

Broward County Public Schools

Morrow 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	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	19
VI. Title I Requirements	21
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Morrow Elementary School

408 SW 76TH TER, North Lauderdale, FL 33068

[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.

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, 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
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 Rtl, school board approved interventions are implemented with fidelity and documentation, conduct assessment of Rtl 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 Rtl, school board approved interventions are implemented with fidelity and documentation, conduct assessment of Rtl skills and knowledge of school staff, ensure adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation, and communication with parents regarding school based plans and activities.
Dowdie, Denise	Other	Supports our ESE students and families in monitoring and developing IEPs. Her duties include being an active member of the Rtl 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 Rtl 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.

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 Improvement Plan is developed and monitored with the input/feedback from all stakeholders. Information is shared at Faculty Meetings and is always linked on our school website. At each SAC meeting, all stakeholders are invited to provide input and feedback in the development/monitoring of the plan.

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))

Morrow's School Improvement Plan will be monitored at each faculty meeting, SAC meeting and SAF Meeting. School data will be shared and our goals will be monitored by all stakeholders. Revisions will be made accordingly.

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	28	30	20	29	21	17	0	0	0	145	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	6	2	1	0	0	0	9	
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	8	14	21	35	21	24	0	0	0	123	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	12	25	31	18	19	0	0	0	105	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	31	46	42	31	28	0	0	0	183	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	5	24	34	44	27	28	0	0	0	162

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	1	4	2	3	0	3	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	1	0	2	2	1	3	0	0	0	9

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	36	24	31	23	21	28	0	0	0	163	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	4	6	7	0	0	0	17	
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	29	23	24	0	0	0	76	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	28	30	30	0	0	0	88	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	6	5	6	7	0	0	0	24	

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	1	12	29	24	34	0	0	0	100

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	3	15	21	0	1	0	0	0	40
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	36	24	31	23	21	28	0	0	0	163
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	4	6	7	0	0	0	17
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	29	23	24	0	0	0	76
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	28	30	30	0	0	0	88
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	6	5	6	7	0	0	0	24

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	1	12	29	24	34	0	0	0	100

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	3	15	21	0	1	0	0	0	40
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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*	36	56	53	34	58	56	34		
ELA Learning Gains				62			49		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				67			23		
Math Achievement*	41	62	59	42	54	50	26		
Math Learning Gains				69			24		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52			23		
Science Achievement*	23	48	54	28	59	59	25		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					60	52			
Graduation Rate					45	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	44	59	59	52			45		

** 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	36
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	180
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	406
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
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	23	Yes	4	1
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	33	Yes	1	
HSP	45			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	31	Yes	1	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	40	Yes	3	
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	47			
HSP	58			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	50			

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	36			41			23					44
SWD	23			28			18				4	
ELL	37			40			24				5	44
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32			41			20				5	42
HSP	52			41			27				5	45
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	33			37			23				5	37

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	34	62	67	42	69	52	28					52
SWD	17	52	69	29	58	45	13					40
ELL	37	66	77	42	70	58	20					52
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30	58	62	39	67	46	29					45
HSP	48	68		57	76		31					67
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	33	58	64	42	66	52	28					54

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	34	49	23	26	24	23	25					45
SWD	16	31		13	15							42
ELL	34	56		34	39		54					45
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29	51		22	21		17					37
HSP	51	38		42	31		50					57
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	32	50	23	26	23	25	23					47

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	37%	56%	-19%	54%	-17%
04	2023 - Spring	46%	61%	-15%	58%	-12%
03	2023 - Spring	28%	53%	-25%	50%	-22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	41%	62%	-21%	59%	-18%
04	2023 - Spring	48%	65%	-17%	61%	-13%
05	2023 - Spring	37%	58%	-21%	55%	-18%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	23%	46%	-23%	51%	-28%

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.

Our students with disabilities exhibited the lowest performance which has been a challenging component for Morrow Elementary. Some of the contributing factors are scheduling and allowing our SWDs to receive their Core instruction in addition to their instruction to assist them in achieving their IEP goals. Staff also needs more training on how to best teach and assess our SWDs.

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

Our overall literacy proficiency continues to be lower than our expectations for Morrow. Our students need intensive instruction in the area of literacy and many come to school with limited English and limited foundational skills in literacy. Morrow continues to work through the challenge of having more Reading Endorsed educators to reach our Tier III students.

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.

Based on the State Average, our 3rd Grade students had the greatest gap with Morrow 3rd Graders at 28% proficient in ELA and the state with 50% proficient.

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

Morrow's 4th graders made significant growth from PM1 to PM3 in 2023. Our instructional coaches and Reading support provided instruction to small groups and assisted with planning with our teachers.

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

Attendance from 2022-2023, 145 students were absent 10% or more days during the school year.

The number of students with a substantial reading deficiencies is 183 students at this time.

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

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

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**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.

Morrow Elementary will work to build a supportive and fulfilling environment with learning conditions that meet the needs of all students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, 80% of Morrow students will rate themselves as feeling happy and safe at school based on the BCPS Annual Student Survey.

Monitoring:

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

Students and Parents will be asked to take a annual survey in order to monitor the positive improvement of our school culture and environment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

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 district adopted tools from the district targeting Life Skills and Wellness. Morrow has assemblies that promote positive academic growth and positive behavior that is rewarded accordingly. Morrow has also partnered with various community organizations that donate incentives to our children as additional motivation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Morrow will continue to motivate our students do be kind to one other, be kind to themselves, and be kind to their environment. Monthly Character Traits will assist our students and staff to have conversations about ways to maintain/build a positive school culture.

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.

Character Traits will be taught each month and students will be recognized for demonstrating each trait.

Person Responsible: My D. Nguyen (myduyennguyen@browardschools.com)

By When: Monthly Recognition for Character Traits

Annual Student Survey will be administered and reviewed for progress towards our goal of creating and maintaining the positive improvement of our school culture and environment.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: By May 2024, the annual student survey will reviewed.

#2. 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 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.

For the last three years at Morrow, Students with Disabilities have not met the Federal Percent of Points Index achievement criteria.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, students with disabilities in grades 3-5 will increase proficiency performance by 2% according to the FAST PM3 ELA Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

FAST PM1 and PM2 data will be monitored for achievement of our students with disabilities and instruction will be adjusted accordingly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jamie Ferguson (jamie.ferguson@brwardschools.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.)

Reading Horizons will be utilized with our students to provide intervention in the areas of need.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Reading Horizons will address the reading foundational skills necessary to assist our students with disabilities become proficient readers.

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.

PM1 and PM2 Data, iReady Diagnostisics, and formative assessments will be monitored and adjusted accordingly

Person Responsible: Laurel Crowle (laurel.crowle@browardschools.com)

By When: Ongoing and following the administration of the formative assessments.

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)).

Morrow is currently a ATSI (Additional Targeted Support and Improvement) School. The resources will be reviewed at all SAC/SAF Meetings. All decisions on resources and funding allocations will be decided by SAC.

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

FAST PM1, PM2, Benchmark Assessments, iReady Diagnostics, and formative assessments will be used to provide targeted instruction to teach the foundational skills and increase reading proficiency. 75% of our K-2 grade students achieved proficiency, therefore, there is need for targeted instruction to address critical needs.

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

FAST PM1, PM2, Benchmark Assessments, iReady Diagnostics, and formative assessments will be used to provide targeted instruction to teach the foundational skills and increase reading proficiency. 36% of our 3-5 grade students achieved proficiency, therefore, there is critical need for targeted instruction to address critical needs.

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 May 2024, students in grade K-2 will improve ELA proficiency from 75% to 85% based on the FAST Assessments (PM3)

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By May 2024, students in grades 3-5 will improve ELA proficiency from 36% to 51% based on the FAST Assessment (PM3).

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.

Benchmark Advance, PM1, PM2, iReady Diagnostic, and formative assessments. These will be monitored and used to plan for effective instruction in small group and individual instruction. Support/Leadership Team will collect and analyze data following each assessment to make instructional decisions.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Crowle, Laurel, laurel.crowle@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 Advance, Reading Horizons, SIPP. These practices and programs will be monitored through formative assessments throughout the year. These programs/practices follow the district scope and sequence and are aligned with the K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan.

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 rationale for the implementation of these programs is because 36% of 3-5 students were proficient in reading.

Benchmark Advance, Reading Horizons, and SIPP are evidence based programs that will assist us in planning for effective, planned lessons for our students. These programs have been recommended by the district and are evidence-based.

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>Assessment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In PLCs, Benchmark Advance Assessments, iReady Diagnostics, formative assessments will be used to address our area of focus 2. Leadership Teams will support grade levels in planning for instruction and will also analyze assessment data to make instructional decisions for students 	<p>Crowle, Laurel, laurel.crowle@browardschools.com</p>
<p>Professional Learning</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will receive training through the Science of Reading, Benchmark Advance, iReady, and Reading Horizons 2. Literacy Coach will provide onsite trainings for staff as needed throughout the year. 	<p>Crowle, Laurel, laurel.crowle@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.

Morrow's School Improvement Plan will be available on our school website, hard copies available at SAC/SAF Meetings and in the front office. Upon request, the School Improvement plan can be made available in other languages.

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))

Morrow's Family Engagement Plan is available at <https://www.browardschools.com/morrow>. It is also available at all SAC/SAF Meetings. Hard copies in other languages will be available upon request.

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))

Morrow will continue to provide quality instruction to all students. Schedules are carefully planned to meet all district requirements and maximize instructional time. Instructional Coaches will assist in planning meetings and pull strategic groups as needed. ELO Camps are going to address Reading and Math support for our students to continue to accelerate their learning.

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))

NA

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

NA

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

NA

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

NA

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

NA

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

NA