**Miami-Dade County Public Schools** 

# Ponce De Leon Middle School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

# **Table of Contents**

| School Demographics            | 3  |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
| School Information             | 7  |
| Needs Assessment               | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 18 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 23 |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 23 |

# **Ponce De Leon Middle School**

5801 AUGUSTO ST, Coral Gables, FL 33146

http://ponce.dadeschools.net/

## **Demographics**

**Principal: Anthony Balboa** 

Start Date for this Principal: 7/27/2021

| 2019-20 Status<br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
|---|---|
| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>6-8  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| 2020-21 Title I School  | Yes   |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)   | 92%   |
| 2020-21 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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History   | 2018-19: B (59%)<br>2017-18: A (63%)<br>2016-17: B (56%)  |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info  | ormation*   |
| SI Region   | Southeast   |
| Regional Executive Director   | <u>LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</u>   |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle   | N/A   |
| Year  |   |
| Support Tier  |   |
| ESSA Status   |   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For   | or 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 <a href="https://www.floridacims.org">www.floridacims.org</a>.

#### 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               | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 18 |
| Title I Requirements           | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 23 |

#### Ponce De Leon Middle School

5801 AUGUSTO ST, Coral Gables, FL 33146

http://ponce.dadeschools.net/

#### **School Demographics**

| School Type and Gi<br>(per MSID |          | 2020-21 Title I Schoo | l Disadvant | Economically<br>taged (FRL) Rate<br>ted on Survey 3) |  |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------------------|----------|-----------------------|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Middle Sch<br>6-8               | nool     | Yes                   |             | 76%  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary Servio<br>(per MSID     |          | Charter School        | (Reporte    | Minority Rate<br>ed as Non-white<br>Survey 2)        |  |  |  |  |  |
| K-12 General E                  | ducation | No                    |             | 93%  |  |  |  |  |  |
| School Grades Histo             | ory      |                       |             |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year                            | 2020-21  | 2019-20               | 2018-19     | 2017-18  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade                           |          | В                     | В           | Α  |  |  |  |  |  |

#### **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 <a href="https://www.floridaCIMS.org">https://www.floridaCIMS.org</a>.

#### **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.

It is the mission of Ponce de Leon Middle School to provide its students with a safe, academically challenging, and culturally diverse learning environment which fosters the development of a strong character and intellect. Furthermore, we aim to develop inquiring, knowledgeable and caring young people who help to create a better and more peaceful world through intercultural understanding and respect. We strive to impress in our students the principles which will enable them to positively and actively contribute to an ever-changing global society. As such, Ponce de Leon Middle School students are expected to be inquisitive, knowledgeable, thinkers, communicators, principled, open-minded, caring, risk-takers, balanced, and reflective in their pursuit of life-long learning.

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

Ponce de Leon Middle IB World School is committed to producing global students who are responsible members of society.

#### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

| Name                 | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|
| Balboa, Anthony      | Principal           | Principal                        |
| Cortez, Mayra        | Teacher, K-12       | PLST Team Member                 |
| Foderick, Christiane | Teacher, K-12       | SPED Chairperson and PLST Member |
| Junious, Toni        | Teacher, K-12       | Teacher and PLST Member          |
| Lacayo, Yader        | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal              |
| Ramos, Marlene       | Magnet Coordinator  | Magnet Lead Teacher/Coordinator  |
| Alvarez, Anay        | Teacher, K-12       |                                  |
| Anderson, Kimberly   | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal              |
| Falcon, Diego        | Teacher, K-12       |                                  |
| Gelin, Eliza         | Teacher, ESE        | ESE Teacher                      |

#### **Demographic Information**

#### Principal start date

Tuesday 7/27/2021, Anthony Balboa

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.

9

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.

45

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

65

Total number of students enrolled at the school

916

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

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

**Demographic Data** 

#### **Early Warning Systems**

#### 2021-22

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

| Indicator  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |   |    |    |    |       |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 254 | 350 | 312 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 916   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42  | 67  | 61  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 170   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 1   | 1   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31  | 14  | 14  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 59    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26  | 37  | 40  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 103   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29  | 38  | 38  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 105   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37  | 32  | 45  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 114   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 120 | 117 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 337   |

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

| Indicator                            |   |   |   |   |   | ( | Grad | e Le | vel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                            | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6    | 7    | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38   | 51   | 53  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 142   |

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

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

#### Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/27/2021

#### 2020-21 - As Reported

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

| Indicator                                     | Grade Level | Total |
|---|-------------|-------|
| Number of students enrolled                   |             |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent                   |             |       |
| One or more suspensions                       |             |       |
| Course failure in ELA                         |             |       |
| Course failure in Math                        |             |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment  |             |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment |             |       |

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

Indicator

| Indicator                            | Grade Level | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Students with two or more indicators |             |       |

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

| maioator                            | Olddo Lovol | i Otai |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|--------|
| Retained Students: Current Year     |             |        |
| Students retained two or more times |             |        |

Grade Level

#### 2020-21 - Updated

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

| Indicator                                     | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |   |    |    |    |       |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 340 | 360 | 395 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1095  |
| Attendance below 90 percent                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67  | 63  | 101 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 231   |
| One or more suspensions                       | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14  | 15  | 52  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 81    |
| Course failure in Math                        | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36  | 41  | 9   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 86    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41  | 37  | 61  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 139   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35  | 54  | 94  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 183   |

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

| Indicator                            |  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |    | Total |    |       |
|--------------------------------------|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|-------|----|-------|
|                                      |  | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11    | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators |  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 54 | 94 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 201   |

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

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

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

#### **School Data Review**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component      |        | 2021     |       |        | 2019     |       |        | 2018     |       |  |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--|
| School Grade Component      | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |  |
| ELA Achievement             |        |          |       | 65%    | 58%      | 54%   | 64%    | 56%      | 53%   |  |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 59%    | 58%      | 54%   | 60%    | 56%      | 54%   |  |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 44%    | 52%      | 47%   | 54%    | 52%      | 47%   |  |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 60%    | 58%      | 58%   | 64%    | 56%      | 58%   |  |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 52%    | 56%      | 57%   | 55%    | 56%      | 57%   |  |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 47%    | 54%      | 51%   | 52%    | 55%      | 51%   |  |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 57%    | 52%      | 51%   | 53%    | 52%      | 52%   |  |
| Social Studies Achievement  |        |          |       | 72%    | 74%      | 72%   | 78%    | 73%      | 72%   |  |

#### **Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

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

|            |          |        | ELA      |                                   |       |                                |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade      | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 06         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 60%    | 58%      | 2%                                | 54%   | 6%                             |
| Cohort Com | nparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 07         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 60%    | 56%      | 4%                                | 52%   | 8%                             |
| Cohort Com | nparison | -60%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 08         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 65%    | 60%      | 5%                                | 56%   | 9%                             |
| Cohort Com | nparison | -60%   |          |                                   |       |                                |

|            |          |        | MATH     | 1                                 |       |                                |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade      | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 06         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 59%    | 58%      | 1%                                | 55%   | 4%                             |
| Cohort Con | nparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 07         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 51%    | 53%      | -2%                               | 54%   | -3%                            |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -59%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 08         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 36%    | 40%      | -4%                               | 46%   | -10%                           |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -51%   |          |                                   | •     |                                |

|            |          |        | SCIEN    | CE                                |       |                                |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade      | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 08         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 44%    | 43%      | 1%                                | 48%   | -4%                            |
| Cohort Com | nparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |

|      |        | BIOLO    | GY EOC                      |       |                          |
|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2021 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 | 91%    | 68%      | 23%                         | 67%   | 24%                      |
|      |        | CIVIC    | S EOC                       |       |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2021 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 | 69%    | 73%      | -4%                         | 71%   | -2%                      |

|      |        | HISTO    | RY EOC                      |       |                          |
|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2021 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
|      |        | ALGE     | BRA EOC                     |       |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2021 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 | 70%    | 63%      | 7%                          | 61%   | 9%                       |
|      |        | GEOME    | TRY EOC                     |       |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2021 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 | 88%    | 54%      | 34%                         | 57%   | 31%                      |

## **Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments**

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

ELA and Math for all grade levels is based on iReady data. Grade 7 Civics and Grade 8 Science is based on Mid-Year Assessements.

|                       |                              | Grade 6 |        |        |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/%<br>Proficiency      | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students                 | 53.6    | 55.7   | 58.4   |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged   | 50.0    | 50.9   | 54.8   |
|                       | Students With Disabilities   | 29.5    | 22.2   | 34.1   |
|                       | English Language<br>Learners |         |        |        |
|                       | Number/%<br>Proficiency      | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students                 | 45.0    | 55.5   | 65.3   |
| Mathematics           | Economically Disadvantaged   | 42.4    | 51.5   | 60.9   |
|                       | Students With Disabilities   | 11.1    | 18.2   | 26.2   |
|                       | English Language<br>Learners |         |        | 37.5   |

|                          |  | Grade 7 |        |        |
|--------------------------|--|---------|--------|--------|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency                              | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students   | 46.9    | 56.5   | 57.9   |
| English Language<br>Arts | Economically Disadvantaged                           | 44.7    | 54.3   | 56.3   |
|                          | Students With Disabilities                           |         | 13.5   | 15.6   |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners                         |         |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency                              | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students   | 37.8    | 49.6   | 52.0   |
| Mathematics              | Economically Disadvantaged                           | 33.6    | 47.6   | 50.0   |
|                          | Students With Disabilities English Language Learners |         | 13.2   |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency                              | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students   |         | 59.0   |        |
| Civics                   | Economically Disadvantaged                           |         | 57.0   |        |
|                          | Students With Disabilities                           |         | 18.0   |        |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners                         |         | 21.0   |        |

|                          |                              | Grade 8 |        |        |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency      | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students                 | 56.2    | 55.1   | 57.9   |
| English Language<br>Arts | Economically Disadvantaged   | 54.5    | 52.5   | 54.5   |
|                          | Students With Disabilities   | 21.7    | 20.8   | 32.6   |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners |         |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency      | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students                 | 39.0    | 47.1   | 51.4   |
| Mathematics              | Economically Disadvantaged   | 36.4    | 45.4   | 48.5   |
|                          | Students With Disabilities   | 17.0    | 14.6   | 23.8   |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners |         |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency      | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students                 |         | 33.0   |        |
| Science                  | Economically Disadvantaged   |         | 31.0   |        |
|                          | Students With Disabilities   |         | 20.0   |        |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners |         | 20.0   |        |

# Subgroup Data Review

|           |             | 2021      | SCHOO             | DL GRAD      | E COMF     | PONENT             | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 |
| SWD       | 23          | 30        | 27                | 13           | 15         | 14                 | 14          | 26         | 38           |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 48          | 47        | 40                | 37           | 23         | 26                 | 18          | 53         | 36           |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 28          | 20        | 11                | 11           | 7          | 8                  | 18          | 31         | 47           |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 59          | 50        | 40                | 38           | 20         | 23                 | 47          | 56         | 48           |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 65          | 53        |                   | 63           | 34         |                    | 38          | 81         | 89           |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 54          | 46        | 33                | 33           | 18         | 19                 | 40          | 53         | 45           |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2019      | SCHO              | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | PONENT             | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2017-18 |
| SWD       | 26          | 43        | 30                | 28           | 46         | 41                 | 23          | 41         |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 53          | 58        | 51                | 51           | 50         | 49                 | 30          | 56         | 59           |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 34          | 36        | 21                | 37           | 44         | 29                 | 26          | 59         | 65           |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 67          | 60        | 48                | 61           | 53         | 52                 | 59          | 72         | 71           |                         |                           |

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |             |           |                   |              |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
|---|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2017-18 |
| WHT                                       | 79          | 68        |                   | 80           | 60         |                    | 89          | 90         | 85           |                         |                           |
| FRL                                       | 62          | 56        | 43                | 56           | 50         | 46                 | 53          | 70         | 69           |                         |                           |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |             |           |                   |              |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2016-17 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2016-17 |
| SWD                                       | 24          | 43        | 36                | 21           | 39         | 31                 | 18          | 39         | 82           |                         |                           |
| ELL                                       | 35          | 57        | 54                | 47           | 60         | 56                 | 21          | 52         | 70           |                         |                           |
| BLK                                       | 31          | 36        | 26                | 35           | 39         | 29                 | 26          | 51         | 75           |                         |                           |
| HSP                                       | 65          | 63        | 57                | 66           | 56         | 55                 | 55          | 81         | 86           |                         |                           |
| WHT                                       | 75          | 63        | 75                | 79           | 58         | 55                 | 65          | 88         | 83           |                         |                           |
| FRL                                       | 61          | 59        | 53                | 62           | 55         | 51                 | 48          | 76         | 85           |                         |                           |

#### **ESSA Data Review**

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index  |     |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  |     |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 41  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 4   |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 41  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 407 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 10  |
| Percent Tested  | 95% |

## **Subgroup Data**

| Students With Disabilities  |    |  |  |  |
|---|----|--|--|--|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                | 22 |  |  |  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        |    |  |  |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% |    |  |  |  |
| English Language Learners   |    |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                 | 37 |  |  |  |

| English Language Learners  |    |  |  |
|--|----|--|--|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                | 37 |  |  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        |    |  |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% |    |  |  |

| 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%        |     |  |  |  |
| 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%                  |     |  |  |  |
| Black/African American Students  |     |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                | 20  |  |  |  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |  |  |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |  |  |  |
| Hispanic Students  |     |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 42  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | NO  |  |  |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               |     |  |  |  |
| Multiracial Students   |     |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   |     |  |  |  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   |     |  |  |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%            |     |  |  |  |
| Pacific Islander Students  |     |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students                                      |     |  |  |  |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              |     |  |  |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%       |     |  |  |  |
| White Students   |     |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - White Students   | 60  |  |  |  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         |     |  |  |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                  |     |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                            | 37  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?    | YES |  |  |  |
|  |     |  |  |  |

#### **Analysis**

#### **Data Analysis**

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

#### What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Based on 2021 Math FSA data, our school learning gains among students identified in the lowest quartile in both Math dropped twenty six percentage points. In ELA, our lowest quartile shoed a drop of nine percentage points. Our SWD and Black student subgroups consistently scored below our school's averages, as did our ELL and FRL subgroups, although not as consistently. Based on 2021 iReady data, our 8th graders had the lowest growth from AP1 to AP3 in both ELA and Math.

# What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on 2020-2021 FSA data, learning gains among our lowest quartile students in both ELA and Math demonstrate the greatest need for improvement, especially among our SWD and Black student subgroups. Based on 2021 iReady progress monitoring data, our 8th graders have the most room for growth from AP1 to AP3. ELA increases could also be improved across grade levels to correlate more closely to increase in math.

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

Contributing factors might have included: general lack of student engagement and motivation, negative attitudes toward schooling, and lack of resources to monitor these students as closely as they might need.

New actions might include: 1) a mentorship program (teacher - student, magnet IB student - student, college student - middle school student), 2) in-school support (push-in / pull-out tutoring, instructional coach support), 3) more regular monitoring of lowest quartile students supervised and directed by team leaders, 4) more consistent use and monitoring of iReady across subgroups (gamify, increase recognition).

# What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based on 2019 data, our average school achievement levels in ELA and Math met or exceeded both district and state averages. Our Hispanic and White student subgroups consistently met or exceeded our school's average achievement and learning gain levels. Based on 2021 iReady data, our 6th grade Math students showed the largest improvement from AP1 to AP3 and our 7th grade ELA students showed the largest ELA improvement as compared to the other grade levels.

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

Contributing factors to this improvement include consistent overall implementation of district and state curricula and resources. New actions we took included increased student access to technology through issuing student laptops, incorporating digital tools, such as iReady, more consistently during class time.

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

Using resources more effectively (including human resources), shared leadership by including team and student leaders in assisting our lowest quartile, clearly defining priorities by setting mini-goals that reward learning gains versus just achievement.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Sessions targeting student engagement across all our various subgroups (magnet IB, lowest quartile, ELL, SWD, Black, Hispanic, etc.) as well as sessions unpacking instructional planning and delivery to more intentionally and effectively meet the unique needs of all our learner groups.

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

Continuing to implement district and state suggested resources with fidelity to meet state standards and continuing to offer enrichment opportunities to all students.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:** 

#### #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of

**Focus** 

Description and

Based on our 2020-2021 FSA data, our lowest quartile students showed a decrease of

twelve percentage points in ELA and thirty two percentage points in Math.

Rationale:

Measurable An increase in learning gains among lowest quartile learners and all subgroups by at least

Outcome: sixteen percentage points on ELA and Math 2022 state assessments.

> The Leadership Team will conduct quarterly data chats, adjust groups based on current data in real time, and follow-up with regular walkthroughs to ensure quality instruction is

taking place. Data Analysis of formative assessments of L25 students will be reviewed **Monitoring:** 

monthly to observe progress. Data will be analyzed during Leadership Team meetings to

ensure students are demonstrating growth on remediated standards.

Person responsible

Anthony Balboa (pr6741@dadeschools.net) for

monitoring outcome:

Evidence-

based By using resources effectively, we can ensure the students' individual needs are being met.

Strategy:

Rationale

for Evidence-

Based on the drop in our 2020-2021 both ELA and Math proficiency, there is a need for this

instructional practice.

Strategy:

based

#### **Action Steps to Implement**

English Language Arts and Math Teachers will participate in an iReady professional development to further their knowledge with the platform and reports via their department meetings. Teachers will analyze and disaggregate the iReady reports to develop groups, plan lessons, and differentiate instruction.

Person

Anthony Balboa (pr6741@dadeschools.net) Responsible

Math teachers will meet to discuss assessment scores and data, examine current procedures, and participate in professional development sessions in order to implement strategies to differentiate instruction.

Person Responsible

Raeford Melton (rmelton@dadeschools.net)

Administrators and Department Chairs will engage in Quarterly Data Chats and will analyze and disaggregate data to measure the impact of strategies in place.

Person Responsible

Yader Lacayo (lacayoy@dadeschools.net)

Teachers will continue to receive quarterly iReady support and differentiated instruction professional development. Teachers will continuously engage in ongoing professional development to further their knowledge to enhance their lessons and increase students' learning.

Person Responsible

Kimberly Anderson (kimanderson@dadeschools.net)

#### #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Due to learning loss and the dual modalities from the prior academic school year, Ponce Description de Leon had a high rate of students failing courses. With students not being engaged, and Rationale: their grades will suffer. As a result, their promotion status could be impacted.

Measurable Fewer students failing courses on a quarterly basis. We will decrease failing rate by at Outcome:

least ten percentage points.

Student grades will be monitored by teachers, department leaders and administration Monitoring: through the electronic gradebook. We will meet with students with D's or below to

remediate their deficiencies.

Person

responsible for monitoring

Anthony Balboa (pr6741@dadeschools.net)

outcome: Evidence-

Shared Leadership will ensure every student is being monitored. based

Strategy:

Rationale for

Evidencebased

Strategy:

Due to the learning loss students have suffered, we are expecting many students to have lower grades. We want to ensure our students are successful and able to pass

their required courses.

#### **Action Steps to Implement**

Faculty members will be assigned a group of students identified on the L25 and meet with them monthly to check academic and disciplinary progress. As a result of creating a mentoring program, L25 students will perform better academically and disciplinary as evidenced by I-Ready Data, PowerBI, Performance Matters Data, and Disciplinary Referrals.

Person Anthony Balboa (pr6741@dadeschools.net) Responsible

Recognize teachers and students of the month to increase student engagement. EESAC will select the Teacher of the Month. Students will be selected through a school-wide survey sent to staff. The "Explorers of the Month" will be announced on the PA and images will be posted on social media.

Person Anthony Balboa (pr6741@dadeschools.net) Responsible

We will conduct a Club Rush Week, during the week of September 20th through September 24th, where all school related clubs will recruit students interested in participating in and joining School related service clubs. Student participation and engagement in school related clubs will increase as evidenced by club rosters.

Person Diego Falcon (c falcon@dadeschools.net) Responsible

Students will participate in an honor roll ceremony quarterly. Students meeting grading criteria will be honored and recognized in the main office and through social media.

Person Kimberly Anderson (kimanderson@dadeschools.net) Responsible

#### #3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus
Description and

Students feel that they cannot relate to what they are learning. If students do not see the connection to what they are learning, they will not want to learn. In turn;

Rationale:

attendance, behavior, and academic progress will be impacted.

Measurable Outcome:

Based on our school climate survey trend, students regularly respond that they do not

relate to what they are learning, etc.

We will conduct Curriculum Council meetings that include team leaders and help ensure students can relate to what they are learning. There will be bi-monthly check-

ins with team leaders and student services staff.

Person

responsible for monitoring

Anthony Balboa (pr6741@dadeschools.net)

outcome:

Evidence-based Effective Use of School and District Support Personnel - counselors, team leaders,

Strategy: coaches, etc.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

If students feel what they are learning is useful and valuable; they will be engaged, feel

connected, and perform better academically and display better behavior.

#### **Action Steps to Implement**

The administrative team will establish a PBS Plan integrating the IB Learner Profiles, present PBS Plan to faculty to communicate expectations, and will review the established plan and data on a quarterly basis.

Person Responsible

Anthony Balboa (pr6741@dadeschools.net)

Counselors and Interdisciplinary Team Leaders will meet and or communicate on a bi-weekly basis to discuss intervention for targeted students with poor attendance. Students indicating poor attendance will be monitored in order improve their attendance by reducing their probability of being absent as evidenced on Power Bi attendance reports.

Person Responsible

Kimberly Anderson (kimanderson@dadeschools.net)

Administrators will encourage teachers to model and promote a growth mindset. As a result of modeling and promoting a growth mindset, the notion that almost anything is attainable via focus, hard work, and willingness to learn from failure will be achieved. Teachers will notice more positive, confident learners that feel connected to the lessons being taught.

Person Responsible

Anthony Balboa (pr6741@dadeschools.net)

Administrators will encourage teachers to communicate with students regarding academic, behavior, and social issues. As a result of effective communication between teachers and students; teachers will be aware of how students are progressing academically, behaviorally, and socially and will be able to provide the necessary resources and/support.

Person Responsible

Anthony Balboa (pr6741@dadeschools.net)

#### #4. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team

Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:

With two new administrators in the building during an IB Evaluation year; communication, collaboration, and consistency will be key to the school's success.

Measurable Outcome:

We will keep copies of all faculty meeting presentations to help develop and foster

consistency.

Clearly Define Priorities - stated goals and expectations, keeping everyone

**Monitoring:** accountable, weekly timelines and to-dos, make sure everyone is on the same page,

know the school goals, deadlines, etc.

Person

responsible for monitoring outcome:

Anthony Balboa (pr6741@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based** 

Strategy:

We will conduct weekly leadership meetings to discuss the progress of our students, faculty, and stakeholders not only academic success, but also cultural success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

With administrative changes, stakeholders need to ensure trust and a shared vision

for success.

#### **Action Steps to Implement**

The leadership team will meet weekly to discuss data, trends, and school culture.

Person Responsible

Anthony Balboa (pr6741@dadeschools.net)

The leadership team will conduct instructional walk throughs and discuss finding to ensure instructional focus is being met.

Person

Responsible

Anthony Balboa (pr6741@dadeschools.net)

Leadership team will meet with Curriculum Council monthly to discuss academic progress, school culture and to ensure shared vision.

Person

Responsible

Anthony Balboa (pr6741@dadeschools.net)

Leadership will hold open hours for parents virtually to address parental concerns and offer potential solutions to those concerns.

Person

Responsible

Anthony Balboa (pr6741@dadeschools.net)

#### **Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Ponce de Leon will monitor behavior patterns and will focus on classroom disruptions by having SEL and Restorative Justice Activities.

#### 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.

Ponce has taken various steps to build a positive school culture and environment. The school will focus on building a positive school moral and culture. We will recognize faculty, staff, students and parents for successes inside and out of the classroom through various methods like Social Media Outlets, our school website, and our school announcements. Through our mentorship program, we will be able to form a connection between teachers and students that will better influence academic performance and behavior.

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

Teachers will work with our students through opting to participate in mentorship programs and completing Values Matters Initiatives. Students will be identified and celebrated for academic successes and positive behavior.

EESAC members will meet to identify Explorers of the Month; a teacher recognition program. PTSA members will meet with parents and work with the school to ensure teachers and students have the necessary support to be successful.

## Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation                            | \$0.00 |
|---|--------|--|--------|
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement                         | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team                          | \$0.00 |
|   |        | Total:   | \$0.00 |