Ramblewood Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Ramblewood Elementary School

8950 SHADOW WOOD BLVD, Coral Springs, FL 33071

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Dacyany Ibarrondo

Start Date for this Principal: 6/10/2020

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)	76%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (50%)
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

Ramblewood Elementary School

8950 SHADOW WOOD BLVD, Coral Springs, FL 33071

[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	61%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	78%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Providing all students with the tools for a safe, cooperative learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To increase achievement for all students through effective instruction.

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
Ibarrondo, Dacyany	Principal	Oversee all operational and instructional areas of the school.
Charlotin, Gregory	Assistant Principal	Assists to oversee all areas of the school.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 6/10/2020, Dacyany Ibarrondo

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.*
32

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.*
19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
43

Total number of students enrolled at the school
718

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
7

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
8

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	105	116	132	139	129	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	760
Attendance below 90 percent	27	20	25	27	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	15	10	38	37	21	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147

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	8	3	13	21	8	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

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	0	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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
Wednesday 9/22/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Number of students enrolled		
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	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		
One or more suspensions	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		
Course failure in Math	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		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	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		

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				63%	59%	57%	57%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				65%	60%	58%	48%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				65%	54%	53%	27%	51%	48%
Math Achievement				63%	65%	63%	59%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				65%	66%	62%	45%	60%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	53%	51%	29%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				41%	46%	53%	44%	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	52%	60%	-8%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	66%	62%	4%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2021					
	2019	60%	59%	1%	56%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	59%	65%	-6%	62%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	76%	67%	9%	64%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2021					
	2019	47%	64%	-17%	60%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	40%	49%	-9%	53%	-13%
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
2020-2021 Science FSA

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	41/39.4	50/47.2	67/68.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	21/38.2	23/41.1	33/66.0
	Students With Disabilities	5/29.4	5/29.4	7/58.3
	English Language Learners	6/31.6	8/40.0	9/50.0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	26/25.2	36/35.0	47/47.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/20.4	17/31.5	18/36.0
	Students With Disabilities	4/25.0	6/37.5	6/46.2
	English Language Learners	4/21.1	6/31.6	6/30.0

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40/33.9	49/40.2	127/56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24/30.0	32/38.6	127/56%
	Students With Disabilities	4/16.7	5/19.2	32/24%
	English Language Learners	2/16.7	1/7.7	2/50%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18/15.0	36/29.8	28/30.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	13/15.9	25/30.1	15/25.4
	Students With Disabilities	1/4.0	5/19.2	4/20.0
	English Language Learners	1/7.7	2/14.3	1/7.1

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	70/54.3	71/57.3	86/68.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	37/46.8	41/56.2	47/62.7
	Students With Disabilities	15/39.5	11/31.4	18/51.4
	English Language Learners	4/26.7	3/20.0	6/46.2
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16/12.5	36 28.8	52/44.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/12.8	18 24.0	30/41.1
	Students With Disabilities	3/7.9	5 14.3	9/28.1
	English Language Learners	0/0.0	1 6.3	2/15.4

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	32/26.9	54/45.4	18/41.9
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/21.1	26/36.6	9/32.1
	Students With Disabilities	4/13.3	7/23.3	1/11.1
	English Language Learners	0/0.0	3/27.3	1/25.0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17/14.2	38/32.2	0/0.0
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/9.7	15/21.4	0/0.0
	Students With Disabilities	4/13.3	7/24.1	0/0.0
	English Language Learners	1/9.1	4/36.4	0/0.0

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	41/30.6	47/35.9	22/40.0
	Economically Disadvantaged	21/26.9	21/28.0	10/32.3
	Students With Disabilities	4/13.3	7/25.0	3/25.0
	English Language Learners	0/0.0	0/0.0	0/0.0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	35/26.1	37/28.7	3/21.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	18/23.1	16/21.6	1/12.5
	Students With Disabilities	4/13.3	6/20.7	0/0.0
	English Language Learners	3/23.1	3/23.1	0/0.0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			123/20%
	Economically Disadvantaged			123/19%
	Students With Disabilities			27/32%
	English Language Learners			15/20%

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	26	34	50	16	10	13	7				
ELL	41	40	45	21	10	8	17				
BLK	38	24	31	21	9	6	9				
HSP	44	43	42	28	21		29				
MUL	86			43							
WHT	58	38		38	20		30				
FRL	40	33	39	24	14	9	20				

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	35	55	52	34	47	50	17				
ELL	49	68	67	55	68	56	13				
BLK	56	67	70	55	60	52	35				
HSP	60	64	67	62	63	54	21				
MUL	81	73		75	64						
WHT	68	64	50	71	69	50	60				
FRL	57	63	63	57	62	54	29				

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	27	34	21	27	29	32	12				
ELL	36	38	33	41	34	29	19				
ASN	73	50		80	40						
BLK	52	39	29	50	41	33	38				
HSP	50	46	29	51	42	33	36				
MUL	67			67							
WHT	65	57	18	72	51	25	57				
FRL	52	44	25	54	42	31	40				

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	33
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	265

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	92%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	22
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	31
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	20
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	40
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	65
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	37
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	30
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?

Based on iReady data and FSA data the trends that emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas are as follows: Historically, ELA has the highest percentage of proficiency across all grade levels. Math has the lowest percentage of proficiency across grade levels. Economically disadvantaged students have the highest percentage of proficiency in ELA, however students with disabilities has the lowest percentage of proficiency. In math, the economically disadvantaged subgroup of students also has the highest percent of proficiency. ELL students has the lowest percentage of proficiency. Based on the Science FSA 20-21 scores students with disabilities has the highest rate of success, while economically disadvantaged students is the lowest subgroup reaching proficiency.

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

Based on the 2019 state assessments the greatest need for improvement is in the area of mathematics. Specifically, Operations, Algebraic Thinking and Numbers in Base Ten.

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

The main contributing factor for this need of improvement is the need for a deeper understanding of multiplication and division. Teachers are utilizing manipulatives across math concepts to increase conceptual understanding by moving from concrete, to pictorial, to abstract thinking.

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

Based on the 2019 state assessments the most improved area was reading.

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

The actions the school engaged in that caused an improvement in this area began with the monitoring of whole group and small group differentiated instruction in K-5 with an uninterrupted 90-Minute Reading Block. Students in need of tier 2 and tier 3 intervention were scheduled in appropriate intervention course and provided with an extra dose of reading. The use of evidence-based multisensory intervention programs/resources/strategies and professional development for teachers also contributed to the improvement. Progress monitoring for all students is and data chats using common reading assessments is regularly practiced at the school.

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

Daily tier one small group instruction in ELA and math. Daily science instruction in K-3 through ELA block and mini-labs once a week. In grades 4-5 science instruction will be conducted during science block. Our ESSER teacher conducts daily pull-outs to reinforce the 5Es and weakest standards. Differentiated math instruction will be delivered through small group and remediation will be provided by ESSER teacher through fluid pullout groups.

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.

Professional development aligned to standards with a focus on how to deliver instruction effectively and meet diverse student needs . The virtual or in person professional developments will be provided by Elementary Learning Department, support staff, and instructional specialists provided by the district.

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

ESSER teachers will continue to be utilized next year and beyond to work with our most fragile subgroups. PLCs will continue to focus on collaborative planning and data driven instruction. District instructional specialists will continue to collaborate with our teachers weekly providing feedback, modeling best practices, and providing professional development.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the results of the 2020-2021 ELA FSA results school-wide proficiency for ELA is 45%. Learning gains for 5th grade were 35%.
Measurable Outcome:	By June 2022, school-wide proficiency in reading will increase from 45% to 50% as measured by the ELA FSA.
Monitoring:	The Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome as follows: Whole group and small group differentiated instruction will take place during the 90 minutes of interrupted reading block. The Reading Decision Tree will be utilized to guide all reading decisions. Students who are in need of Tier 2 or Tier 3 support will be placed into appropriate intervention course. Tier 3 instruction will be provided by a reading certified teacher. Ramblewood references the K-12 Reading Plan and utilizes evidence based instructional and supplemental materials. Common formative assessments provided by Benchmark Advance, iReady, and BAS will be utilized to monitor student progress. Teacher led student data chats and administration led teacher data chats will occur quarterly. Literacy instruction is incorporated into all content areas to build comprehension and peer to peer collaborative discussions.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dacyany Ibarrondo (dacyany.ibarrondo@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	All classroom and small group strategies are standards aligned. Students who are in need of interventions are pulled out by the ESSER teacher and/or classroom teacher for an additional 30 minutes of instruction. Students are provided with systematic, explicit, and interactive small group instruction that targets foundational deficiencies. Students are provided with multiple opportunities to practice the skill and receive feedback from teachers. Accommodations are provided for all ESE, ELL and 504 students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Ramblewood follows the district's literacy plan and research-based resources recommended. These resources include Benchmark Advance, iReady, Reading Horizons Discovery and Reading Horizons Elevate, Wilson Reading System, Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI), and Heggerty's Phonemic Awareness Program.

Action Steps to Implement

1. PLCs focused on data that drives planning, instruction, and continuous improvement.

Person Responsible	Dacyany Ibarrondo (dacyany.ibarrondo@browardschools.com)

2. Quarterly data chats with teachers and students in grades 3-5 for continuous improvement.

Person Responsible	Dacyany Ibarrondo (dacyany.ibarrondo@browardschools.com)

3. Collaboration with Reading Instructional Specialist to coach and model best practices.

Person Responsible	Dacyany Ibarrondo (dacyany.ibarrondo@browardschools.com)

4. Professional development based on areas of deficiency.

Person Responsible	Dacyany Ibarrondo (dacyany.ibarrondo@browardschools.com)

#2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA was identified as a critical need due to student performance on the 20-21 FSA. Proficiency decreased from 63% as measured by the 2018-2019 FSA to 45% proficiency. Learning gains in ELA fifth grade decreased from 65% to 35%.
Measurable Outcome:	By June 2022, school-wide student proficiency in ELA will increase from 45% to 50% as measured by the ELA FSA.
Monitoring:	In grades kindergarten- second grade Area of Focus will be monitored through quarterly BAS Assessments. In grades 3-5 Area of Focus will be monitored through quarterly BAS Assessments for students who have been identified as level 1 and 2 on the FSA ELA Assessment. iReady standards mastery will also be utilized in all grade levels to monitor for the desired outcome.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dacyany Ibarrondo (dacyany.ibarrondo@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The following evidence-based strategies are implemented for this Area of Focus: Students will engage with on grade-level standards based lessons through whole group instruction utilizing Benchmark Advance. Gaps in learning are continuously addressed through progress monitoring and systematic, explicit, and interactive small groups led by classroom teacher and/or ESSER teacher.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher led small group guided reading utilizing Benchmark Advance Intervention. ESSER small group instruction utilizing Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI). Reading Horizons Discovery K-3 and Reading Horizons Elevate 4-5.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Ramblewood Elementary reported 0.7 incidents per 100 students. The school received a rating of moderate for violent incidents, very low for property incidents, and very high for drug/public order incidents. The school received a very low rating for the total number of reported suspension compared to statewide rate. The top incident and primary area of concern is unruly/disruptive behavior. The secondary area of concern is disobedience/insubordination. At the beginning of every school year, staff is trained on the School-Wide Positive Behavior Plan. Instructional staff introduce rules and expectations at the beginning of the year and create lessons that emphasize positive choices throughout the school year. The school-wide expectations are as follows: Be respectful, Be kind, Be responsible, Be positive, and Be safe. Tier 1 strategies are implemented in all classrooms. All at-risk or high-risk students are referred to on-campus groups led by the school counseling team. Students are referred to outside counseling agencies with parents' consent. All teachers are required to have a discipline plan. Students with repeated behaviors are referred to the Comprehensive Problem Solving Team (CPST) and placed on behavioral RtI.

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.

At Ramblewood we promote and engage students in building trustworthy and respectful relationships with stakeholders. We teach students to social emotional learning and begin the school by identifying member to the SEL team. The SEL team meets every month to review and analyze the school data (attendance, behavior, and academics. Based on the needs of the school, the SEL creates goals and partners with businesses and community members to gather resources. The information is shared with stakeholders through monthly SAC meetings, parent newsletters, and 10 minutes of daily mindfulness practice. SEL team members are encouraged to attend district provided trainings and share the information at PLCs. Rethink Ed lessons and activities are provides to teachers on weekly basis. We build student community through safety patrols, Ram Buddies, safety patrol, clubs, and peer mentoring opportunities.

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

Dacyany Ibarrondo, Principal oversees and is responsible for promoting a positive culture throughout the environment of the school. Gregory Charlotin, Assistant Principal aids in promoting a positive environment at the school. Classroom teachers daily engage students in social emotional lessons and build a positive community in their classrooms where all students feel respected and valued. Guidance counselors hold grade level lessons that are specific to students social emotional needs. Melanie Tesch Equity Liaison, is responsible for all populations and groups being represented at our school. SAF Liaison, Stephanie Correa attends SAC meetings and District Advisory Meetings to communicate any needs for the school and/or district and works collaboratively with the district and principal on new initiatives that will increase the school's positive environment.

Nicole Schuler and John Stawicki, SAC Co-Chairs collaborate with all stakeholders to ensure the school's vision and mission as well as the school improvement plan are followed with fidelity.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$12,253.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	100-Salaries	2721 - Ramblewood Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$5,793.00
			Notes: Salary stipend for classroom teachers to conduct ELOs.			
	5100	519-Technology-Related Supplies	2721 - Ramblewood Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$6,460.00
			Notes: iReady Learning Teacher Toolbox			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:				$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:				$0.00
					Total:	$12,253.00