subgroup will receive push-in instruction based on deficient standards as measured by FAST assessments, Benchmark Advanced unit tests, and teacher informal observations. This data will also drive our ELO curriculum, Walk to Read groupings, and our whole and small group instruction. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy. | By using the first two diagnostic FAST assessments, Benchmark Advance unit assessments, and Savvas Success Maker data to measure student progress and deficiencies, grade levels and administration and prescribe appropriate and effective lessons to be address those areas. |

**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.

Teacher will participate in data chats on a weekly rotation during their team meetings.

| **Person Responsible** | Andrew Gerlach (dgerlach@browardschools.com) |
|---|---|

Coaches will check on progress monitoring with teachers on a consistent basis using Benchmark Advanced and Savvas Success Maker.

| **Person Responsible** | Deborah Rothberger (deborah.rothberger@browardschools.com) |
|---|---|

Teacher will provide differentiation of Prodigy and EnVision lessons for students, and targeted support through Success Maker and Benchmark Advanced toolbox with Coach Support.

| **Person Responsible** | Aaron Laplante (aaron.laplante@browardschools.com) |
|---|---|

Walk to Read interventions daily.

| **Person Responsible** | Deborah Rothberger (deborah.rothberger@browardschools.com) |
|---|---|

Push in lessons will be provided by paraprofessionals, support staff and administrators daily.

| **Person Responsible** | Andrew Gerlach (dgerlach@browardschools.com) |

ELO Camps will be provided for lowest quartile and SWD students with a focus on data based targeted standards 10-12 weeks, 2x/week.

| **Person Responsible** | Jessica Desrosiers (jessica.desrosiers@browardschools.com) |

Group all instruction by ability and needs not ages/grade

| **Person Responsible** | Deborah Rothberger (deborah.rothberger@browardschools.com) |

## RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

### 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

The percentage of students in grades k-2 that scored below level was 68% not proficient. One of our main struggles is developing the mechanics of a high quality reader with parent support at home to reinforce our lessons at school. Over the last two years, we have had an influx of ELL learners and also increased challenges with attendance. We are creating more push-in and pull-out groups to support these students to bridge that gap. We are also working hand-in-hand with our social worker and attendance manager to carefully monitor and ensure students are in classrooms. To continue to develop strong readers, we are working through PLC's, we have added a primary reading coach, and also continue to implement intensive Tier 2 and Tier 3 small group instruction.

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

The percentage of students that scored below a level 3 on the FSA was 59%. We believe one of the main reasons behind this was the fact that many of our students are still reading below grade level and are struggling with the mechanics of reading (i.e. phonics, fluency, decoding, etc.). We firmly believe that providing extra instruction through centers, small group, and Tier 2 and 3 interventions will continue to alleviate and increase grade level proficiency. We will accomplish this through a protected Walk to Read time where students will receive 30 minutes of extra instruction based on their areas of weakness,

continue with Tier 2 and 3 pull outs with a highly qualified reading teacher, and push-ins with extra support staff based on areas of weakness.

**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 new 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: Measureable Outcome(s)**

Our Overall ELA proficiency will increase 5% as measured on the summative FAST assessment administered during the third testing window in May of 2023.

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

Our Overall ELA proficiency will increase 10% as measured on the summative FAST assessment administered during the third testing window in May of 2023.

**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 take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Our students will receive push-in instruction based on weak standards as measured by FAST assessment, benchmark advanced unit assessments, and teacher non-formal observations. This data will also drive our ELO curriculum, Walk to Read groupings, and our whole and small group instruction.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Gerlach, Andrew, dgerlach@browardschools.com

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**
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. Â§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?

We are implementing small group instruction through research-based programs at levels to continue to stretch their growth (Vygotsky). These practices do align because we are instructing students on the mechanics of reading through research based programs (i.e. Phonics for Reading, Reading Horizons, LLI, etc.).

**Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific 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 practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

By using the first two diagnostic FAST assessments, Benchmark Advanced unit assessments, and Savvas Success Maker data to measure student progress and deficiencies, grade levels and administration and prescribe appropriate and effective lessons to be address those areas.

**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 |
|---|---|
| ELA we will use FAST assessments and our Benchmark Advanced unit assessments to measure student growth. For Math, we will utilize EnVision Topic Unit assessments and Savvas Success Maker to measure student growth. | Gerlach, Andrew, dgerlach@browardschools.com |
| Coaches will check on progress monitoring with teachers on consistent basis | Rothberger, Deborah, deborah.rothberger@browardschools.com |
| ELO Camps (specific standards prescribed by FAST first round results, recruiting lowest quartile and SWD students to attend through parent communication, monitoring of attendance, 10-12 weeks 2x/week) | Gerlach, Andrew, dgerlach@browardschools.com |

## Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

**Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.**

Deerfield Beach Elementary (DBES) will utilize multiple modalities to communicate and engage our parents in the educational process. Parents will be informed of school events through the school's website, twitter page, parent links, teacher specific remind app pages, and traditional flyers. Throughout the year, we will offer multiple opportunities to engage parents and the community in the educational process.

DBES hosts an annual Literacy night, technology night, Science night, and Math night. This year, we will look to partner with our local businesses to host two family conference nights. To increase parent participation during parent-teacher conferences, our school will partner up with some of our local restaurants to provide low-cost dinners for purchase, as an incentive for our working parents. We will work with local community groups including Rotary and Kiwanis and the Deerfield Beach Education Advisory Board to communicate our vision out to our communities.

**Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.**

School Advisory Council chair acts like a liaison between our parents, staff, teachers, administration, and our community leaders. Through her role as SAC chair- she conducts meetings keeping everyone informed as well as bringing up issues that may arise. We conduct votes on how to use our school accountability funds as well as keep the parents informed on what is happening with our school improvement plan.

Principal and Assistant principal build business relationships as they are actively present in the community. They represent our school. They advocate for our students and staff. They conduct themselves in a positive way to ensure we have a healthy and positive school culture.