Pompano Beach Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Pompano Beach Elementary School

700 NE 13TH AVE, Pompano Beach, FL 33060

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Shezette Blue Small

Start Date for this Principal: 10/1/2020

2019-20 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	95%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: D (32%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
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

Pompano Beach Elementary School strives to inspire a love of learning by meeting each child's academic, social, and emotional needs while challenging all students to become productive citizens in our ever-changing global community.

Provide the school's vision statement

At Pompano Beach Elementary our vision is to ensure equity throughout the educational and social environments through the use of diverse quality leadership and instructional approaches to classroom and social experiences.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Blue-Small, Shezette	Principal	To provide the leadership and managment necessary to administer and supervise all programs, policies and activities of the school to ensure high quality educational experiences and services for the students in a safe and enriching environment.
Foster, Shamelle	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach will provide personalized support based on identified needs of individual teachers and differentiated supports that foster the growth and development of teachers. In addition, the goal of the coach is to improve and sustain student achievement by promoting a culture for learning to include all stakeholders, by enhancing and refining instruction and intervention, providing targeted instructional coaching and building capacity across the curriculum.
Odom, Germaine	Assistant Principal	To assist the principal in providing vision and leadership to develop, administer and monitor high quality educational programs that optimize the human and material resources, including time and space, available for a successful and safe school program for students, staff and community.
Hibbert, Tonnie	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach will provide personalized support based on identified needs of individual teachers and differentiated supports that foster the growth and development of teachers. In addition, the goal of the coach is to improve and sustain student achievement by promoting a culture for learning to include all stakeholders, by enhancing and refining instruction and intervention, providing targeted instructional coaching and building capacity across the curriculum.
Monroe, Tiffany	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach will provide personalized support based on identified needs of individual teachers and differentiated supports that foster the growth and development of teachers. In addition, the goal of the coach is to improve and sustain student achievement by promoting a culture for learning to include all stakeholders, by enhancing and refining instruction and intervention, providing targeted instructional coaching and building capacity across the curriculum.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 10/1/2020, Shezette Blue Small

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*
0

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*
0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
30

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	95%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: D (32%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
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.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by 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	71	93	68	86	75	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	443
Attendance below 90 percent	22	14	15	10	16	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/1/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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	69	70	92	77	51	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	452
Attendance below 90 percent	5	8	13	13	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	9	10	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	1	4	16	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Prior Year - Updated

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	69	70	92	77	51	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	452
Attendance below 90 percent	5	8	13	13	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	9	10	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	1	4	16	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	37%	59%	57%	30%	56%	56%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Learning Gains	60%	60%	58%	42%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	54%	53%	57%	51%	48%
Math Achievement	50%	65%	63%	42%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains	66%	66%	62%	50%	60%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	53%	51%	38%	47%	47%
Science Achievement	31%	46%	53%	44%	49%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
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
03	2019	34%	60%	-26%	58%	-24%
	2018	32%	59%	-27%	57%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	48%	62%	-14%	58%	-10%
	2018	15%	58%	-43%	56%	-41%
Same Grade Comparison		33%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
05	2019	23%	59%	-36%	56%	-33%
	2018	36%	56%	-20%	55%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	51%	65%	-14%	62%	-11%
	2018	44%	63%	-19%	62%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	67%	-16%	64%	-13%
	2018	27%	63%	-36%	62%	-35%
Same Grade Comparison		24%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	42%	64%	-22%	60%	-18%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	47%	62%	-15%	61%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	28%	49%	-21%	53%	-25%
	2018	43%	51%	-8%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	19	49	48	30	56	57	15				
ELL	42	61	53	50	68	62	35				
BLK	32	60	58	48	65	60	31				
HSP	41	59	50	54	68	64	33				
WHT	45	58		45	62						
FRL	37	61	53	51	67	63	31				

2018 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	6	41	53	18	47	38	13				
ELL	14	28	50	37	42	20	36				
BLK	26	44	73	41	49	48	43				
HSP	35	47	36	45	50	23	38				
WHT	39	20		39	53		60				
FRL	30	42	56	43	50	37	43				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	51
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	409
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	53
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	50
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	53
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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	53
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	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Based on the 2018-2019 FSA data, Science achievement showed the lowest performance. This performance was an actual decrease from the prior year (44% to 31%). There were no apparent trends from one year to the next.

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

Based on the 2018-2019 FSA data, Science achievement also showed the greatest decline from the prior year. There were no apparent trends from one year to the next.

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

According to the 2018-2019 FSA data, the data component with the greatest gap compared to the state is our Science component. There were no apparent trends from one year to the next.

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

The 2018-2019 FSA data illustrated, Math Lowest 25th Percentile showed the most improvement. The strategy put in place was the pulling of small-groups in each grade-level weekly.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

One area of concern are our students whose attendance is below 90%.

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

1. Teacher Development in Instructional Practices
2. Teacher Development in the creation of standards-based lessons, activities, project-based, and class assignments.
3. Holding data chats with teachers after a common formative assessment is administered.
4. Progress monitoring of our MTSS
5. Strengthen the school-home connection

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teachers continue to need professional development on delivering high-quality instruction in order to increase student achievement and learning, implementation of rigorous standard-based lessons and activities, and technology integration.
Measureable Outcome:	By December 2020, 50% of students will be classified as Tier 1 and/or 2 on the iReady ELA AP2 Diagnostic.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Shezette Blue-Small (blue-small@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The implementation of the uncommon lesson plans which include explicit standards-based instruction to increase achievement in ELA, Math, and Science.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will receive professional learning courses from the Teacher Professional Learning and Growth (TPLG) Department, these courses for each content area will take place via Microsoft TEAMS throughout the school year. Teachers will then be able to analyze and determine the standards they need to address and delve deeper with their students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Leadership team to collect, monitor, and analyze student data to identify areas of gaps pertaining to standards. Based on this information teachers will receive professional learning training from the Elementary Learning Department, TPLG Department, and/or Cadre 8 Instructional Facilitators.
2. Based on areas of weakness, the leadership team will collaborate with teachers to implement research-based strategies and interventions needed to address areas of weakness continuing to develop strengths.
3. SchoolCity, iReady, and PBES data charts will be used to monitor student achievement and learning gains this will drive team and/or individual data chats, and instruction.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

To address the school-wide improvement area of focus, the leadership team will track & monitor students attendance and will implement a reward system for parents & students.

Part IV: 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 to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. 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.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Pompano Beach Elementary works extensively to build a positive school culture and environment for all stakeholders by implementing events and activities for all. For example, for the 2020-2021 school year the administrative team created a virtual space called Parents, Pepsi & Post Chats. Every Friday, for the month of September and once a month starting in the month of October, parents, teachers, and students. Stakeholders attend this forum to discuss various topics pertaining to the culture and environment of the school and parents provide feedback regarding various topics of concerns.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning				$15,423.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0751 - Pompano Beach Elementary School	Title, I Part A	0.0	$15,423.00
			Notes: Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO), IXL Site Licenses, Reflex Math Site Licenses, School City Site Licenses, instructional and supplemental materials, James Patterson Training, and Salary for substitutes to cover teacher classes who are attending training.			
					Total:	$15,423.00