

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Earlington Heights Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Earlington Heights Elementary School

4750 NW 22ND AVE, Miami, FL 33142

<http://earlingtonheightselem.dadeschools.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Jackson Nicolas

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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	2018-19: D (40%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: F (31%)
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	CS&I
* 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 Dade 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Earlington Heights Elementary School

4750 NW 22ND AVE, Miami, FL 33142

<http://earlingtonheightselem.dadeschools.net/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	96%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	99%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	D	D	A	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Dade 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.

The staff, parents, and community of Earlington Heights Elementary School believe all students have the right and ability to learn. We are committed to providing a solid educational foundation for our students so they may achieve their highest academic potential, while maintaining steady, positive growth.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All stakeholders of Earlington Heights Elementary School envision a learning environment that nurtures and encourages students to achieve their full potential as life-long learners who become productive citizens and leaders.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Nicolas, Jackson	Principal	As the school's principal, Mr. Nicolas provides a mission and shapes a vision for academic success for all students. Data is utilized to drive decision-making, cultivate leadership in others, and provide the appropriate curriculum offerings. Mr. Nicolas establishes high expectations for all students, and ensures that the school-based team is implementing Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS).
Clayton, Tequila	Assistant Principal	As the assistant principal, Ms. Clayton works in collaboration with the principal in implementing the vision and mission for the school. Ms. Clayton ensures fidelity of the MTSS monitoring by evaluating the following: instructional staff's implementation of tiered instruction, process of administering assessments, and the alignment of professional development with faculty needs.
Ramontal, Shahllynn	Instructional Coach	As the reading coach, Ms. Medina provides direct instructional services related to improving and supporting classroom instruction. Ms. Medina utilizes the coaching model to support teachers in effective evidenced-based instructional strategies that will improve students' academic success.
Javier, Estephany	Instructional Coach	As the math coach, Ms. Javier provides direct instructional services related to improving and supporting classroom instruction. Ms. Javier utilizes the coaching model to support teachers in effective evidenced-based instructional strategies that will improve students' academic success.
Jhones, Lindsey	Instructional Coach	As the science coach, Ms. Jhones provides direct instructional services related to improving and supporting classroom instruction. Ms. Jhones utilizes the coaching model to support teachers in effective evidence-based instructional strategies that will improve students' academic success.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Jackson Nicolas

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

20

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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	2018-19: D (40%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: F (31%)
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	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems**Current Year**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	49	81	69	70	65	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	397
Attendance below 90 percent	4	10	11	14	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	1	8	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	5	5	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	28	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	20	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	3	14	25	11	18	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94

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	1	11	13	12	16	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 5/19/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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	94	86	77	77	79	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	502
Attendance below 90 percent	28	23	16	12	29	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	2	10	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	17	19	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70

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	7	3	5	3	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

Prior Year - Updated**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	94	86	77	77	79	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	502
Attendance below 90 percent	28	23	16	12	29	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	2	10	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	17	19	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70

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	7	3	5	3	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data**

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	41%	62%	57%	29%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	41%	62%	58%	63%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	58%	53%	83%	58%	52%
Math Achievement	52%	69%	63%	66%	66%	61%
Math Learning Gains	40%	66%	62%	77%	65%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	55%	51%	76%	57%	51%
Science Achievement	18%	55%	53%	30%	52%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	49%	60%	-11%	58%	-9%
	2018	41%	61%	-20%	57%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	41%	64%	-23%	58%	-17%
	2018	32%	60%	-28%	56%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	31%	60%	-29%	56%	-25%
	2018	28%	59%	-31%	55%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	63%	67%	-4%	62%	1%
	2018	68%	67%	1%	62%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	59%	69%	-10%	64%	-5%
	2018	66%	68%	-2%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2019	35%	65%	-30%	60%	-25%
	2018	70%	66%	4%	61%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-35%				
Cohort Comparison		-31%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	21%	53%	-32%	53%	-32%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	39%	56%	-17%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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	17	26	41	38	21		6				
ELL	57	58		67	58						
BLK	37	38	41	47	38	40	13				
HSP	51	51	60	63	47		38				
FRL	41	41	46	52	40	41	18				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	18	52	73	85	93	100	9				
ELL	54	67		79	55						
BLK	33	49	71	72	73	81	44				
HSP	49	48		89	62		50				
FRL	37	49	70	76	70	83	45				
2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	12	69	76	49	79	90	6				
ELL	24	58		76	67						
BLK	28	64	88	64	79	81	27				
HSP	34	65		78	78		45				
FRL	28	63	83	65	78	76	29				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	63

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	342
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	61
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	36
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
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	
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	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant 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 that showed the lowest performance on iReady AP2 for both Math and Reading, was second grade. One of the contributing factors to this data was in AP1 iReady diagnostic, 5% of students were proficient and for iReady AP2 19% were proficient. Although, there was a 14 point increase, we found that it was still low performance compared to the rest of the school's data. Another contributing factor to this data being our lowest performance was that in this grade level we had the highest percentage of students receiving tier 3 reading interventions. Another contributing factor to this was that this grade level consisted of 2 novice teachers to the grade level and/or profession. When analyzing past data for this specific group of students we found that they have historically performed poorly on iReady diagnostic and SAT10 assessments. The data also shows that the students from 2018-2019 school year showed no movement in tiers.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was was third grade math AP2 iReady diagnostic. The percentage of students that achieved proficiency was as follows: 43% (2018-2019) and 31% (2019- 2020) which shows an 12 point decrease in gains. Contributing factors

to this decline was a teacher new to the grade level as well as the rigor in standards presented a challenge to 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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Science. Possible contributing factors for the low performance in this area is that students were not meeting proficiency on various Topic Assessments. Remediation of these benchmarks were not monitored utilizing a Data Tracker. The teachers are in need of support in effective Science instruction.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was first grade reading. The percentage of students that achieved proficiency was as follows: 6% (2018-2019) and 32% (2019- 2020) which shows an 26 point increase in gains. The new action that the school implemented in this area was the implementation of interventionists in the grade level which provided a small group setting and strategic interventions.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Reflecting on the EWS data, student attendance is an area of concern.

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

1. Coaches
2. Interventionists
3. Technology
4. Teacher and student attendance
5. Academic Resources

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the data, we have a high turn over rate of teachers, both new to the profession and new to the grade level being taught. In turn having content area instructional coaches (reading, math and science) will benefit the teachers at our school.

Measurable Outcome: If instructional support and coaches maintain classroom collaboration with content area teachers, then student learning needs will be met by evidence of teachers understanding the standards (reading, math and science), thus resulting in 50% of the students in grades three through five achieving proficiency in ELA , 60% achieving proficiency in Mathematics and 40% of the students in grade five achieving proficiency in science on the 2020-2021 Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) and FCAT.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jackson Nicolas (pr1561@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will participate in coaching cycles and collaborative planning led by coaches. This practice will identify areas of growth for the teachers and a coaching cycle will be implemented in order to improve on the chosen practice.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If teachers participate in coaching cycles, then teachers will improve teaching practice and pedagogy that will lead to higher student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will meet with content area coaches on a weekly basis to analyze student data, as a result to this implementation step evidence of student regrouping and shifts in DI resources will be shown in teacher's data tracker.

Person Responsible Jackson Nicolas (pr1561@dadeschools.net)

Teachers will meet with content area coaches on a weekly basis to identify resources, create guiding questions, and end products that are aligned to the standards and the benchmarks. As a result of this implementation step, content area alignment will occur in whole group.

Person Responsible Jackson Nicolas (pr1561@dadeschools.net)

Using the Framework of Effective Instruction, content area coaches will observe teachers to determine areas for growth and collaboratively create professional development and coaching cycles aligned to teachers needs.

Person Responsible Jackson Nicolas (pr1561@dadeschools.net)

Content area coaches will identify teachers implementing "best practices" to be observed by peers.

Person Responsible Jackson Nicolas (pr1561@dadeschools.net)

#2. Other specifically relating to Interventions/ Rtl

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the data, Interventions and Rtl are essential to our students because we have a large percentage of lowest 25 percent that will benefit from these practices being implemented with fidelity.

Measurable Outcome: If teachers implement Interventions and Rtl with fidelity, then 50% of the 5th grade and 4th grade retainees will make learning gains on the 2020-2021 Florida Standards Assessment. Additionally, 60% of the lowest 25 will make learning gains on the FSA as well.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jackson Nicolas (pr1561@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will be implementing appropriate Intervention daily to meet the needs of our students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If the appropriate interventions are implemented with fidelity, then we will see an increase in student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will utilize the use of computers to access various resources to drive differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible Jackson Nicolas (pr1561@dadeschools.net)

Interventionists will be assigned to support identified students performing below grade level on math a reading in grade kindergarten to fifth.

Person Responsible Jackson Nicolas (pr1561@dadeschools.net)

Teachers will use appropriate resources to conduct one hour of reading intervention or enrichment daily.

Person Responsible Jackson Nicolas (pr1561@dadeschools.net)

Interventionists will plan with reading coach and math coach to review resources to teach critical standards.

Person Responsible Jackson Nicolas (pr1561@dadeschools.net)

Bi weekly assessment will be administered to assess skills taught during intervention. This data will be reviewed during common planning to address strengths and weakness of the students.

Person Responsible Jackson Nicolas (pr1561@dadeschools.net)

#3. Other specifically relating to Data Driven Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the data, it is important that we are focused on data driven instruction due to the varying needs of our learners and shifts needed in instruction to our data.

Measurable Outcome: If our teachers are engaged in collaborative planning and data is monitored, then 50% of the 5th grade and 4th grade retainees will make learning gains on the 2020-2021 Florida Standards Assessment. Additionally, 60% of the lowest 25 will make learning gains on the FSA as well. Also, 40% of the students in grade five will achieve proficiency on the 2020-2021 Science FCAT.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jackson Nicolas (pr1561@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will be accountable to knowing their students data by updating trackers and monitoring their progress.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If the data is analyzed in an effective manner, then that will lead to shifts in our instruction that will meet the needs of our learners and yield greater student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will attend weekly collaborative planning to analyze data from content area assessments.

Person Responsible Jackson Nicolas (pr1561@dadeschools.net)

Teachers and coaches will access data from Performance Matters to identify standards which require remediation.

Person Responsible Jackson Nicolas (pr1561@dadeschools.net)

Administration will engage in data chats quarterly with teachers to discuss OPM's and bi weekly assessments in math and reading.

Person Responsible Jackson Nicolas (pr1561@dadeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Student Attendance

The leadership team will utilize available resources and consistently recognize and reward students who have less than four days of being absent.

Academic Resources

The leadership team in collaboration with teachers will review and analyze various data points and make decisions on utilizing various academic resources to meet the needs of all learners.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Involving all stakeholders in regards to school improvements is the key to a schools success. In an effort to build a positive school culture and environment, all stakeholders are encouraged to attend our monthly EESAC (Educational Excellence School Advisory Council) meetings. During these meetings stakeholders are apprised of all changes related to school academics and budgetary matters. Stakeholders have an opportunity to share their concerns or add any suggestions to school improvement plans. Additionally, all stakeholders are invited to our Annual Title One meeting. During this time stakeholders have an opportunity to give their input regarding the PFEP (Parent Family and Engagement Plan). This plan allows parents and guardians to see the various resources that will be used for student achievement.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Instructional Coaching				\$78,772.50
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	1561 - Earlington Heights Elem. Schl	UniSIG	1.0	\$58,352.50
			<i>Notes: Transformation Science Coach to improve science proficiency, support school transformation and turnaround efforts, interventions and wraparound services for ETO-School Improvement.</i>			
	6400	210-Retirement	1561 - Earlington Heights Elem. Schl	UniSIG	0.0	\$6,407.00
			<i>Notes: Retirement for Transformation Science Coach</i>			
	6400	220-Social Security	1561 - Earlington Heights Elem. Schl	UniSIG	0.0	\$4,464.00
			<i>Notes: Social Security for Transformation Science Coach</i>			
	6400	230-Group Insurance	1561 - Earlington Heights Elem. Schl	UniSIG	0.0	\$8,184.00

			<i>Notes: Insurance for Transformation Science Coach</i>			
	6400	240-Workers Compensation	1561 - Earlington Heights Elem. Schl	UniSIG	0.0	\$1,365.00
			<i>Notes: Worker's Compensation for Transformation Science Coach</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Interventions/ Rtl				\$90,045.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	1561 - Earlington Heights Elem. Schl	UniSIG	1.37	\$74,610.00
			<i>Notes: Classroom Hourly Teachers and Hourly Interventionists for supplemental instructional support that will include various delivery models to improve learning gains through small group instruction during extended learning opportunities before, during, or after the school day, tutorial sessions during Saturday Academy and/or during Spring Recess Camps. 3 hourly interventionists for 28 weeks and 4 hourly teachers during Spring Break Academy for 5 days for extended learning opportunities to increase student achievement.</i>			
	5100	210-Retirement	1561 - Earlington Heights Elem. Schl	UniSIG	0.0	\$8,082.00
			<i>Notes: Retirement for Classroom Hourly Teachers and Hourly Interventionists</i>			
	5100	220-Social Security	1561 - Earlington Heights Elem. Schl	UniSIG	0.0	\$5,631.00
			<i>Notes: Social Security for Classroom Hourly Teachers and Hourly Interventionists</i>			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	1561 - Earlington Heights Elem. Schl	UniSIG	0.0	\$1,722.00
			<i>Notes: Workers Compensation for Classroom Hourly Teachers and Hourly Interventionists</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Data Driven Instruction				\$18,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	644-Computer Hardware Non-Capitalized	1561 - Earlington Heights Elem. Schl	UniSIG	0.0	\$18,000.00
			<i>Notes: Non-Capitalized Computer Hardware - To purchase approximately 30 desktop computers to improve small group and differentiated instruction, enhance and supplement the development of conceptual meaning and technology based interventions centered on students' needs and further differentiated instruction for individual student learning within the student block.</i>			
Total:						\$186,817.50