

Broward County Public Schools

Morrow Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Morrow Elementary School

408 SW 76TH TER, North Lauderdale, FL 33068

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Laurel Crowle

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2011

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 (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 Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: D (34%) 2016-17: C (45%)
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&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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Morrow Elementary School

408 SW 76TH TER, North Lauderdale, FL 33068

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	83%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	98%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	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 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.

Morrow Elementary School is committed to educating ALL students and fostering life-long learners with a global impact.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Morrow Elementary School we are united to empower ALL learners to become academically proficient, providing them with tools for College and Career Readiness with a global impact.

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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Crowle, Laurel	Principal	Dr. Crowle and Mrs. Ferguson provide Morrow with a common vision for use of: data based decision making, ensure that the school-based team is implementing RtI, school board approved interventions are implemented with fidelity and documentation, conduct assessment of RtI skills of school staff, ensure adequate professional development to support the MTSS implementation, and communicate with parents regarding school based plans and activities.
Ferguson, Jamie	Assistant Principal	Dr. Crowle and Mrs. Ferguson provide Morrow with a common vision for use of: data based decision making, ensure that the school-based team is implementing RtI, school board approved interventions are implemented with fidelity and documentation, conduct assessment of RtI skills of school staff, ensure adequate professional development to support the MTSS implementation, and communicate with parents regarding school based plans and activities.
Eldridge-Mason, Tamilla	Reading Coach	Provides guidance on the K-12 Reading Plan, facilitates and supports data collection activities. She assists in data analysis, provided professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data based instructional planning. She supports the implementation of Tier I, II, and III plans.
Dowdie, Denise	Other	Ms. Dowdie supports our ESE students and families in monitoring and developing IEPs. Her duties include being an active member of the RtI Team and providing input with interventions and support for students and teachers.
Nguyen, My D.	School Counselor	Ms. Nguyen is the guidance counselor and the RtI coordinator and provides interventions to child linking services and community agencies that help support families with a child's academic, emotional, behavioral and social success, and participates in student data collections, works with teachers to integrate core instructional activities/materials into Tier 2 and 3 instruction and collaborates with General Education Teachers to develop specific intervention activities for students.
Tucker, Ava	Math Coach	Develops, leads and evaluates the school's core content standards/programs. Ms. Tucker identifies, analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. She assists with school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk".
Lopes, Andrea	Other	Ms. Lopes assists ASD teachers with K-3 academic and behavioral support. She assists families with strategies to implement at home to assist students' needs. She also assists with PreK ESE classes accordingly.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2011, Laurel Crowle

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.*

9

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.*

21

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

44

Total number of students enrolled at the school

534

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

10

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

15

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
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	79	78	71	67	62	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	439
Attendance below 90 percent	6	8	7	10	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	5	9	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
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

Saturday 9/25/2021

2020-21 - 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	78	73	77	64	80	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	434
Attendance below 90 percent	30	23	20	12	20	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
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	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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

2020-21 - 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	78	73	77	64	80	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	434
Attendance below 90 percent	30	23	20	12	20	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
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	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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 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%	40%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				48%	60%	58%	40%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	54%	53%	14%	51%	48%
Math Achievement				42%	65%	63%	43%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				55%	66%	62%	37%	60%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				31%	53%	51%	36%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				30%	46%	53%	29%	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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	42%	60%	-18%	58%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	39%	62%	-23%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
05	2021					
	2019	28%	59%	-31%	56%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	38%	65%	-27%	62%	-24%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	42%	67%	-25%	64%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
05	2021					
	2019	40%	64%	-24%	60%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	28%	49%	-21%	53%	-25%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

iReady Diagnostic Assessments for utilized for progress monitoring Math and ELA. Science Utilized a Comprehensive Assessment for Fall, the Benchmark Science Assessment for Winter, and the NGSSS 2021 for Spring for progress monitoring

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30%	25%	35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	25%	15%	15%
	English Language Learners	14%	9%	25%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	18%	16%	35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	11%	11%	15%
	English Language Learners	19%	14%	25%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	22%	28%	33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	11%	23%	19%
	English Language Learners	4%	7%	14%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15%	25%	29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	25%	38%	36%
	English Language Learners	10%	10%	28%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	20%	32%	42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	9%	15%	19%
	English Language Learners	4%	13%	25%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4%	15%	25%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	3%	15%	20%
	English Language Learners	0	12%	12%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	24%	35%	39%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	43%	14%	23%
	English Language Learners	4%	19%	26%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13%	25%	36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	5%	14%	27%
	English Language Learners	8%	15%	26%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	22%	29%	34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	7%	7%
	English Language Learners	0	9%	18%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16%	28%	36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	20%	0%	7%
	English Language Learners	0	9%	27%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6/57=11%	7/57=12%	12/57=21%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Subgroup Data Review

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	16	31		13	15						
ELL	34	56		34	39		54				
BLK	29	51		22	21		17				
HSP	51	38		42	31		50				
FRL	32	50	23	26	23	25	23				
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	7	41		14	28						
ELL	34	57	55	33	41	27	13				
BLK	34	48	50	38	56	35	32				
HSP	53	69		52	62						
FRL	36	48	46	39	53	32	27				

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	5	12		5	24						
ELL	33	21	8	33	29	36	9				
BLK	39	42	17	39	37	43	27				
HSP	48	35		67	53						
FRL	39	39	14	41	35	36	27				

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	31
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	249
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
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	44
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 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	30
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	45
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	31
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

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 emerge across grade levels/subgroups in core content areas demonstrate a need for building literacy in the primary grades. A primary focus will also be needed to build math competencies in primary/intermediate grade levels. Both Student with Disabilities and English Language Learners will need specific attention to work towards proficiency and learning gains.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Improving grade level proficiency in literacy
Improving grade level proficiency in Mathematics

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

There is a critical need for training teachers in the reading interventions and new core curriculum. Continued support and guidance in Data Driven Instruction and monitor Response to Intervention to ensure our scholars are progressing with the needed support.

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

Based on the 2019 State Assessment, ELA Achievement for the students in the lowest 25th percentile showed the most improvement.

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

Actions that led to the improvements in the ELA are teacher professional development in small group guided instruction and the implementation of differentiated small group instructional strategies.

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

CLI (Children's Literacy Initiative) strategies and support are in place for K-3 teachers
Teachers in K-2 trained in ORR (Oral Reading Record)
Implementation of Benchmark Advance in K-5
Monitor students tracked in Rtl and support teachers with interventions

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.

Benchmark Advance Training for all K-5 Teachers
BAS training for 3-5 teachers not already trained
LLI Training and Wilson/Fundations

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

CLI (Children's Literacy Initiative) Coach will be assisting K-2 teachers with planning and implementation of lessons

ESSER teachers will be pulling strategic groups to close the achievement gap and provide enrichment.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

34% of scholars in grades 3-5 were proficient on the 2021 ELA FSA

Measurable Outcome:

By June 2022, 51% of students in grades three to five will demonstrate Proficiency in ELA as measured by the 2022 Florida Standards Assessment

Monitoring:

Morrow's Leadership Team plans to:

*Monitor our targeted ELA students for Proficiency

*Monitor iReady progress and make adjustments as needed

*Monitor and support small group instruction for all targeted students

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tamilla Eldridge-Mason (tamilla.l.eldridge-mason@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

All students will receive instruction using Benchmark Advance and the components to increase reading proficiency. LLI and Wilson will be used as needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Our scholars need consistent instruction at grade level and additional instruction utilizing an evidence-based program to help close the achievement gap and move our scholars towards proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

Analyze iReady AP1 Diagnostic scores

Administer the BAS to our 3-5 students and plan small group instruction to help close the achievement gap

Train teachers on ORR and administer the ORR to K-2 teachers-use data to drive instruction

Monitor instruction and iReady data

Person Responsible

Tamilla Eldridge-Mason (tamilla.l.eldridge-mason@browardschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

26% of grades 3-5 scholars were proficient according to the 2021 Math FSA.

Measurable Outcome:

By June 2022, 70% of students in grades three to five will demonstrate proficiency in Math as measured by the 2022 Florida Standards Assessment

Monitoring:

This Area of Focus will be monitored utilizing unit assessments, CFAs, and iReady progress monitoring

**Person responsible for
monitoring outcome:**

Ava Tucker (ava.tucker@browardschools.com)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Go Math will be used to implement instruction
iReady AP1 data will be used to form small groups
Pre-requisite lessons will be used in small group
ESSER Support teacher will support our scholars in math

**Rationale for Evidence-
based Strategy:**

There is a critical need to improve proficiency in the area of Math. Support Staff and Administration will continue to support and monitor our scholars.

Action Steps to Implement

Monitor iReady for Grades 3-5 for lessons passed
Monitor the usage of the Pre-requisite lessons
Analyze data of CFAs

Person Responsible

Ava Tucker (ava.tucker@browardschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

Morrow Elementary 2019-20- data collected from SafeSchoolsforAlex.org

-Morrow ranked in the middle for Violent Incidents(Fighting), Very High for Property Incidents (Vandalism), and Very High for Drug/Public Order Incidents (Disruption on Campus).

Areas of Concern/Plans moving forward

*Administration, Support Staff, and teachers will be diligent about promoting CHAMPs strategies in their classrooms and throughout the campus. Social Emotional Learning will be a daily part of the school day and we will work keep a positive school culture everyday and with each other. Administration will monitor the Behavior Dashboard and adjust school-wide plan accordingly.

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.

Our school guidance counselor promotes Character Traits each month that the classroom teacher chooses a student that demonstrates that trait. The Guidance Counselor and teachers teach/instruct using curriculum (Classroom Meetings, Online SEL Tools), for Social Emotional Learning. Morrow has assemblies that promote positive academic growth and SEL that is rewarded accordingly.

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

Morrow will continue to work towards a positive homeschool connection for stakeholders allowing for opportunities to attend trainings aligned to Florida State Standards and learn ways to best assist their children at home. In order to improve communication between home and school, we have multi-lingual staff members that translate during that will translate during parent conferences, meetings and special events. We will continue to communicate via Parentlink (phone, email, text and Social Media) in multiple languages when possible. Morrow's school website is updated weekly for parents to learn more information about their child's school.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$3,351.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			2691 - Morrow Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$3,351.00
			<i>Notes: Salaries for Temporary Hourly Teachers to work with students in the lowest quartile including students in the ELL and SWD ESSA subgroups</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$3,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			2691 - Morrow Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$3,000.00

	<i>Notes: Salaries for Temporary Hourly Teachers to work with students in the lowest quartile including students in the ELL and SWD ESSA subgroups</i>	
Total:		\$6,351.00