# Morrow Elementary School

**2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan**

## Table of Contents

# Morrow Elementary School

### 408 SW 76TH TER, North Lauderdale, FL 33068

### [ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

## Principal: Laurel Crowle                    Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2011

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status** (per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served** (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2021-22 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented** (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| **School Grades History** | 2021-22: C (51%) 2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: D (34%) |
| **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** | ATSI |
| * 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

# Morrow Elementary School

408 SW 76TH TER, North Lauderdale, FL 33068

[ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

| **School Type and Grades Served** (per MSID File) | **2021-22 Title I School** | **2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary School PK-5 | Yes | 100% |

| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 98% |

## School Grades History

| Year | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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.**

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

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

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

### School Leadership Team

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

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Friday 7/1/2011, Laurel Crowle

**Number of teachers with a 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.*

1

**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.*

5

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

44

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

521

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

17

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

9

**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 | 81 | 82 | 79 | 74 | 79 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 480 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 36 | 24 | 31 | 23 | 21 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 163 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| 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 | 29 | 23 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 30 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |

**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 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 29 | 24 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |

**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 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 21 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

**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 | 79 | 78 | 71 | 67 | 62 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 439 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 6 | 8 | 7 | 10 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

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

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 5 | 9 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**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 | 79 | 78 | 71 | 67 | 62 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 439 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 6 | 8 | 7 | 10 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

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

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 5 | 9 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

## 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 | 34% | 58% | 56% | | | | 37% | 59% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 62% | | | | | | 48% | 60% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 67% | | | | | | 44% | 54% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 42% | 54% | 50% | | | | 42% | 65% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 69% | | | | | | 55% | 66% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 52% | | | | | | 31% | 53% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 28% | 59% | 59% | | | | 30% | 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 | 42% | 60% | -18% | 58% | -16% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 39% | 62% | -23% | 58% | -19% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -42% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 28% | 59% | -31% | 56% | -28% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -39% | | | | |

| 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 | 38% | 65% | -27% | 62% | -24% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 42% | 67% | -25% | 64% | -22% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -38% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 40% | 64% | -24% | 60% | -20% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -42% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 28% | 49% | -21% | 53% | -25% |
| 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 | 17 | 52 | 69 | 29 | 58 | 45 | 13 | | | | |
| ELL | 37 | 66 | 77 | 42 | 70 | 58 | 20 | | | | |
| BLK | 30 | 58 | 62 | 39 | 67 | 46 | 29 | | | | |
| HSP | 48 | 68 | | 57 | 76 | | 31 | | | | |
| FRL | 33 | 58 | 64 | 42 | 66 | 52 | 28 | | | | |

| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 16 | 31 | | 13 | 15 | | | | | | |
| ELL | 34 | 56 | | 34 | 39 | | 54 | | | | |
| BLK | 29 | 51 | | 22 | 21 | | 17 | | | | |
| HSP | 51 | 38 | | 42 | 31 | | 50 | | | | |
| FRL | 32 | 50 | 23 | 26 | 23 | 25 | 23 | | | | |

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 7 | 41 | | 14 | 28 | | | | | | |
| ELL | 34 | 57 | 55 | 33 | 41 | 27 | 13 | | | | |
| BLK | 34 | 48 | 50 | 38 | 56 | 35 | 32 | | | | |
| HSP | 53 | 69 | | 52 | 62 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 36 | 48 | 46 | 39 | 53 | 32 | 27 | | | | |

## 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 | 51 |
| 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 | 52 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 406 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| **Subgroup Data** | |
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 40 |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|---|---|
| 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 | 53 |
| 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 | 47 |
| 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 | 58 |
| 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 | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Economically Disadvantaged Students** | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 50 |
| 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?**

The trends that emerge across grade levels/subgroups in core content areas demonstrate a need for building literacy in the primary grades. A primary focus will also be needed to build math competencies in Primary/Intermediate grade levels. Students with Disabilities will need specific attention in the effort to improve proficiency with our SWDs.

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

Improving grade level proficiency in ELA
Improving grade level proficiency in Mathematics
Improving proficiency in our SWD subgroup

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

There is a critical need for training for teachers as we have a newly adopted Math series with several components to learn for instruction. We will need continued support and guidance in Data Driven instruction and monitoring RtI to ensure our scholars are progressing with needed support.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

Based on the 2022 State Assessment, ELA Achievement in the Lowest 25th Percentile showed the most improvement.

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

Actions that led to the improvements in ELA are teacher professional development in small group and the the implementation of differentiated small group instructional strategies. Administration and Literacy coach assisting with planning intentional lessons for ELA.

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

Benchmark Advance implementation and lesson fidelity in K-5
Implementation of the Envision Mathematics newly adopted math series
Monitoring grade level PLCs

**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.**

LLI training and refreshers for K-5 Teachers
Continued Math trainings (all components) and Benchmark trainings

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

Administration and support staff will continue to support grade level teams with planning and instruction, and will provide the necessary professional development as needed throughout the year.

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

**:**

| #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**<br>**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | 34% of students in grades 3-5 were proficient according to the 2022 ELA FSA. |
| **Measurable Outcome:**<br>**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | By June 2023, 51% of students in grades 3-5 will demonstrate proficiency in ELA as measured by the 2023 PM#3 FAST (Florida Assessment of Student Thinking). |
| **Monitoring:**<br>**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | Morrow's Leadership Team plans to:<br>*Monitor our targeted ELA students for proficiency<br>*Monitor Benchmark Assessments and make curriculum adjustments accordingly<br>*Monitor and support small group instruction for all targeted students |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Tamilla Eldridge-Mason (tamilla.l.eldridge-mason@browardschools.com) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:**<br>**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** | All students will receive instruction using Benchmark Advance and the lesson components to increase reading proficiency. LLI and additional interventions will be used accordingly. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**<br>**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.** | Our scholars need consistent instruction at grade level and additional instruction utilizing an evidence-based program to help close the achievement gap and move scholars towards proficiency. |

### 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.

*FAST will be utilized for progress monitoring throughout the school year and adjustments will be made to curriculum based on the data
*Professional Development will be scheduled accordingly

| **Person Responsible** | Tamilla Eldridge-Mason (tamilla.l.eldridge-mason@browardschools.com) |
|---|---|

| #2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**<br>**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | 40% of Grade 3-5 scholars were proficient on the 2022 ELA FSA |
| **Measurable Outcome:**<br>**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | By June 2023, 51% of Students with Disabilities in Grades 3-5 will demonstrate proficiency in ELA as measured by the 2023 FAST (Florida Assessment of Student Thinking). |
| **Monitoring:**<br>**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | *Monitor and support Student with Disabilities (SWD) for proficiency<br>*Monitor FAST progress monitoring throughout the year and make adjustments accordingly<br>*Monitor and collect data from Grade 3-5 teachers and ESE Support Facilitator |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Jamie Ferguson (jamie.ferguson@brwardschools.com) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:**<br>**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** | All SWD that are assessed on Florida Standards will receive instruction using Benchmark Advance and the components to increase reading proficiency. LLI will also be used accordingly. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**<br>**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.** | Our scholars need consistent instruction on their IEP goals in an effort and goal to close the achievement gap. Grade level curriculum must be consistent as well with proficiency as the end goal. |

### 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.

*Monitor IEP Goals and progress towards proficiency
*Analyze FAST PM#1 and #2 data and make necessary adjustments to instructional plans.
*Monitor instruction of all SWD and ESE Support Facilitator lessons and instruction

| **Person Responsible** | [no one identified] |
|---|---|

### 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**

45% of K-2 students were not predicted to be proficient according to the iDAP3 administered in May 2022.
48% of 1st and 2nd Grade students were not proficient on the EOY Primary Assessment administered in May 2022

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

34% of students in grades 3-5 were achieved proficiency as measured by the 2022 ELA FSA.

**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, 65% of students in grades K-2 will demonstrate proficiency in ELA as measured by the FAST (Florida Assessment of Student Thinking) Star Early Literacy for VPK-1st grade or the Star Reading for 1st -2nd grade PM#3.

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

By June 2023, 51% of students in grades 3-5 will demonstrate proficiency in ELA as measured by the 2023 PM#3 FAST (Florida Assessment of Student Thinking).

**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.

*Monitor Progress Monitoring PM#1 and PM#2 for K-5 and make curriculum adjustments accordingly
*Monitor Benchmark Unit Assessments as administered and analyze data with Leadership Team
*Monitor and support small group instruction for all target students

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Crowle, Laurel, laurel.crowle@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?

Benchmark Advance Grades K-5 will be utilized and is aligned with the B. E. S. T. ELA Standards/BCPS K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-Based 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?

Yes, the Benchmark Advance Grades K-5 addresses the identified need, but is newly adopted by the district within the last two years. We showed an increase in literacy proficiency from the 2021-2022 school year.

**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 |
|---|---|
| Analyze FAST PM#1 and #2 data and monitor curriculum and instruction moving forward<br>Monitor instructional delivery and small group instruction<br>Monitor data-driven PLCs | Eldridge-Mason, Tamilla, tamilla.eldridge-mason@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.

Our school Guidance Counselor promotes Character Traits each month. Each classroom teacher chooses a student that demonstrates that trait. The guidance counselor and teachers instruct their students using the curriculum Classroom Meetings and online SEL tools from the district targeting Social Emotional Learning. Morrow has assemblies that promote positive academic growth and SEL that is rewarded accordingly. Morrow has also partnered with various community organizations that donate incentives to our children as additional motivation.

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

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