



---

## 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>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Ramblewood Elementary School

8950 SHADOW WOOD BLVD, Coral Springs, FL 33071

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Dacyany Ibarondo**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/10/2020

<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>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	76%
<b>2021-22 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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: B (60%) 2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: C (44%)
<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>	ATSI
* 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>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Ramblewood Elementary School

8950 SHADOW WOOD BLVD, Coral Springs, FL 33071

[ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	76%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	76%

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2018-19</b>
<b>Grade</b>	B	B	B	B

## 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**

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ibarrondo, Dacyany	Principal	Oversee all operational and instructional areas of the school.
Charlotin, Gregory	Assistant Principal	Assist principal in overseeing all areas of the school.

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Wednesday 6/10/2020, Dacyany Ibarrondo

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

5

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

7

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

44

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

700

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

1

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.**

0

**Demographic Data**

**Early Warning Systems**

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	97	116	127	132	120	129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	721
Attendance below 90 percent	35	42	38	32	27	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	208
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	5	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	35	18	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	39	22	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	2	11	14	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	2	4	9	34	29	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	4	8	20	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
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**

Thursday 9/1/2022

**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	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	

**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	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	

**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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	55%	58%	56%				63%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	70%						65%	60%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	62%						65%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	53%	54%	50%				63%	65%	63%
Math Learning Gains	80%						65%	66%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	71%						52%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	30%	59%	59%				41%	46%	53%

**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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	52%	60%	-8%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	66%	62%	4%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	60%	59%	1%	56%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	59%	65%	-6%	62%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	76%	67%	9%	64%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2022					
	2019	47%	64%	-17%	60%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	40%	49%	-9%	53%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						

**Subgroup Data Review**

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	21	59	52	21	60	46	18				
ELL	38	49	33	44	67	57	11				
BLK	44	68	59	43	77	67	17				
HSP	55	68	63	54	79	70	29				
MUL	53	50		71							
WHT	69	80	64	64	88	80	56				
FRL	48	68	63	48	79	68	19				

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				

**ESSA Data Review**

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	476
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

**Subgroup Data**

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	44
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	54
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	59
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	58
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	72
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	56
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### 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 the the FSA data the trends that emerge across all grade levels, subgroups, and core content areas are as follows: Historically, ELA has the highest 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, all subgroups increased in all categories.

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on the 2022 state assessment 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 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based on the 2022 state assessment the greatest areas of improvements were in ELA and math learning gains and lowest 25%ile.

#### 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 and small group differentiated instruction in K-5 with an uninterrupted 90-minute reading block. Students in 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. Process monitoring for all students and data chats using common reading assessments is regularly practiced.

#### 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-5 and interactive labs once a week. Our resource teacher conducts daily pull-outs to reinforce the 5E Cycle and fair game

standards. Differentiated math instruction will be delivered through small group and remediation will be provided by resource 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.**

Our ESSER and resource teacher will continue to be utilized next year 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 on a weekly basis providing feedback, modeling best practices, and providing professional development.

### **Areas of Focus**

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

**Area of Focus**

**Description and Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Based on the results of the 2021-2022 ELA FSA school-wide proficiency is 55%. However, ELA proficiency for our Students with Disabilities dropped 5% points and is currently at 20%.

**Measurable Outcome:**

**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

By June 2023, school-wide proficiency for our Students with Disabilities will increase to 25% as measured by the FAST PM3 assessment.

**Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

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-minute reading block. The Reading Decision Tree will be utilized to guide all reading decisions. Common formative assessments provided by Benchmark and Reading Horizons Elevate will be utilized to monitor student progress. The IEP will be used to monitor students' progress towards reading proficiency.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Dacyany Ibarondo (dacyany.ibarrondo@browardschools.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Accommodations are provided to all ESE students as per their IEP. Students are provided with systematic, explicit, and interactive small group instruction that target foundational deficiencies.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Ramblewood follows the district's literacy plan and research-based resources recommended. These resources include Benchmark Advance, Reading Horizons Discovery, Reading Horizon's Elevate, Wilson Reading System, Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) and Heggerty's Phonemic Awareness Program.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

PLC's focused on data that drives planning, instruction, and continuous improvement.



**Person Responsible** Dacyany Ibarondo (dacyany.ibarrondo@browardschools.com)

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

**Person Responsible** Dacyany Ibarondo (dacyany.ibarrondo@browardschools.com)

Collaboration with ESE Support Facilitator, Literacy Coach, and classroom teacher.

**Person Responsible** Dacyany Ibarondo (dacyany.ibarrondo@browardschools.com)

Professional development specific to ESE needs.

**Person Responsible** Dacyany Ibarondo (dacyany.ibarrondo@browardschools.com)

## RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

### Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Ramblewood will focus on Foundational Skills for K-2nd grade. Our Standardized Test for the Assessment of Reading (S.T.A.R.) report shows that in Kindergarten 35% of students are classified as Urgent Intervention or Intervention. In 1st grade 30% of students are classified as Urgent Intervention or Intervention and in 2nd grade 30% of students are classified as Urgent Intervention or Intervention. This means that approximately one third of our K-2nd students are in need of intervention in foundational skills such as letter names and sounds and grade level appropriate phonics and phonemic awareness skills. They were identified using S.T.A.R. Early Literacy and S.T.A.R. Reading reports. The critical need was identified as phonemic awareness, letter names and sounds, and grade appropriate phonics as described by the Benchmark for Excellent Student Thinking (B.E.S.T) Standards.

### Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Ramblewood Elementary's FSA scores from the 2021-2022 school year show that 51% of 3rd graders, 64% of 4th graders, and 46% of 5th graders earned a proficient score. Key Ideas and Details were the lowest performing area. On the Florida's Assessment of Student Thinking (F.A.S.T assessment), Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary was the lowest area in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade. The percentage

of students scoring below the standard in this area includes 48% of 3rd grade students, 44% of 4th grade students, and 37% of 5th grade students. With over 40% of our students struggling in this area, this will be our focus. Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary encompasses comparative reading, context and connotation, interpreting figurative language, morphology, and paraphrase and summarizing. This was identified as a critical need by using the F.A.S.T progress monitoring 1 data.

### **Measurable Outcomes:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

### **Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)**

By June 2023, the percentage of students classified as in need of Urgent Intervention or Intervention will decrease by 5% as assessed by the S.T.A.R. Assessment #3.

### **Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

By June 2023, the percentage of students scoring below the standard in the area of Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary will decrease by 5% as evidenced by the Florida's Assessment of Student Thinking PM 3.

### **Monitoring:**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

The areas described above will be monitored by analyzing the data in Progress Monitoring period two and adjusting instruction to meet the needs of the students. In addition, Phonics Screenings, Letter Names and Sounds Assessments (Kindergarten only) will be used quarterly to track progress in K-2nd, and Benchmark Assessments will be used monthly to track progress in K-5th grade.

### **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Ibarrondo, Dacyany , dacyany.ibarrondo@browardschools.com

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

The programs implemented to achieve a measurable outcome include a schoolwide intervention block that allows school staff to place students in incredibly targeted intervention groups. Intervention groups are comprised of intervention programs recommended in the 2022-2023 Broward Reading Plan. Specifically, we use Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI), Heggerty, Benchmark Intervention, Reading Horizons, and Elevate. The evidence-based levels are described in the reading plan.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The rationale used in choosing the intervention programs is twofold. First, we identified the student needs. Foundational skills (letter names and sounds, phonemic awareness, grade level appropriate phonics skills) was the area identified in K-2nd. In 3rd-5th it was Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary. Once the need was established, we used the Reading Plan to find evidence-based programs that would meet those needs. We then used the schoolwide reading block to assign teachers to instruct small groups of students using a targeted intervention. The programs for foundational skills include Heggerty, Reading Horizons, and Elevate. The programs for Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary include LLI and Benchmark Intervention.

**Action Steps to Implement:**

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Presenting Broward 2022-2023 Reading Plan to staff.	Ibarrondo, Dacyany , dacyany.ibarrondo@browardschools.com
Identify the criteria for MTSS Tiers as outlined in the Reading Plan and compile a set of screeners for phonemic awareness and phonics.	Ibarrondo, Dacyany , dacyany.ibarrondo@browardschools.com
Monthly professional learning for staff based on area of need.	Ibarrondo, Dacyany , dacyany.ibarrondo@browardschools.com

### 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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

#### 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 provide students with daily lessons in social emotional learning and begin the school year by identifying members 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 provided to teachers on a weekly basis. We build student community through safety patrols, Ram Buddies, clubs, and peer mentoring opportunities.

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

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.