

Broward County Public Schools

Colbert Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 22 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 23 |

Colbert Elementary School

2701 PLUNKETT ST, Hollywood, FL 33020

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Dorsett Mcleod

Start Date for this Principal: 1/5/2019

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School KG-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 Multiracial Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (53%) 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 | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 23 |

Colbert Elementary School

2701 PLUNKETT ST, Hollywood, FL 33020

[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 KG-5 | Yes | 79% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 94% |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Colbert Museum Magnet is committed to fostering a safe, nurturing, learning community that provides an equitable and quality education experience for ALL scholars, while embracing unique talents and diverse compositions, to leverage opportunities for high quality instruction, real-world experiences, data-driven interventions, and acceleration through academia and social emotional learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Educating today's students, to transform tomorrow's world, through continuous improvement in academia and social emotional learning.

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 |
|----------------------|---------------------|---|
| McLeod, Dorsett | Principal | Instructional & Operational Leader |
| Cooper-Moye, Eyvonda | Assistant Principal | Instructional and Operational Leader |
| Brown, Nicholas | Instructional Coach | Coaching, Modeling, Feedback, Data Analysis and Monitoring. Resource Purveyor |
| Neat, Chentel | Instructional Coach | Coaching, Modeling, Feedback, Data Analysis and Monitoring. Resource Purveyor |
| Engel, Pamela | Teacher, ESE | ESE Staffing, Progress Monitoring |
| Jackson, Karmala | Teacher, ESE | Cluster Instructional Support, Data Analysis and Monitoring, Coaching and Feedback |
| Morris, Frances | School Counselor | Academic Support Groups, SEL implementation Manager, Data analysis, Behavioral Support Groups, ESOL Contact |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 1/5/2019, Dorsett McLeod

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

27

Total number of students enrolled at the school

623

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

6

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

5

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 | 101 | 75 | 95 | 75 | 104 | 113 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 563 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 13 | 10 | 19 | 9 | 20 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 29 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 24 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 |

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 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |

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 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 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 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/27/2021

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 | 70 | 96 | 86 | 96 | 117 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 575 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 21 | 24 | 25 | 23 | 33 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 157 |
| 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 | 33 | 29 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 24 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 |

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 | 2 | 19 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |

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 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 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 | 70 | 96 | 86 | 96 | 117 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 575 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 21 | 24 | 25 | 23 | 33 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 157 |
| 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 | 33 | 29 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 24 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 |

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 | 2 | 19 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |

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 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 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 | | | | 45% | 59% | 57% | 43% | 56% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 50% | 60% | 58% | 55% | 57% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 48% | 54% | 53% | 63% | 51% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 56% | 65% | 63% | 53% | 62% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 53% | 66% | 62% | 60% | 60% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 55% | 53% | 51% | 57% | 47% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 35% | 46% | 53% | 42% | 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 | 43% | 60% | -17% | 58% | -15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 49% | 62% | -13% | 58% | -9% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -43% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 44% | 59% | -15% | 56% | -12% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -49% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 50% | 65% | -15% | 62% | -12% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 59% | 67% | -8% | 64% | -5% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -50% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 57% | 64% | -7% | 60% | -3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -59% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 36% | 49% | -13% | 53% | -17% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tool used for all grades below is the I-Ready Reading and Math Diagnostic taken at 3 points in the school year. The Science Data is from beginning middle and end of year district based formative assessments.

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 30/37% | 28/34% | 37/45% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 30/37% | 28/34% | 37/45% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0/0% | 2/13% | 2/13% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0% | 3/17% | 2/11% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 25/31% | 15/19% | 31/38% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 25/31% | 15/19% | 31/38% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 3/20% | 3/20% | 27% |
| | English Language Learners | 2/40% | 1/20% | 3/60% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Grade 2 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 13/19% | 30/43% | 26/37% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 13/19% | 30/43% | 26/37% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0/0% | 0/0% | 2/29% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0% | 4/27% | 4/27% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 13/19% | 27/39% | 37/53% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 3/19% | 27/39% | 37/53% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 2/28% | 0/0% | 4/57% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0% | 0/0% | 6/40% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 12/13% | 9/10% | 31/35% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 12/13% | 9/10% | 31/35% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0/0% | 0/0% | 3/21% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0% | 1/14% | 0/0% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 3/3% | 11/12% | 20/22% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 3/3% | 11/12% | 20/22% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 1/7% | 2/14% | 2/14% |
| | English Language Learners | 1/14% | 1/14% | 1/14% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Grade 4 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 31/30% | 34/33% | 39/38% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 31/30% | 34/33% | 39/38% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 1/8% | 0/0% | 4/31% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0% | 0/0% | 1/6% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 9/9% | 21/21% | 33/33% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 9/9% | 21/21% | 33/33% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0/0% | 0/0% | 2/17% |
| | English Language Learners | 1/7% | 0/0% | 3/14% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |

| Grade 5 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 21/22% | 35/36% | 36/37% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 21/22% | 35/36% | 36/37% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0/0% | 0/0% | 0/0% |
| | English Language Learners | 2/14% | 2/14% | 4/29% |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 11/10% | 24/25% | 19/20% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 11/10% | 24/25% | 19/20% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0/0% | 0/0% | 0/0% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0% | 0/0% | 3/21% |
| Science | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 19/19% | 18/18% | 23/23% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 19/19% | 18/18% | 23/23% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0/0% | 0/0% | 0/0% |
| | English Language Learners | 1/7% | 0/0% | 2/14% |

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 | 19 | 35 | | 24 | 40 | | 20 | | | | |
| ELL | 38 | 65 | 70 | 41 | 60 | | 40 | | | | |
| BLK | 23 | 34 | 43 | 29 | 28 | 19 | 16 | | | | |
| HSP | 49 | 58 | | 62 | 44 | | 65 | | | | |
| WHT | 53 | | | 58 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 31 | 39 | 38 | 40 | 34 | 24 | 26 | | | | |
| 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 | 15 | 13 | 23 | 46 | 44 | | | | | |
| ELL | 31 | 45 | 36 | 53 | 70 | 63 | 20 | | | | |
| BLK | 43 | 50 | 50 | 55 | 54 | 49 | 25 | | | | |
| HSP | 44 | 51 | 50 | 56 | 55 | 73 | 42 | | | | |

| 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 |
| MUL | 50 | | | 60 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 44 | 49 | 49 | 55 | 52 | 53 | 30 | | | | |
| 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 | 11 | 40 | 50 | 14 | 38 | | 18 | | | | |
| ELL | 45 | 80 | 85 | 41 | 60 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 43 | 55 | 61 | 56 | 59 | 48 | 42 | | | | |
| HSP | 40 | 56 | | 43 | 61 | 75 | 47 | | | | |
| WHT | 33 | | | 25 | 50 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 42 | 54 | 63 | 53 | 59 | 56 | 41 | | | | |

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 | 34 |
| 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 | 36 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 271 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 91% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 30 |
| 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 | 50 |
| 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 | 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 | 56 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 34 |
| 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?

There is a notice that foundational skills such as phonics are a struggle for our students on multiple grade levels whereas high frequency words and phonemic awareness are a strong point in ELA. We also notice that the grade level vocabulary domain is a consistent area of improvement for scholars across grade levels which is impacting the comprehension progress for many students. In Math we notice that geometry is a area of growth as well as numbers in base ten across the grade level. Students struggle most with the nature of science as well.

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

Our lowest performance area was in Science. After conducting a cause analysis, it was determined that the absence of equity in resources and personnel in support had a significant impact on the outcome of our science achievement. When analyzing the trend over the last 4 years, it was noted that in 2018 our Science achievement was at its peak due to the multiple layers of support provided, as a result of implementing science close reads in addition to the science block, and also having the luxury of multiple science support staff pulling groups.

Our greatest decline in performance was in the Lowest 25% learning gains in ELA.. This was a result of not

having an extra hour in ELA that was given in 2017 due to being on the state's lowest 300 list, which allowed us to implement foundation reading skills, and pull multiple intervention groups, to foster growth among our struggling readers. We also experienced multiple scheduling conflicts with support led pull out groups due to the

high demand for coaching and support meetings/credentialing. The inconsistency in the use of appropriate resources paired with effective questioning and instructional strategies in small guided reading groups, had a significant impact on the decline in achievement for the lowest 25% in ELA as well.

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 analysis of what changed from the 18 school year to the 19 school year it was noticed that the availability of the human resource to provide the multi layers of support given in the previous year as not as frequent or consistent and our time for interventions was shortened due to an increase in proficiency and being removed form the lowest 300 list which shortened our day by an hour. The new actions calls for us to restructure our ELA blocks to fit the components we had in the extended block to an extent to further address gaps in student achievement. It class for the development, implementation, and monitoring of support schedules to ensure student are getting data driven narrow focused support groups with fidelity. Finally it calls for us to continuously dive deeper into assessment question types and test specs to inform our instruction and ensure exposure and practice in student tasks.

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

Our 5th Grade Math showed the most improvement from 2018 to 2019. We reverted back to self contained classrooms and did away with departmentalization.

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

Our implementation of small group instruction in math was conducted on a more frequent basis than the year prior, as well as the frequency of support from the coach. Our crunch plan was more intentional, strategic, and collaborative in the months leading up to FSA testing as well, thus resulting in a noticeable increase in achievement.

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

The improved use of formative data to inform instruction will need to be implemented with fidelity and utilized for strategic planning daily. TLAC engagement techniques will need to be adopted to ensure continuous and meaningful engagement. The quality of instruction will need to be monitored to ensure rigor and intentional implementation of instructional strategies.

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 participate in data-based professional learning communities in which they will have a support member assigned to their grade level for collaboration and resource purposes. Teachers will be afforded opportunities to participate in district and school-based PD based on engagement and data based planning & instruction. Teachers will engage in data chats with the opportunity for collaboration on research based instructional strategies based on student performance. Teachers will engage in quality of instruction feedback sessions to improve instructional efficacy and students engagement in meaningful tasks.

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

We will dissect our data and develop an additional instructional plan for inclusion strategies for SWD students. We will also dissect the data and progress monitor SWD students on their IEP goals in addition to their Gen. Ed. goals. Additional PD for inclusion will be apart of our PD plan, and strategies for inclusion and scaffolding will be monitored in isolation for a specific focus to ensure the quality of instruction for inclusive education.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Colbert Museum Magnet's area of focus for 21-22 is, intentionally planning for and implementing strategies for effective student engagement via (in)formative assessments before, during, and/or after instruction. If implemented as a non-negotiable with fidelity, we are more likely to experience improvement in student growth and overall achievement across subjects. After analysis of instructional implementation and making strides in in our area of focus last year, our core whole group instruction experienced a decline in effectiveness, thus leading us to the analysis of the planning practices for whole group, and the missing piece(s) for student engagement and effective teacher assessment regarding scholar's and their levels of understanding. This noticing led our analysis to effective ways to improve this area of growth, thus leading to the ultimate decision to shift our focus to ongoing formatives throughout lessons to increase student engagement and evidence for learning that informs instructional practices and planning. |
| Measurable Outcome: | By June 2021, at least 95% of Colbert teachers (K-5) will implement the two school-wide formatives selected into ALL of their whole group lessons in both ELA and Math, thus yielding 50% proficiency in ELA, and 60% proficiency in Math as measured by the AP3 ELA and Math Diagnostic on I-Ready and the 2022 Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) in grades 3-5. |
| Monitoring: | Quality of Instruction Walkthroughs will be conducted to monitor the implementation of this focus. Feedback sessions will be held to discuss glows, grows, and wonderings for this focus, and follow-ups based in feedback to ensure implementation will be conducted as well. Data chats will be held to collaborate and engage in the continuous improvement cycle. The student achievement will be monitored by the progress made on AP1, 2, and 3 as well as monthly common formative assessments |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Dorsett McLeod (dorsett.mcleod@browardschools.com) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | The two evidence based strategies will be from Teach Like A Champion. We will focus on Everybody Writes, and the No Opt Out strategy for engagement. The evidence based strategy that we will implement this year is Formative Assessment. This type of assessment is carried out during the instructional process for the purpose of improving teaching and/or learning. It has be shown to be an effective process of feedback in which a teacher learns about a student's current level of understanding to determine the next learning steps for that student. The two specific evidence based strategies will be from Teach Like A Champion. We will focus on Everybody Writes, and the No Opt Out strategy for engagement. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | When implemented effectively, formative assessment provides ongoing feedback to students about where they are relative to their goals, it equips them with resources and suggestions for further exploration, and it encourages questions that accelerate the learning process due to providing a purpose and guide for learning. Formative assessment matters because it has been shown to help students learn. Not only does it help with cognitive processes, but it also fully engages students in learning. |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Disaggregate student and teacher data and tier students/teachers in need of intervention supports
2. Assign support staff push-in/pull-out groups across subjects

3. Structure resources and instructional strategies for effective implementation of formatives to drive planning and instructional practices
4. Develop phases of implementation and monitoring
5. Ongoing Collaborative planning, monitoring, implementation & feedback, teacher/student support, follow up, repeat

Person Responsible Dorsett McLeod (dorsett.mcleod@browardschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | In analysis of the ELA FSA data we experienced a significant double digit decrease in all three reporting categories for ELA. The data was disaggregated by grade level, domains, and students displaying significant gaps in foundational skills needed for reading fluency and comprehension across grade levels. In addition, our SWD population displayed a significant gap in achievement when compared to other subgroups in the area of ELA thus presenting a need to double down on services for these students as well. |
| Measurable Outcome: | By June of 2022, each reporting category, proficiency, learning gains, and low 25 learning gains for ELA including our SWD subgroup will increase in score by at least 10 percentage points. |
| Monitoring: | This area of focus will be monitored by 3 I-Ready diagnostic assessments taken at 3 points of the school year for detailed data instruction based growth. It will also be monitored through the use of common formative assessments given at the conclusion of each unit/ cycle of learning by standard. All data obtained will be recorded and analyzed through collaborative teacher led, student centered, data chats. Each student will be monitored individually and provided prescriptive instructional plans for improvements to achieve gains throughout the year. We will monitor and make tweaks along the way for each subgroup with an emphasis on SWD students. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Dorsett McLeod (dorsett.mcleod@browardschools.com) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Close reading strategies will be the focus of instruction to improve the comprehension of text to answer text based questions. In addition to this school-wide approach, the implementation of phonics for reading will be utilized for our SWD students and students with foundational gaps to build reading fluency. This will be paired with the implementation of Wordly Wise to build vocabulary for reading comprehension. Thus servicing the needs of students in ELA. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Close reading as a strategy was chosen because it allows students to dissect text over a course of days while holding students accountable for reading strategies that will enhance their comprehension. It allows students to see the connection between good evidence based strategies and how they benefit the reader in understanding the text. It also allows for appropriate scaffolding and developing the mindset regarding the need for multiple reads to comprehend text. This strategy yields a high probability for learning as its effect size is greater than .50. |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Analysis of baseline AP1 data to determine instructional groupings and priorities
2. PD for adopted strategies and implementation
3. Determine the use and focus of weekly PLCs to align actions with our goals
4. Consistent quality of instruction walkthroughs and feedback cycles for instructional improvement
5. Student work analysis for the appropriateness of tasks
6. Continuous data chats and instructional data-based planning for improvement

Person Responsible Dorsett McLeod (dorsett.mcleod@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.

We will monitor the amount of in-school suspensions that we have as we are considerably higher than average in this area thus presenting a concern. We will conduct quarterly Positive Behavior and Intervention Support Team meetings to assess data and strategies for school-wide improvement in this area. We will implement daily SEL and coping strategies in our instructional block to help students make better decisions to aid in their progress. We will also conduct counseling support groups as well as a mentor program for students presenting high risk factors and frequent undesirable behaviors.

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.

We have adopted and implement our School-Wide Positive Behavior Plan that outlines our expectations and rewards. We engage in a character program that highlights kids of character monthly to promote positive behaviors. We host staff and community appreciation raffles randomly for acts of kindness. We highlight staff and students in our weekly newsletter for their awesomeness and we have a shout out board in our front office for recognition and positivity. The school has a parental and family involvement committee as an effort to collaborate and execute plans to increase family involvement to its maximum potential. There are monies allotted via the Title I budget to host parent nights educating parents on academic strategies and resources that they can use with students at home, as well as nights that focus on strategies to cater to their child's social emotional needs at home. We are partnering with neighboring businesses to host family nights at their places of businesses, allowing families to have family time, while also making the home to school connection, and also to support school events that cater to our families.

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

The Instructional Leadership Team plans and hosts recognition and acts of kindness for staff and students. Teachers incentivize and reinforce our SWPB and PBIS efforts, as well as shout out each other and students.

Our Parents volunteer ideas for rewards, events, and school improvement through email communications and SAC meetings. Our students utilize the buddy bench at recess to talk and play with students who may

not have anyone to play with. Parents students and staff participate in culture and kindness influenced spirit weeks to promote awareness and positivity.

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | | | | |
|--------|----------|--|---|-----------------|-------|-------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement | | | | \$24,026.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | | | 0231 - Colbert Elementary School | Title, I Part A | 543.0 | \$21.00 |
| | | | Notes: Instructional Materials | | | |
| | | | 0231 - Colbert Elementary School | Title, I Part A | 543.0 | \$17,000.00 |
| | | | Notes: Salaries for ELO | | | |
| | | | 0231 - Colbert Elementary School | Title, I Part A | 543.0 | \$3,000.00 |
| | | | Notes: Salaries for Instructional Coaches ELO | | | |
| | | | 0231 - Colbert Elementary School | Title, I Part A | 543.0 | \$4,005.00 |
| | | | Notes: Parental Involvement | | | |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | | | | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | | | | \$24,026.00 |