

Broward County Public Schools

Oriole Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 12 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 21 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 21 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 23 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

Oriole Elementary School

3081 NW 39TH ST, Lauderdale Lakes, FL 33309

[no web address on file]

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Broward County School Board on 10/17/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections | Title I Schoolwide Program | Charter Schools |
|--|---|------------------------|
| I-A: School Mission/Vision | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1) |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3) | |
| I-E: Early Warning System | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-A-C: Data Review | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(3) | |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection | ESSA 1114(b)(6) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4) |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii) | |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g) | |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

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

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-------------------|---------------------|---|
| Blue, Sheneka | Principal | <p>The School Principal effectively performs her responsibilities using the following knowledge, skills, and abilities to: provide instructional leadership for all educational programs at the school; prepare and manage the school's budget and manage and inventory the school's assets; read, interpret, follow and enforce the State Board Rules, Code of Ethics, School Board policies, and other state and federal laws; use effective interview techniques, coaching procedures, and evaluation procedures; enforce collective bargaining agreements; use effective public speaking skills, group dynamics, and interaction and problem-solving skills; maintain a sensitivity to multicultural issues; perceive the impact of a decision on other components of the organization; communicate effectively, both orally and in writing, and through the use of technology; and analyze and use data. The School Principal will need knowledge of current educational trends and research. Knowledge and understanding of the unique needs and characteristics of the school system.</p> |
| Bolden, Seporia | Assistant Principal | <p>To assist the principal in providing vision and leadership to develop, administer and monitor educational programs that optimize the human and material resources, including time and space, available for a successful and safe school program for students, staff and community. The Assistant Principal effectively performs her responsibilities using the following knowledge, skills and responsibilities through her ability to demonstrate the knowledge and practice of current educational trends, research and technology; understand the unique needs, growth problems and characteristics of school students; read, interpret and implement the State Board Rules, Code of Ethics, School Board Policies and appropriate state and federal statutes; and coach, supervise and evaluate personnel in accordance with collective bargaining agreements. The Assistant Principal demonstrates effective communication and interaction skills with all stakeholders, has the ability to use group dynamics within the context of cultural diversity and be knowledgeable of Florida educational reform, accountability and effective school concepts.</p> |
| Peeples, Kimberly | Math Coach | <p>The Math Coach provides personalized support based on the identified needs of individual teachers and differentiated supports that foster the growth and development of teachers. In addition to strategic content-focused mentoring and conceptual understanding of mathematical practices, the Math coach supports teachers in developing skills in analyzing student work, differentiating instruction, and supporting English Language Learners and students with special needs. Also, the instructional coach works collaboratively with the support team to build skills, analyze data, examine needs related to professional practice, and engage in peer coaching with teachers. The Math Coach works with the instructional staff to improve and sustain student achievement by promoting a culture for real-world applications of Math learning to include all stakeholders, by enhancing and refining math instruction and intervention, providing targeted instructional coaching, and building capacity for math proficiency across the curriculum.</p> |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-----------------------------|------------------|---|
| Newell, Ruthanne | Teacher, ESE | <p>Autism Coach collaborates with the ESE Specialist to ensure all exceptional student education (ESE) staff are in accordance with the annual Local Education Agency (LEA) Memo. The Autism Coach provides information to school-based personnel on a variety of topics including updating staff on policy changes, assisting regular education teachers of students with disabilities to implement the Individual Education Plan (IEP), and monitoring the progress of IEP goals. The Autism Coach assists in identifying, reporting, and correcting IDEA compliance concerns identified internally, reports all compliance concerns directly to the school-based leadership, and corrects compliance errors identified internally (within the school) and externally, in accordance with federal, state, and local laws, rules, policies and procedures, communicates effectively with parents, colleagues, and other stakeholders to ensure that IEPs for students with disabilities are implemented with fidelity. The ESE Specialist ensures adherence to safety rules and procedures and follows federal and state, as well as School Board policies. The Autism Coach provides personalized support based on the identified needs of individual teachers and differentiated supports that foster the growth and development of teachers providing instruction to scholars with disabilities. In addition to mentoring, the instructional coach supports teachers in developing skills in analyzing student work, differentiating instruction, developing IEPs, and developing behavior plans. Also, the coach works collaboratively with the support team to build skills, analyze data, examine needs related to professional practice, engage in peer coaching with teachers, and develop an inclusive learning environment for all scholars.</p> |
| Walker, Brittney | School Counselor | <p>Our School Counselor promotes and enhances achievement with an annual comprehensive school counseling plan that ensures that every student receives school counseling services. The school counselor collaborates with the other school leadership team members and the instructional staff to provide comprehensive counseling programs that incorporate prevention and intervention with continuous academic, career, and personal/development activities that will prepare them for meaningful participation in a diverse, changing world. These activities include classroom guidance, small groups for skills mastery, individual counseling for students with specific needs, and a variety of other proactive and innovative ways to support student performance.</p> |
| Blocker-Coleman, Jacqueline | SAC Member | <p>The SAC member is responsible for actively participating in SAC meetings, keeping accurate, complete minutes, and ensuring those records are accessible to the public (e.g., posted on the school or district website). They also ensure that a copy of the minutes and agenda are kept in an official, designated location in the front office of the school. Additionally, the secretary is responsible for keeping accurate records of the council's membership, attendance, duties, and special assignments.</p> |

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school leadership team collaborates and assess the needs of scholars. In addition, stakeholders are surveyed to determine the needs. Once needs have been determined, the needs are presented to the SAC committee and input is solicited to develop a plan of action. Once a plan of action has been developed, the plan will be executed and monitored to determine its effectiveness.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored for effective implementation and impact on a monthly basis. School-wide data will be analyzed. After analysis, the plan will be reviewed to ensure the data aligns. If the plan is not effective, all stakeholders will reconvene to collaborate and revise the plan as needed. This process will be on going until the data reflects increasing achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

| | |
|--|---|
| 2023-24 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 |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | Yes |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 98% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 100% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | Yes |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | ATSI |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: C 2019-20: C |

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| | 2018-19: C 2017-18: D |
| School Improvement Rating History | |
| DJJ Accountability Rating History | |

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 60 | 48 | 48 | 36 | 37 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 252 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 26 | 46 | 38 | 39 | 36 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 212 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 34 | 44 | 26 | 32 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 164 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 10 | 28 | 35 | 58 | 25 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 175 |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 18 | 47 | 44 | 52 | 46 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 236 |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 9 | 6 | 7 | 34 | 15 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 |
| Students retained two or more times | 7 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 |

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 42 | 42 | 44 | 47 | 28 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 245 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 31 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 26 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 113 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 3 | 9 | 9 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 2 | 4 | 39 | 43 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 131 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 32 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 42 | 42 | 44 | 47 | 28 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 245 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 31 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 26 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 113 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 3 | 9 | 9 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 2 | 4 | 39 | 43 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 131 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 32 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | 43 | 56 | 53 | 35 | 58 | 56 | 28 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 57 | | | 31 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 51 | | | 24 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 46 | 62 | 59 | 42 | 54 | 50 | 24 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 68 | | | 15 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 58 | | | 9 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 26 | 48 | 54 | 21 | 59 | 59 | 22 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 71 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 60 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 45 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 35 | 59 | 59 | 54 | | | | | |

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 38 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | Yes |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 191 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |
| Percent Tested | 98 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 48 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 386 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 98 |
| Graduation Rate | |

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 22 | Yes | 4 | 1 |
| ELL | 36 | Yes | 1 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 37 | Yes | 1 | |
| HSP | 57 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | | | | |

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| FRL | 38 | Yes | 1 | |

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 32 | Yes | 3 | |
| ELL | 50 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 47 | | | |
| HSP | 58 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | | | | |
| FRL | 47 | | | |

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 43 | | | 46 | | | 26 | | | | | 35 |
| SWD | 26 | | | 28 | | | 14 | | | | 4 | |
| ELL | 42 | | | 46 | | | 20 | | | | 5 | 35 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 43 | | | 44 | | | 21 | | | | 5 | 37 |
| HSP | 50 | | | 63 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 42 | | | 45 | | | 25 | | | | 5 | 38 |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 35 | 57 | 51 | 42 | 68 | 58 | 21 | | | | | 54 |
| SWD | 13 | 28 | 31 | 35 | 53 | 50 | 12 | | | | | |
| ELL | 32 | 49 | 64 | 45 | 72 | 64 | 19 | | | | | 54 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 32 | 55 | 51 | 41 | 68 | 59 | 18 | | | | | 54 |
| HSP | 55 | | | 60 | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 34 | 54 | 45 | 40 | 67 | 63 | 20 | | | | | 55 |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 28 | 31 | 24 | 24 | 15 | 9 | 22 | | | | | |
| SWD | 11 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 6 | | 17 | | | | | |
| ELL | 20 | 29 | | 16 | 18 | | 13 | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 27 | 30 | 27 | 24 | 15 | 12 | 22 | | | | | |
| HSP | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 27 | 30 | 26 | 23 | 15 | 10 | 21 | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 43% | 56% | -13% | 54% | -11% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 42% | 61% | -19% | 58% | -16% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 37% | 53% | -16% | 50% | -13% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 44% | 62% | -18% | 59% | -15% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 49% | 65% | -16% | 61% | -12% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 46% | 58% | -12% | 55% | -9% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 24% | 46% | -22% | 51% | -27% |

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year’s low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component shows that 5th grade science showed the lowest performance with 24% proficiency. The following factors contributed to the low performance: teachers knowledge of standards, lack of hands on science learning experiences in grades K-4, tracking student progress, and the need for more training on data driven instruction.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

The data component that continues to show minimal growth is Science proficiency which only increased 4% from 2022 to 2023. The following factors contributed to the low performance: teachers knowledge of standards, lack of hands on science learning experiences in grades K-4, tracking student progress, the need for more training on data driven instruction.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component which had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is Science in which Oriole scored at 21% proficiency compared to the state's 52%.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Math showed the most improvement. New actions implemented - strategic PLCs, collaborative planning, targeted instruction and small group instruction.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Attendance and the total number of students with one or more EWS indicators are our two potential areas of concern. All students identified in EWS will participate in Oriole's attendance initiative and they will receive tiered interventions through the Multi-Tiered System of Supports and Response to Intervention, with continued support from our school Social worker.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Professional Development
2. Collaborative Planning
3. Progress Monitoring
4. Student Feedback
5. Teacher Feedback

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Science proficiency continues to show minimal growth, increasing only 4% from 2022 SSS to 2023 SSS. In addition, our ESE population showed 1% proficiency in the area of science.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June 2024, Oriole's science proficiency will increase from 24% to 36% as evident by the 2024 SSS assessment. In addition, our ESE proficiency will increase by 5%.

Monitoring:

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

Student Achievement Data (Science BSA, SSS Assessments and informal assessments) along with classroom walkthroughs and data analysis meetings will be utilized to monitor effectiveness of teacher instructional practice and student achievement. This information will determine additional supports that will be provided based on data driven results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sheneka Blue (sheneka.blue@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Science Bootcamp will be utilized and implemented to achieve the outcomes in grades 4 and 5. SOAR Camp will also be implemented to offer additional support for scholars in grade 5 and our ESE population.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The abovementioned practices and programs address the identified need for the targeted populations.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Teachers will engage scholars in well planned differentiated instruction. Targeted scholars will be provided additional support through push-in model. Scholars will be assessed on standards and skills taught. Formal assessment data will be analyzed and monitored in addition to teacher observation.

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

By When: On-going

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June, 2024 Oriole will increase it's stakeholder participation rate by 10%.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored for analyzing meeting and family event sign-in sheets

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brittney Walker (brittney.walker@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Parents, Teachers and stakeholders will be invited to participate in family engagement activities and SAC meetings throughout the academic school year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Family engagement activities and SAC Meetings will be planned and executed with fidelity to ensure stakeholder participation to gain input for improvement.

Person Responsible: Brittney Walker (brittney.walker@browardschools.com)

By When: June 2024

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

ELA proficiency continues to show minimal growth, increasing only 5% from 2022 FAST to 2023 FAST. In 2022, 35% of students were proficient in ELA, in 2023 40% of students were proficient. Additionally, our SWD subgroup met showed no growth.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If teachers implement high quality literacy instruction with fidelity, then students will become engaged learners and demonstrate proficiency in all content areas. By June 2024, ELA proficiency will be 54%.

Monitoring:

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

Formal assessment data will be analyzed and monitored in addition to teacher observation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sheneka Blue (sheneka.blue@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Scholars will be provided differentiated instructional learning opportunities to read, write and talk about texts.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Providing scholars differentiated instructional learning opportunities to read, write and talk about texts helps teachers connect with scholars with different learning styles. In addition to connecting with scholars and their interests, differentiating instruction allows scholars to utilize higher order thinking. Scholars use complex ways to think about what they are learning which aids them in being effective problem solvers and develop deeper understanding of content.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Teachers will engage scholars in well planned differentiated instruction. Targeted scholars will be provided additional support through push-in model. Scholars will be assessed on standards and skills taught. Formal assessment data will be analyzed and monitored in addition to teacher observation.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

In order to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs, Oriole analyzed STAR & FAST data for all scholars in grades K-5. After collaborative conversations amongst the staff, the data is presented by administration to stakeholders in our monthly SAC meetings. Stakeholders' input is solicited and discussed. Discussions include funding allocations and resource implementation.

Oriole implements WIN (What I Need) support which is implemented in both push in and pull out models. WIN provides an additional 30 minutes of intervention for targeted students to address their individual needs. Student progress is reported and discussed during SAC meetings as well to determine student needs.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

To ensure all K-2 students achieve learning gains in English Language Arts (ELA), tiered instruction will be utilized to personalize instruction for all scholars. Teachers require additional professional development along with a structure for continued support as they develop highly effective teaching strategies.

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

To ensure all 3-5 students achieve learning gains in English Language Arts (ELA), tiered instruction will be utilized to personalize instruction for all scholars. Teachers require additional professional development along with a structure for continued support as they develop highly effective teaching strategies.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

By June, 2024 scholars in grades K-2 will demonstrate academic growth and show an increase by 20 percentage points as indicated via the STAR reading assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By June, 2024 scholars in grades 3-5 will demonstrate academic growth and show an increase by 25 percentage points as evident via FAST - ELA.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Student Achievement Data along with classroom walkthrough data, observation logs and teacher surveys will be utilized to monitor effectiveness of professional development and support. This information will determine additional supports that will be provided based on data driven results.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Bolden, Seporia, seporia.bolden@browardschools.com

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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. §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 will be utilized and implemented to achieve the outcomes in each grade level. SOAR Camp will also be implemented to offer additional support which aligns with the district and BEST ELA standards.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The abovementioned practices and programs address the identified need for the targeted populations.

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 |
|--|---|
| <p>Teachers will receive targeted professional development in Benchmark Advance Instruction, focusing specifically on small group differentiation, shared reading, literacy centers, and close reading strategies. The Elementary Learning Department will provide on-site support to ensure effective implementation of strategies learned through Professional Development. As a follow-up to professional learning experiences, teachers will receive additional peer coaching from teacher leaders on the school campus.</p> | <p>Washington, Azaleas, azaleas.washington@browardschools.com</p> |

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school’s webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Oriole's SIP and school's progress will be shared with all stakeholders via monthly SAC Meetings. All stakeholders will receive SAC flyers five days prior to the meeting date and will be invited to attend the meeting. Translators will be available to translate info in dominant languages (Spanish and Creole).

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Oriole plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress by hosting family events, disseminating information in various languages and meeting with parents and stakeholders on a monthly basis.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Oriole plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum by providing teachers with meaning professional develop sessions, implementing differentiated bell to bell instruction. Small group instruction and pull-out support will also be implemented to target identified students.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

ESSA teacher will provide push in and pull out support to target fragile students and implement interventions to close the achievement gap.