

Broward County Public Schools

# Oriole Elementary School



## 2021-22 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>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

# Oriole Elementary School

3081 NW 39TH ST, Lauderdale Lakes, FL 33309

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

Principal: Sheneka Blue

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

<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>2020-21 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2020-21 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 Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: D (36%) 2016-17: C (46%)
<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>	
* 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>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

## Oriole Elementary School

3081 NW 39TH ST, Lauderdale Lakes, FL 33309

[ 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	88%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	99%

### 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.

At Oriole Elementary, we involve scholars, teachers, parents, community, and business partners in providing an innovative curriculum and safe environment which will lead to high academic achievement among a diverse scholar population with a goal of educating the whole child.

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

Oriole Elementary's vision is to challenge students to excel beyond their potential in becoming college and career ready by creating a safe, supportive and positive learning environment, utilizing authentic strategies within the contexts of the Florida Standards.

Oriole Elementary believes that everyone's unique life experience and background adds valuable perspective to our community, and that our community is stronger because of the differences represented by our scholars, faculty, and families. As a school community, we strive to develop confident, well-rounded, lifelong learners and responsible citizens.

### 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
Blue, Sheneka	Principal	
Bolden, Seporia	Assistant Principal	
Peeples, Kimberly	Math Coach	
Washington, Azaleas	Reading Coach	
Sullivan, Shemetria	Reading Coach	
Kane, Jody	Teacher, ESE	
Newell, Ruthanne	Instructional Coach	
Holmes, Cynthia	Parent Engagement Liaison	
Ivy, Tanya	Attendance/Social Work	
Blocker-Coleman, Jacqueline	SAC Member	
Walker, Brittney	School Counselor	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Sheneka Blue

**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.*

**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.*

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

35

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

569

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

3

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

4

### 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	84	79	85	90	79	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	519
Attendance below 90 percent	23	36	38	37	38	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	205
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	6	6	17	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
	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	1	0	4	8	12	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

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

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

Monday 6/28/2021

## 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
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	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	102	81	104	88	105	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	596	
Attendance below 90 percent	67	42	44	30	51	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	277	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	
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	4	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	

#### 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	1	0	4	8	12	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

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

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				36%	59%	57%	40%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				43%	60%	58%	34%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	54%	53%	35%	51%	48%
Math Achievement				48%	65%	63%	46%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				48%	66%	62%	30%	60%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	53%	51%	30%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				28%	46%	53%	34%	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	31%	60%	-29%	58%	-27%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	30%	62%	-32%	58%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
05	2021					
	2019	41%	59%	-18%	56%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	57%	65%	-8%	62%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	38%	67%	-29%	64%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
05	2021					
	2019	38%	64%	-26%	60%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	27%	49%	-22%	53%	-26%
Cohort Comparison						

### Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

I-Ready Diagnostic Assessment - Reading and Math Monitoring Tool  
Science Formative Assessments

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	68%	36%	47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	38%	37%	44%
	Students With Disabilities	35%	14%	30%
	English Language Learners	48%	48%	50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	31%	26%	35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	30%	23%	35%
	Students With Disabilities	50%	14%	37%
	English Language Learners	34%	31%	38%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	19%	31%	36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4%	22%	17%
	Students With Disabilities	20%	25%	20%
	English Language Learners	48%	48%	50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15%	15%	30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16%	14%	31%
	Students With Disabilities	19%	17%	16%
	English Language Learners	5%	16%	32%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	22%	31%	33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22%	31%	30%
	Students With Disabilities	12%	11%	12%
	English Language Learners	8%	16%	19%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5%	9%	23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5%	8%	23%
	Students With Disabilities	4%	0%	8%
	English Language Learners	4%	3%	13%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	21%	27%	25%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20%	29%	22%
	Students With Disabilities	6%	6%	0%
	English Language Learners	20%	33%	35%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11%	20%	33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11%	17%	32%
	Students With Disabilities	6%	5%	6%
	English Language Learners	10%	21%	38%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10%	20%	29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6%	6%	23%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	6%	6%	19%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14%	18%	29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13%	16%	27%
	Students With Disabilities	8%	4%	16%
	English Language Learners	32%	17%	28%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20%	10%	20%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5%	10%	20%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	5%	5%
	English Language Learners	10%	16%	10%

## 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	11	6	8	8	6		17				
ELL	20	29		16	18		13				
BLK	27	30	27	24	15	12	22				
FRL	27	30	26	23	15	10	21				
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	19	50	54	17	25	27					
ELL	31	34	37	44	46	38	32				
BLK	35	42	48	47	49	48	26				
FRL	36	42	49	48	47	45	28				

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		22	33	4	6	9					
ELL	34	30	20	39	18	25					
BLK	40	35	33	46	30	32	36				
HSP	36			45							
FRL	40	34	35	46	29	30	33				

### 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	22
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	153
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	94%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	9
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	19
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	22
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	22
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?**

All subjects showed significant decline last school year. English Language Arts achievement declined 26 percentage points to 22% proficient, with only 31% of students achieving a learning gain; this is not a trend. Math achievement declined 10 percentage points to 26% proficient, with only 15% of students achieving a learning gain; this is not a trend, Oriole students normally score well in Mathematics. In the area of Science, achievement declined 10 percentage points to 18% proficient. As a result, the school is taking a close look at the core instruction and interventions put in place to support Mathematics instruction.

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

Student Math proficiency declined 26 percentage points, and Math learning gains declined 33 percentage points. As discussed earlier, gaps in foundational math concepts create challenges when preparing students for grade level expectations. Student ELA proficiency declined 10 percentage points, and ELA learning gains declined 12 percentage points. As discussed earlier, gaps in foundational knowledge create challenges when preparing students for grade level expectations.

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

After reviewing student and teacher performance data, it was determined that gaps in foundational reading skills and inconsistent rigorous instruction, were major contributing factors to low student performance.

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

No improvement was shown between the progress monitoring and state assessment.

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

N/A

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

To accelerate learning, personalized instruction will be implemented to ensure scholars receive both remediation and enrichment.

**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.**

Teachers will receive training in the following areas: Mathematical Instructional Routines, Educational Equity, Manipulative Based Instruction, High Order Questioning Strategies.

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



Professional Learning Communities will be utilized to ensure continued growth in instructional practices.

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### Areas of Focus:

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

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	To ensure all students achieve learning gains in English Language Arts (ELA), tiered instruction must be utilized to personalize instruction to students. Teacher require additional professional development along with a structure for continued support as they develop highly effective teaching strategies
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	As a result of targeted skill instruction, by June 2022, ELA proficiency will increase from 26% to 45%.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	Student Achievement Data along with classroom walkthrough data, observation logs and teacher surveys will be utilized to monitor effectiveness of professional development and support. This information will determine additional supports that will be provided based on data driven results.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Sheneka Blue (sheneka.blue@browardschools.com)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Teachers will receive targeted professional development in literacy instructional strategies, focusing specifically on small group differentiation, shared reading, literacy centers, and high-order questioning, and close reading strategies. The Elementary Learning Department will provide on-site support to ensure effective implementation of strategies learned through Professional Development. As a follow-up to professional learning experiences, teachers will receive additional peer coaching from teacher leaders on the school campus.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	If teachers implement high quality literacy instruction with fidelity, then students will become engaged learners and demonstrate proficiency outcomes in all content areas.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Teachers will receive professional development in research based literacy instructional strategies in correlation to the Science of Reading.

**Person Responsible** Azaleas Washington (azaleas.washington@browardschools.com)

Teachers will work collaboratively to plan standards-based literacy instruction to address the needs of learners at all levels. To ensure time for collaboration, extended collaboration opportunities will be scheduled into the school's master schedule.

**Person Responsible** Sheneka Blue (sheneka.blue@browardschools.com)

Teachers will utilize address foundational gaps through the use of targeted small group instruction during allotted W.I.N (What I Need) Time for literacy intervention. Teachers will collaborate with instructional support team to provide tiered intervention in small groups for scholars in K-5 grade.

**Person Responsible** Shemetria Sullivan (shemetria.sullivan@browardschools.com)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** To ensure all students achieve learning gains in Mathematics, students must be exposed to numbers and gain a clear understanding of how their impact our world. Students need exposure to math literature, mathematical centers, manipulatives, and patterns to develop conceptual thinking skills. To achieve this goal, tiered instruction will be utilized to personalize instruction for all learners. Teachers require additional professional development along with a structure for continued support as they develop highly effective teaching strategies.

**Measurable Outcome:** As a result of conceptual mathematics instruction, by June 2022, Math proficiency will increase from 22% to 55%.

**Monitoring:** Student achievement data along with classroom observation logs/data and teacher surveys will be utilized to monitor effectiveness of professional development and support. This information will determine additional supports that will be provided based on data driven results.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** [no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Teachers will receive targeted professional development in manipulative-based instructional strategies, focusing specifically on multiple skill exposure (via Acalectics), conceptual math centers, math fluency development, and differentiated small group instruction. The Elementary Learning Department and Acalectics will provide on-site support to ensure effective implementation of strategies learned through Professional Development. As a follow-up to professional learning experiences, teachers will receive additional peer coaching from teacher leaders on the school campus.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** If teachers implement high quality math instruction with fidelity, then students will become engaged learners and demonstrate proficiency outcomes in all content areas. Students will develop mathematical thinking transition from concrete to abstract mathematical reasoning.

**Action Steps to Implement**

All K-5 teachers will receive training in Standards-Based Math Instruction, specifically focusing on effective implementation of manipulative-based instruction.

**Person Responsible** Kimberly Peeples (kimberly.peeples@browardschools.com)

Teachers will work collaboratively to develop standards-based math instruction, participating in extended planning sessions to ensure instructional decisions are data-driven.

**Person Responsible** Sheneka Blue (sheneka.blue@browardschools.com)

In an effort to close achievement gaps, K-5 teachers will develop conceptual teaching strategies and increase student mastery through daily multiple skill exposure. The math instructional block has been extended for all grade levels to ensure time is designated for repetitive, consistent, review of mathematical concepts.

**Person Responsible** Kimberly Peeples (kimberly.peeples@browardschools.com)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Teachers need support in effective facilitation of high quality standards-based Science instruction aligned to the Florida Standards. Students need more opportunities for science exploration, inquiry, scientific discourse, and written communication about scientific topics, to cement science concepts in the mind.

**Measurable Outcome:** As a result of standards-based science instruction, by June 2022, Science proficiency will increase from 18% to 40%.

**Monitoring:** Student achievement data along with classroom observation logs/data and teacher surveys will be utilized to monitor effectiveness of professional development and support. This information will determine additional supports that will be provided based on data driven results.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Sheneka Blue (sheneka.blue@browardschools.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Teachers will receive targeted professional development instructional strategies, focusing specifically on science inquiry, exploration, and problem-solving skills. Students will engage in Science Boot-camp laboratory activities to reinforce science standards. The Elementary Learning department will provide on-site support to ensure effective implementation of strategies learned through Professional Development. As a follow-up to professional learning experiences, teachers will receive additional peer coaching from teacher leaders on the school campus.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** If teachers implement high quality Science instruction with fidelity- providing inquiry and experimentation, science note-booking, and consistent reinforcement of concepts, then students will become engaged learners and demonstrate proficiency outcomes in all content areas. Furthermore, through experimentation and inquiry, students will improve problem-solving skills.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Fourth/ fifth grade teachers and coach will attend Science Bootcamp training session to ensure effective implementation of supplemental Science materials.

**Person Responsible** Seporia Bolden (seporia.bolden@browardschools.com)

PK-5th grade teachers will work collaboratively to plan standards-based science instruction. Teachers will incorporate hands-on science experiences to ensure students develop a conceptual understanding of science concepts.

**Person Responsible** Kimberly Peebles (kimberly.peeples@browardschools.com)

K-5th grader teachers will utilize interactive science notebooks to ensure students develop written notes regarding science standards.

**Person Responsible** Seporia Bolden (seporia.bolden@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.

**Oriole's school reported 1.9 incidents per 100 students. These incidents involved a pattern of the same students which required additional behavior supports. To decrease the number of incidents, the school's Positive Behavior plan will be revised to proactively address school behavior concerns. Additionally, school staff will incorporate SEL strategies throughout the school to address the social emotional needs of all learners.**

### 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. Providing on site wrap around services in the form of a full-time school social worker and full-time community liaison.
2. Partnering with community and business partners to provide parent engagement events.
3. Participating in community-based events such as city parades and celebrations.
4. School embeds a love for literacy in school events, hosting a weekly Facebook Read Aloud, Community Book Give-A-Ways, and Daily Read Alouds for PK-5th grade scholars.

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

Through the SPARKS Initiative, Oriole currently has a Community Liaison who develops both community and business partnerships. These partnerships help in various ways, including mentoring, food donations, or other in kind services. Through the SPARKS Initiative, Oriole currently has a Community Liaison who develops both

community and business partnerships. These partnerships help in various ways, including mentoring, food donations, or other in kind services. Oriole has partnered with the Black Child Development Institute (BCDI) to encourage literacy and strengthen community literacy.

### 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: Instructional Practice: ELA</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$31,000.00</b>