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## Thurgood Marshall Elementary School

## Principal: Michael Billins

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2013

| 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 |
| 2020-21 Title I School | Yes |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100\% |
| 2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented <br> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (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> Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2018-19: } D(40 \%) \\ & \text { 2017-18: C }(44 \%) \\ & \text { 2016-17: C }(41 \%) \end{aligned}$ |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* |  |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year |  |
| Support Tier |  |
| ESSA Status |  |
| * 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\&l:

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 noncharter 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.
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## Thurgood Marshall Elementary School

800 NW 13TH ST, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33311
[ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

## School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)

Elementary School PK-5

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)

K-12 General Education

## 2020-21 Title I School

Yes

Charter School

No

2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)

86\%

2018-19 Minority Rate
(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)

School Grades History

| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | $2018-19$ | $2017-18$ <br> Grade |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | D | D |  |

## 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 noncharter 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.

At Thurgood Marshall Elementary Health and Environmental Wellness School, our MISSION is to ensure that all students attain maximum academic achievement while maintaining our dedication to providing a safe caring environment. We embrace high expectations with an emphasis on a healthy lifestyle for all students and staff.

Provide the school's vision statement.
Be healthy, be active and be ready to achieve your goals by learning today and leading tomorrow.

## School Leadership Team

## Membership

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

Name | Position |
| :---: |
| Title |$\quad$ Job Duties and Responsibilities

Billins, Principal Responsible for providing instructional leadership and managing all aspects of Michael

Principal the school environment (operational, budget, community involvement, etc).

Turner, Assistant Responsible for providing instructional leadership and managing all aspects of Lori Principal the school environment (operational, budget, community involvement, etc).

Bloomfield Reading , Christina Coach

## Kaigler, Math

Delphia Coach

Wesley, Teacher, Quisha ESE

Responsible for providing on site ELA coaching and ELA curriculum support to classroom teachers and students via modeling effective instructional strategies.

Bedward, School
Tamar Counselor

Responsible for providing on site math coaching and math curriculum support to classroom teachers and students via modeling effective instructional strategies.

As our Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Specialist, Ms. Wesley coordinates all required ESE meetings. She assists regular education teachers of students with disabilities to implement the Individual Education Plan, (IEP) and monitor progress of IEP Goals.

Responsible for addressing the Social/Emotional needs of the school community. Provides on site behavior support and assists with the monitoring of MTSS initiatives.

## Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2013, Michael Billins
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.

3

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.
3
Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
19
Total number of students enrolled at the school
317
Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year. 2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year. 2

## Demographic Data

## Early Warning Systems

## 2021-22

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

| Indicator | Grade Level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students enrolled | 46 | 43 | 50 | 57 | 83 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 366 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 20 | 17 | 15 | 26 | 32 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 143 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Course failure in ELA | 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 |  |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 6 | 11 | 19 | 40 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 81 |

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

| Indicator | K | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Students with two or more indicators | 2 | 3 | $\mathbf{7}$ | 14 | 24 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 7/6/2021

## 2020-21 - As Reported

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

| Indicator | K | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of students enrolled | 47 | 52 | 70 | 65 | 85 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 414 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 7 | 9 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 12 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| 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 | 29 | 33 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 33 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107 |

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

| Indicator | K | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

2020-21 - Updated
The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | $\mathbf{K}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of students enrolled | 47 | 52 | 70 | 65 | 85 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 414 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 7 | 9 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 12 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| 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 | 29 | 33 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 33 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107 |

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

| Indicator | $\mathbf{K}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | $\mathbf{K}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

## 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 | 2021 |  | 2019 |  |  | 2018 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement |  |  |  | $37 \%$ | $59 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $56 \%$ |
| ELA Learning Gains |  |  |  | $52 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $55 \%$ |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile |  |  |  | $50 \%$ | $54 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $48 \%$ |
| Math Achievement |  |  |  | $45 \%$ | $65 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $62 \%$ | $62 \%$ |
| Math Learning Gains |  |  |  | $36 \%$ | $66 \%$ | $62 \%$ | $62 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $59 \%$ |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |  |  |  | $32 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $47 \%$ |
| Science Achievement |  |  |  | $29 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $55 \%$ |

## 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.

Broward - 3291 - Thurgood Marshall Elem. School-2021-22 SIP

| ELA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2019 | 34\% | 60\% | -26\% | 58\% | -24\% |
| Cohort Comparison |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04 | 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2019 | 36\% | 62\% | -26\% | 58\% | -22\% |
| Cohort Comparison |  | -34\% |  |  |  |  |
| 05 | 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2019 | 32\% | 59\% | -27\% | 56\% | -24\% |
| Cohort Comparison |  | -36\% |  |  |  |  |


| MATH |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2019 | 56\% | 65\% | -9\% | 62\% | -6\% |
| Cohort Comparison |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04 | 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2019 | 39\% | 67\% | -28\% | 64\% | -25\% |
| Cohort Comparison |  | -56\% |  |  |  |  |
| 05 | 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2019 | 33\% | 64\% | -31\% | 60\% | -27\% |
| Cohort Comparison |  | -39\% |  |  |  |  |


| SCIENCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- <br> District <br> Comparison | State | School- <br> State <br> Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cohort Comparison |  | 2019 | $24 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $-25 \%$ | $53 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.
All students in grades K through 5, used Curriculum Associates, iReady Tutorial Program, for progress monitoring.

|  |  | Grade 1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| English LanguageArts | Number/\% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|  | All Students | 10/26.3 | 7/18.4 | 14/35.9 |
|  | Economically Disadvantaged | 10/27.8 | 7/19.4 | 13/36.1 |
|  | Students With Disabilities | 1/20.0 | 1/20.0 | 0/0.0 |
|  | English Language Learners | 2/20.0 | 1/10.0 | 3/27.3 |
| Mathematics | Number/\% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|  | All Students | 11/29.7 | 1/2.7 | 9/23.7 |
|  | Economically Disadvantaged | 11/30.6 | 1/2.9 | 8/22.9 |
|  | Students With Disabilities | 1/20.0 | 0/0.0 | 0/0.0 |
|  | English Language Learners | 4/44.4 | 0/0.0 | 1/9.1 |


| Grade 2 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| English LanguageArts | Number/\% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|  | All Students | 7/15.9 | 7/15.p | 14/30.4 |
|  | Economically Disadvantaged | 7/16.3 | 7/16.3 | 14/31.1 |
|  | Students With Disabilities | 0/0.0 | 1/14.3 | 1/12.5 |
|  | English Language <br> Learners | 1/9.1 | 0/0.0 | 1/7.7 |
| Mathematics | Number/\% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|  | All Students | 7/15.9 | 5/12.2 | 14/30.4 |
|  | Economically Disadvantaged | 7/16.3 | 5/12.5 | 14/31.1 |
|  | Students With Disabilities | 0/0.0 | 0/0.0 | 0/0.0 |
|  | English Language Learners | 0/0.0 | 0/0.0 | 1/7.7 |


| Grade 3 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| English LanguageArts | Number/\% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|  | All Students | 19/35.8 | 24/42.9 | 28/50.9 |
|  | Economically Disadvantaged | 17/34.7 | 22/42.3 | 26/51.0 |
|  | Students With Disabilities | 1/9.1 | 2/18.2 | 4/36.4 |
|  | English Language Learners | 2/20.0 | 1/9.1 | 2/18.2 |
| Mathematics | Number/\% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|  | All Students | 7/13.2 | 10/17.9 | 0/0.0 |
|  | Economically Disadvantaged | 5/10.2 | 9/17.3 | 0/0.0 |
|  | Students With Disabilities | 0/0.0 | 1/9.1 | 0/0.0 |
|  | English Language Learners | 0/0.0 | 0/0.0 | 0/0.0 |


| Grade 4 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| English LanguageArts | Number/\% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|  | All Students | 11/16.2 | 8/11.9 | 16/28.6 |
|  | Economically Disadvantaged | 9/14.5 | 6/10.0 | 13/26.0 |
|  | Students With Disabilities | 2/13.3 | 0/0.0 | 1/8.3 |
|  | English Language <br> Learners | 1/7.1 | 1/7.1 | 1/7.1 |
| Mathematics | Number/\% <br> Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|  | All Students | 5/7.1 | 10/15.2 | 0/0.0 |
|  | Economically Disadvantaged | 4/6.3 | 8/13.6 | 0/0.0 |
|  | Students With Disabilities | 0/0.0 | 0/0.0 | 0/0.0 |
|  | English Language Learners | 0/0.0 | 1/7.1 | 0/0.0 |


|  | Grade 5 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number/\% <br> Proficiency | Fall | Winter |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Subgroups | ELA <br> Ach. | $\begin{gathered} \text { ELA } \\ \text { LG } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ELA } \\ \text { LG } \\ \text { L25\% } \end{gathered}$ | Math Ach. | Math LG | $\begin{gathered} \text { Math } \\ \text { LG } \\ \text { L25\% } \end{gathered}$ | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Grad } \\ \text { Rate } \\ 2019-20 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | C \& C <br> Accel <br> $2019-20$ |
| SWD | 21 | 50 |  | 20 | 47 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| ELL | 49 | 50 |  | 48 | 50 |  | 13 |  |  |  |  |
| BLK | 37 | 43 | 78 | 36 | 33 | 47 | 15 |  |  |  |  |
| HSP | 59 |  |  | 44 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FRL | 39 | 43 | 75 | 36 | 34 | 53 | 16 |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subgroups | ELA <br> Ach. | $\begin{gathered} \text { ELA } \\ \text { LG } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { ELA } \\ \text { LG } \\ \text { L25\% } \end{array}$ | Math Ach. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Math } \\ \text { LG } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Math } \\ \text { LG } \\ \text { L25\% } \end{gathered}$ | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Grad } \\ \text { Rate } \\ 2017-18 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | C \& C <br> Accel <br> $2017-18$ |
| SWD | 16 | 35 | 41 | 25 | 24 | 23 | 13 |  |  |  |  |
| ELL | 37 | 53 | 47 | 54 | 37 | 20 | 28 |  |  |  |  |
| BLK | 37 | 51 | 47 | 43 | 33 | 26 | 30 |  |  |  |  |
| HSP | 60 |  |  | 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FRL | 38 | 52 | 49 | 46 | 35 | 31 | 30 |  |  |  |  |


| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Subgroups | ELA <br> Ach. | $\begin{gathered} \text { ELA } \\ \text { LG } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ELA } \\ \text { LG } \\ \text { L25\% } \end{gathered}$ | Math <br> Ach. | Math LG | $\begin{gathered} \text { Math } \\ \text { LG } \\ \text { L25\% } \end{gathered}$ | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Grad } \\ \text { Rate } \\ 2016-17 \end{gathered}$ | C \& C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 15 | 44 | 50 | 30 | 50 | 40 | 13 |  |  |  |  |
| ELL | 42 | 62 | 42 | 47 | 67 |  | 22 |  |  |  |  |
| BLK | 34 | 47 | 32 | 46 | 63 | 62 | 25 |  |  |  |  |
| FRL | 33 | 47 | 35 | 47 | 63 | 58 | 25 |  |  |  |  |

## ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| ESSA Category (TS\&I or CS\&I) |  |
| OVERALL Federal Index - All Students | 44 |
| 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 | 57 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 352 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 96\% |
| Subgroup Data |  |
| Students With Disabilities |  |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 29 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41\% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32\% |  |
| English Language Learners |  |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 45 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41\% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32\% |  |
| 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\% |  |
| Asian Students |  |
| Federal Index - Asian Students |  |


| Asian Students |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41\% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32\% |  |
| 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\% |  |
| Hispanic Students |  |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 52 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41\% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32\% |  |
| 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\% |  |
| 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\% |  |
| White Students |  |
| Federal Index - White Students |  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41\% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32\% |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students |  |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 44 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41\% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32\% |  |
| Analysis |  |
| Data Analysis <br> 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?
Student proficiency levels have been consistent but learning gains have not.
What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Math Learning Gains and Math Lowest 25th Percentile both showed the greatest decline from last year. They both declined by $26 \%$.

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

The data component with the greatest gap compared to the state is the Math Learning gains. There was $28 \%$ gap. Factors contributing to this gap is lack of rigorous standard based instruction by teachers.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ELA Lowest 25th Percentile showed the most improvement. Our Literacy Coach facilitated the ELA Professional Learning Communities with an emphasis on creating standards-based rigorous lessons and activities.

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

Professional Learning Communities have contributed to the gains.
What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?
1.Teacher Development in Instructional Practices
2. Teacher Development in the creation of standards-based lessons, activities and class assignments
3. Progress monitoring of student achievement
4. Progress monitoring of our MTSS
5. Strengthen the school-home connection

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.

Understanding Florida Standards and Improved Teaching Stategies.
Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

PLC's and PD Opportunities.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

## Areas of Focus:

## \#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of
Focus
Description
and
Rationale:

Teachers continue to need professional development on delivering high quality instruction in increase student achievement, technology integration and implement rigorous, standards-aligned instruction and lessons.

Teachers will deliver high quality instruction to increase student achievement and reach our school goals of:
ELA - 45\% Proficient
Math - 50\% Proficient
Science - 40\% Proficient
ELA Learning Gains - 65\%
ELA Lowest Quartile Gains - 60\%
Math Learning Gains - 65\%
Math Lowest Quartile Gains - 60\%
Monitoring will take place via the following formats: Classroom observations; Student
Monitoring: Common Formative Assessment Data Collection; Teacher and Administration Data Analysis Meetings

## Person

responsible
for monitoring outcome:
Evidencebased Strategy:

## Rationale

for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:

The implementation of explicit and systematic standards-based instruction to increase student achievement in ELA, Math and Science.

The teachers need professional development on standards-based instruction to ensure that their instructions are aligned to the ELA and MATH shifts linked to the FSA Standards. Teachers will then be able to determine their students' specific weaknesses and strengths per standard covered, and they will be used the evidence-based strategy in order to inform their daily instruction. The teachers will analyze the data per student based on performance levels ( deficient, struggling, proficient) and remediation and enrichment activities will be assigned based on each student's performance on the assessment.

## Action Steps to Implement

1. Leadership team will collect and analyze student achievement data to identify areas of strengths and weakness.
2. Based on areas of weaknesses, the leadership team will collaborate with teachers to implement research-based strategies and interventions needed to address areas of weakness while continuing to develop strengths.
3. Teachers will implement the balance literacy program and interventions during their ELA instructional block, differentiating instruction to meet the needs of students.
4. Schedule daily push in Math and ELA support (paraprofessional) assigned to lowest quartile students in grades three, four and five.
5. Extended Learning Opportunities 3 days weekly for 24 weeks, to provide remedial instruction in ELA, Science and Math.
6. Administration will procure additional resources (if necessary) through District resources, school budget resources, grants and partnerships.
7. Professional Learning Communities will center on the implementation of writing, BAS calibration, whole group instructional practices of Balanced Literacy Program and Guided Reading Groups.
8. Teachers will receive professional development in small group instruction, guided reading, quality math
instruction and quality science instruction.
9. Teachers will receive training on the Promethean Board and use it as a medium to infuse technology. 10. Lenovo Laptops will be purchased to increase to a $1: 1$ allocation to students.
11.Curriculum Associates, iReady Site Licenses, iReady Toolbox, LAFS and MAFS will allow teachers to support students through the implementation of high quality instructional materials and progress monitoring.
10. The use of Acaletics Math and Acaletics Science will help increase Math and Science proficiency.
11. The use of Renaissance Accelerated Reader will help increase ELA proficiency and increase learning gains.
12. SchoolCity will be used to progress monitor student achievement and learning gains.
13. J \& J Educational Bootcamp will work with student groups to conduct hands on labs with students.

Person
Responsible
Michael Billins (michael.billins@browardschools.com)
No description entered
Person
Responsible [no one identified]

## \#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

## Area of

## Focus <br> Description

## and

Rationale:
Measurable The school plan to achieve at least 50\% of SWD achieving learning gains on the 2020 Outcome: FSA.

Monitoring will take place via the following formats: Classroom observations; Student

## Monitoring: Common Formative Assessment Data Collection; Teacher and Administration Data

 Analysis Meetings
## Person

responsible
for
monitoring
outcome:
Evidence-

## based

## Strategy:

## Rationale

for Evidencebased Strategy:

Students with disabilities (SWD) are not progressing when compared to other subgroups tested.

## Action Steps to Implement

1. Leadership team will collect and analyze student achievement data of SWD students to identify areas of strengths and weakness.
2. Schedule daily push in Math and ELA support (paraprofessional) assigned to lowest quartile students in grades three, four and five.
3. Extended Learning Opportunities 3 days weekly for 24 weeks, to provide remedial instruction in ELA, Science and Math.
4. Professional Learning Communities will center on the implementation of writing, BAS calibration, whole group instructional practices of Balanced Literacy Program and Guided Reading Groups.
5. Teachers will receive professional development in small group instruction, guided reading, quality math instruction and quality science instruction.
6.Curriculum Associates, iReady Site Licenses, iReady Toolbox, LAFS and MAFS will allow teachers to support SWD students through the implementation of high quality instructional materials and progress monitoring.
6. SchoolCity will be used to progress monitor student achievement and learning gains of SWD students..
[^0]
## Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Thurgood Marshall Elementary School reported 0.7 incidents per 100 students. When compared to all elementary schools statewide, it falls into the moderate category. This school ranked \#81/ 116 elementary schools in the county.

## 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.

The school builds and sustains partnerships by:

1. Provide high-quality instruction for our students and increase collaboration and communication with our parents and community through, but limited to parent letters, telephone calls, emails, quarterly parent nights and parent conferences to support the family and the student.
2. Providing on site wrap around services in the form of a full-time school social worker and full-time community liaison.
3. Partnering with community and business partners to provide parent engagement events.

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

Parents, Business Partners, Teachers and Faculty meet monthly and discuss creating a positive environment at the School Advisory Committee Meeting.

## Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA |  | $\mathbf{\$ 1 7 0 , 5 7 2 . 5 0}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | $2021-22$ |


|  | 5100 | 519-Technology-Related Supplies | 3291 - Thurgood Marshall Elem. School | UniSIG | \$1,820.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Notes: Purchase Lenovo AC Adapters with differing USB tips to replace missing and broken adapters. The adapters will allow the scholars to engage in their learning without the worry of battery going dead and not having an adequate charger to continue learning. |  |  |
|  | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 3291 - Thurgood Marshall Elem. School | UniSIG | \$8,585.50 |
|  |  |  | Notes: Student classroom instructional supplies: Purchase composition books, pencils, sharpeners, ink pens, paper, dry erase markers, white boards and glue for students to use daily. |  |  |
|  | 5100 | 530-Periodicals | 3291 - Thurgood Marshall Elem. School | UniSIG | \$3,000.00 |
|  |  |  | Notes: Scholastic Classroom Magazines cover core subjects and helps support instruction and encourage students to make real-world connections across disciplines. Teachers will use these magazines in grades K-5 during small group and/or whole group instruction. |  |  |
|  | 5100 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 3291 - Thurgood Marshall Elem. School | UniSIG | \$38,880.00 |
|  |  |  | Notes: ELO Stipends: Stipends for 12 teachers to provide tutoring and extended learning opportunities in ELA, Math and Science for students in grades 3-5. Stipends for 12 teachers to work 1.25 hours, for three days per week, for 24 weeks. Stipends will be paid at hourly <br>  based on progress monitoring data, disaggregate data to ensure assignments are standards based and communicate with parents concerning student progress and/or additional supports needed. Stipends will be paid at hourly rate; $\$ 36 /$ hour will be used for budgeting purposes. There will be approximately 120 total students anticipated to attend the ELO camps. The student to teacher ratio for ELO camps will be a minimum of 10:1. If the student to teacher ratio is not met, the number of teachers providing instruction must be reduced to meet that ratio. If there are unspent ELO funds at the end of the school year, the school will extend ELO opportunities into Summer 2022 for current students. - ELO Student Camp Time: 1.25/ day $x 3$ days $\times 24$ weeks $=90$ hours - ELO Student Camp Stipends: 12 teachers x 90 hours x $\$ 36$ stipend $=\$ 38,880$ |  |  |
|  | 5100 | 220-Social Security | 3291 - Thurgood Marshall Elem. School | UniSIG | \$2,975.00 |
|  |  |  | Notes: Fringe Social Security: FICA for 12 teachers |  |  |
|  | 5100 | 240-Workers Compensation | 3291 - Thurgood Marshall Elem. School | UniSIG | \$833.00 |
|  |  |  | Notes: Fringe Workers Compensation for 12 teachers |  |  |
|  | 5100 | 250-Unemployment Compensation | 3291 - Thurgood Marshall Elem. School | UniSIG | \$90.00 |
|  |  |  | Notes: Fringe Unemployment 12 teachers |  |  |
|  | 6400 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 3291 - Thurgood Marshall Elem. School | UniSIG | \$21,600.00 |
|  |  |  | Notes: Professional Development Stipends: Provide stipends to 25 teachers to engage in professional development. The intense literacy, mathematics, science, data usage and pedagogy focus of the professional development will support teachers to increase their knowledge as they work with students to close the achievement gap in reading, writing, math and science. Staff development will take place on six Saturdays, during the 2021-2022 school year. District Trainers and School Based Coaches will facilitate some of the PD sessions. Stipends will be paid at hourly rate; $\$ 36 / h o u r$ will be used for budgeting purposes for a total of twenty hours per teacher. - PD stipends: 25 teachers $x 6$ Saturdays x 4 hours/ session $\times \$ 36$ stipend $=\$ 21,600$ |  |  |
|  | 6400 | 220-Social Security | 3291 - Thurgood Marshall Elem. School | UniSIG | \$1,653.00 |
|  |  |  | Notes: Fringe Social Security: FICA (Social Security) for 25 teachers |  |  |



|  |  |  | - Grade K: Wordly Wise 3000 Academic Vocabulary Classroom Set with 26 Books - Grade 1:Wordly Wise 3000 Academic Vocabulary Classroom Set with 26 Books - Grade 2: Wordly Wise 3000 4th Edition Class Refill Set - Grade 3: Wordly Wise 3000 4th Edition Class Refill Set - Grade 4: Wordly Wise 3000 4th Edition Class Refill Set - Grade 5: Wordly Wise 3000 4th Edition Class Refill Set |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 3291 - Thurgood Marshall Elem. School | UniSIG |  | \$27,050.00 |
|  |  |  | Notes: Heinemann's Fountas LLI Red, Blue and Green Kits designed to provide remediation and intervention support for students in grades 1-3 in ELA as well as support small group instruction. These kits will reinforce reading fluency and reading comprehension. - Leveled Literacy Intervention kits (Grade 1) - Leveled Literacy Intervention kits (Grade 2) - Leveled Literacy Intervention kits (Grade 3) - Leveled Literacy Intervention kits (Grade 4) |  |  |  |
|  | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 3291 - Thurgood Marshall Elem. School | UniSIG |  | \$4,113.00 |
|  |  |  | Notes: Houghton Mifflin - Calendar Math Kits to teach and reteach math standards to students in grades K-2. Calendar Math Kits will help students see patterns, develop algebraic thinking and explore math relationships. |  |  |  |
|  | 6400 | 644-Computer Hardware Non-Capitalized | 3291 - Thurgood Marshall Elem. School | UniSIG |  | \$6,225.00 |
|  |  |  | Notes: Purchase 10 Lenovo ThinkPad L13 i5 (Touch) @ $\$ 622.50$ each for teachers in grades 4-5 to align with advanced technology equipment for intermediate digital classrooms. The additional laptops will provide teachers the opportunity to integrate technology within the classroom. |  |  |  |
|  | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 3291 - Thurgood Marshall Elem. School | UniSIG |  | \$20,390.00 |
|  |  |  | Notes: Educational Development Associates, ACALETICS: Purchase instructional materials and resources from ACALETICS to support mathematics and science, and supplementary math and science resources for students in grades 3-5 to utilize for classroom instructional and to reinforce Florida Math Standards by providing a supplement to the core instructional materials. - Grade 3-CRS Pre/Post Assessment, Quik-Pik (Bks 1-4), Comp. Domain Review (Bk 1-2), Common Core Modeling (Bk 1-2) - Grade 4-CRS Pre/Post Assessment, Quik-Pik (Bks 1-4), Comp. Domain Review (Bk 1-2), Common Core Modeling (Bk 1-2) - Grade 5 CRS Pre/Post Assessment, Quik-Pik (Bks 1-4), Comp. Domain Review (Bk 1-2), Common Core Modeling (Bk 1-2), Science Scrimmage, Science Quik-Pik |  |  |  |
|  | 5100 | 644-Computer Hardware Non-Capitalized | 3291 - Thurgood Marshall Elem. School | UniSIG |  | \$9,500.00 |
|  |  |  | Notes: Purchase 40 laptops @ $\$ 237.50$ each to be used by students for classroom teaching enhancement. For use by students in grades 2-5 for educational apps in reading, math, and science. The laptops will replace broken and damaged ones returned upon completion of the hybrid school year. Current District policy is one laptop for every 2.5 students; purchase of these additional laptops will move the school closer to $1: 1$ student/laptop ratio. |  |  |  |
| 2 | III. A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities |  |  |  | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total: | \$170,572.50 |


[^0]:    Person
    Responsible
    Michael Billins (michael.billins@browardschools.com)

