

Broward County Public Schools

# Maplewood Elementary School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>17</b>

# Maplewood Elementary School

9850 RAMBLEWOOD DR, Coral Springs, FL 33071

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

Principal: Leena Itty

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (50%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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](http://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.

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>17</b>

## Maplewood Elementary School

9850 RAMBLEWOOD DR, Coral Springs, FL 33071

[ no web address on file ]

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	60%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	73%

### School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	C

### 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 school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://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.

Maplewood Elementary provides optimal learning experiences for all students in a respectful and safe environment.

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

Together Everyone Achieves More

### 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
Itty, Leena	Principal	The principal provides strategic direction in our school's system. The principal assesses teaching methods, monitors student achievement, encourages parent involvement, revises policies and procedures, and administers the school's budget.

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Leena Itty

**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.*

2

**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.*

9

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

46

#### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5

<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (50%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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	78	105	108	107	108	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	613
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

#### 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	9	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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

Tuesday 9/29/2020

#### 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	94	125	119	110	119	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	686
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	5	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

#### 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	0	1	0	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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	94	125	119	110	119	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	686
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	5	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	0	1	0	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

## 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	60%	59%	57%	53%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	60%	58%	49%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	54%	53%	31%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	62%	65%	63%	56%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	55%	66%	62%	50%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	53%	51%	31%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	46%	53%	35%	45%	51%

**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	59%	60%	-1%	58%	1%
	2018	60%	59%	1%	57%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	62%	-1%	58%	3%
	2018	58%	58%	0%	56%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	58%	59%	-1%	56%	2%
	2018	62%	56%	6%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	69%	65%	4%	62%	7%
	2018	62%	63%	-1%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	67%	-1%	64%	2%
	2018	60%	63%	-3%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	53%	64%	-11%	60%	-7%
	2018	52%	62%	-10%	61%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	50%	49%	1%	53%	-3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	52%	51%	1%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	27	34	50	29	40	45	25				
ELL	59	61	62	68	68	80	67				
ASN	77			85							
BLK	48	48	45	43	46	48	50				
HSP	64	70	55	73	61	44	53				
MUL	47	70		40	50						
WHT	66	56		72	59		54				
FRL	52	59	51	51	50	46	48				
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	38	52	50	33	49	39	50				
ELL	65	77		53	62						
BLK	49	53	53	48	52	37	54				
HSP	63	67	67	59	60	47	51				
MUL	60	60		50	60						
WHT	69	58	46	70	63	50	57				
FRL	55	61	55	52	56	37	45				
2017 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	22	37	25	20	24	13	17				
ELL	63	56		54	44						
ASN	70			70							
BLK	44	39	15	40	39	28	25				
HSP	54	51	37	56	47	20	33				
WHT	58	55	42	64	60	50	42				
FRL	48	45	24	50	45	29	29				

### 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	58
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	83
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	467
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	69
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	81
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
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	63

Hispanic Students	
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	52
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial 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	61
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	55
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.**

Our lowest area of performance was in the Math bottom quartile. This year, we were 12% below district and 10% below the state. This data has been trending as our lowest performing since 2016-167. Contributing factors are inconsistent implementation of small group- differentiated instruction, inadequate intervention programs and knowledge of the standards.

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

Both math learning gains and math lowest 25% learning gains showed a significant decline from the prior year's data. The data shows a 7% decrease from 2017-2018. The primary factors related to this decline was inexperienced teachers in 5th grade. Of the three 5th grade teachers had a single year of experience teaching 5th

grade math/science. Without consistent, rigorous support, the teachers were unable to bridge the experience gap.

**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.**

Our lowest area of performance was in Math L25%. This year, we were 12 % below district and 10% below the state. This cell has been trending as our lowest performing since 2016. Some of the factors are inconsistent implementation of small group- differentiated instruction, and limited remedial instructional material

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

Our ELA showed the greatest gains from the previous year. The school was implemented Balanced Literacy in the classes and determined which students needed interventions. In addition, we continued our departmentalized structure in 4th and 5th grade, which allowed our teachers to continue to build the experience and effective cooperative learning structures.

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

Our area of concern is SWD. While our ELA LG increased and ELA L25% showed strong improvement, our increase for ELA was only 1 %. In Math, learning gains declined, with 5% in math and 6% with the lowest 25%.

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

1. Math Lowest 25%
2. Math Learning gains
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

<b>Area of Focus</b>	
<b>Description and Rationale:</b>	Lack of differentiation strategies being implemented consistently
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	To increase the number of Student with Disabilities (SWD) performing at the proficient achievement level or higher on the FSAA Assessment/FSA in ELA and Math.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Leena Itty (leena.itty@browardschools.com)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Review weekly lesson plans and provide feedback Provide professional development on differentiation strategies Provide support to teachers using an Academic Coach and professional learning communities
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	The overall percentage of Student with Disabilities (SWD) will increase their performance to proficient. Professional development on building rigor, relevance, and relationships. FSA and FSAA was used to determine the area of need

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Case managers will provide weekly review of student progress and recommend support as needed.
2. Engage in weekly collaborative planning sessions
3. Conduct monthly learning walks

**Person Responsible** Leena Itty (leena.itty@browardschools.com)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**Teachers will receive ongoing instructional support with differentiated instruction. collaborative planning, and student engagement. Leadership will monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards based instruction**

- Provided school-based coaching support in collaborative planning
- Monitor implementation of daily small group, differentiated instruction practices.

**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.

Parents, families and community stakeholders will be invited and encouraged to become active members of the School Advisory Council (SAC). At the SAC meetings, these stakeholders will be provided information regarding the school's Title 1 allocation (inclusive of professional development and parent involvement allotments). They will be allowed to provide input in the development and decision-making process of all Title 1 activities related to the school. An annual evaluation will be conducted using surveys completed by parents, staff, and students. The results will be analyzed to evaluate the effectiveness of the school's parent involvement program.

#### **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**

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

<b>1</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>