Kinloch Park Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Kinloch Park Elementary School

4275 NW 1ST ST, Miami, FL 33126

http://newkpe.dadeschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Kisa Humphrey D

Start Date for this Principal: 7/30/2015

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (59%)
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	
* 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

Kinloch Park Elementary School

4275 NW 1ST ST, Miami, FL 33126

http://newkpe.dadeschools.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	82%

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	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	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.

Build a community of literate readers. Develop lifelong effective writers. Produce real world problem solvers. Encourage learners in scientific inquiry. Expand students' knowledge base of history, culture, geography and government. Incorporate the fine arts to promote cultural appreciation. Utilize technology to facilitate knowledge acquisition.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Kinloch Park Elementary School strives to build committed relationships in which all stakeholders collaborate to ensure that each student receives an educational program that facilitates growth and development that is appropriate to their future as contributing members of a global 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
Guzman, Techie	Principal	Provide strategic direction within the learning community to increase student achievement.
Larranaga, Jesus	Assistant Principal	Assist the principal with providing strategic direction within the learning community to increase student achievement.
Cooper, Himilse	Instructional Coach	Reinforce evidence-based practices implemented in the classrooms by providing personalized support with instructional staff.
Ramos, Lissette	Teacher, K-12	Provide a student-centered learning environment that will address the needs of all learners. Serve as the professional development liaison between the school site and the District office.
Liccioni, Xaimile	ELL Compliance Specialist	Reinforce evidence-based practices implemented in the classrooms by providing personalized support with instructional staff. Govern and facilitate compliance of the English Language Learner program.
Lopez, Caroline	School Counselor	Provide student services to learners in need.
Zabala, Jose	Instructional Coach	Reinforce evidence-based practices implemented in the classrooms by providing personalized support with instructional staff.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/30/2015, Kisa Humphrey D

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.*

26

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

37

Total number of students enrolled at the school

431

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

7

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

0

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	32	59	69	83	85	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	419
Attendance below 90 percent	6	19	16	23	19	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	4	9	13	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in Math	0	4	10	10	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	16	36	38	28	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148

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	1	5	10	17	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	5	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/28/2021

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	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

2020-21 - 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	62	75	89	102	97	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	510
Attendance below 90 percent	16	11	26	23	20	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	9	14	10	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Course failure in Math	0	9	14	6	14	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	1	9	17	11	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

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	5	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				67%	62%	57%	63%	62%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				63%	62%	58%	48%	62%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	58%	53%	42%	59%	48%
Math Achievement				62%	69%	63%	65%	69%	62%
Math Learning Gains				50%	66%	62%	56%	64%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				35%	55%	51%	43%	55%	47%
Science Achievement				56%	55%	53%	68%	58%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	69%	60%	9%	58%	11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	71%	64%	7%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	60%	-12%	56%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	71%	67%	4%	62%	9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	62%	69%	-7%	64%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
05	2021					
	2019	46%	65%	-19%	60%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	52%	53%	-1%	53%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Grades K-5 will use i-Ready Data for ELA and Math using AP1 for Fall, AP2 for Winter and AP3 for Spring.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24.1%	23.2%	44.8%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24.6%	21.8%	45.6%
	Students With Disabilities	16.7%	33.3%	50.0
	English Language Learners	19.0%	14.3%	33.3%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33.3%	27.3%	39.7%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33.9%	27.8%	40.4%
	Students With Disabilities	33.3%	33.3%	50.0%
	English Language Learners	33.3%	33.3%	42.9%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31.5%	46.6%	55.6%
	Economically Disadvantaged	28.6%	44.3%	53.6%
	Students With Disabilities	8.3%	41.7%	33.3%
	English Language Learners	0%	20%	20%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18.1%	30.6%	44.6%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17.4%	27.5%	42.3%
	Students With Disabilities	9.1%	33.3%	41.7%
	English Language Learners	0%	20%	0%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40.0%%	52.2%	60.9%
	Economically Disadvantaged	37.5%	50%	61%
	Students With Disabilities	27.3%	31.8%	27.3%
	English Language Learners	0%	22.2%	20.0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17.8%	43.3%	53.3%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17.5%	42.5%	50%
	Students With Disabilities	9.1%	36.4%	31.8%
	English Language Learners	0%	20%	20%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31.7%	41.9%	45.3%
	Economically Disadvantaged	28.9%	39.2%	43.0%
	Students With Disabilities	5.9%	12.5%	16.7%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	22.4%	32.6%	18.5%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21.8%	29.1%	33.8%
	Students With Disabilities	6.3%	17.6%	11.1%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26.3%	36.3%	46.9%
	Economically Disadvantaged	27.4%	38.4%	50.0%
	Students With Disabilities	11.1%	11.1%	22.2%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18.5%	38.8%	42.0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17.6%	39.7%	41.9%
	Students With Disabilities	11.1%	22.2%	22.2%
	English Language Learners	14.3%	14.3%	14.3%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0%	15.0%	0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0%	16.0%	0%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	4.0%	0%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	26	17		21	17						
ELL	52	45	40	38	29	53	54				
HSP	57	44	41	41	28	50	55				
FRL	54	43	33	37	28	53	54				
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	24	30	30	29	18	18					
ELL	63	63	47	58	47	29	51				
HSP	67	63	47	62	50	35	56				
FRL	65	61	49	60	48	30	54				

	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	31	26	38	38	19	9	42				
ELL	53	42	42	57	50	45	39				
HSP	63	48	41	65	56	44	69				
FRL	62	47	42	64	55	45	66				

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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	360
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
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?	N/A
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?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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?

2021 data findings:
English Language Arts proficiency decreased by 14 percentage points (67% to 53%). Students demonstrating one year of academic growth/learning gain decreased by 20 percentage points (63% to 43%). Thirty-nine percent of least proficient learners labeled as the "Lowest Quartile" demonstrated a learning gain, as opposed to 47% during the 2018-2019 school year.

Mathematics proficiency decreased from 62% to 41%, a decrease of 22 percentage points. Mathematics Learning Gains decreased from 50% to 28%, a decrease of 22 percentage points. Lowest Quartile increased from 35% to 50%, an increase of fifteen percentage points.

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

Based on 2021 scores and i-Ready Progress Monitoring schoolwide data, Math demonstrated a greater need for improvement. Although Reading decreased, Math Proficiency and Learning Gains demonstrated a greater loss.

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

The contributing factors to this need for improvement were student truancy and interruption in learning due to quarantine. All teachers, coaches and support staff will continue to focus on building knowledge through weekly collaboration. Dialogue in collaborative learning structures will focus on meeting the needs of individual learners.

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

Based on 2021 scores and i-Ready Progress Monitoring school wide data, the lowest quartile in Mathematics made the most improvement. The lowest quartile in Math made an increase of 15 percentage points.

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

The master schedule allotted weekly collaborative planning sessions amongst grade levels and departments. Administrators and coaches will attend weekly collaboratively planning sessions, to identify needs; contribute to conversations that support academic initiatives, as well as, gather/align existing resources. Strengthen the utilization of teacher leaders to share best practices and facilitate dialogue to drive effective instruction.

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

Horizontal and Vertical Collaborative Planning, Data Driven instruction, Interventions, MTSS/RtI Referrals, Extended Learning Opportunities

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.

Beginning August 2021, Leadership Team will facilitate professional development to guide instructional staff to analyze data through collaborative structures. Teachers and support staff will discuss findings, prioritize focus, create ab action plan to address academic and cultural centralized concerns, as well as, outline measures that will evaluate effectiveness of actions.

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

Weekly collaborative planning will occur Tuesdays and Thursdays. A member from the leadership team will participate and contribute during the planning sessions to ensure fidelity to the strategies being implemented school wide are aligned to the goals.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

When comparing student results from the 2019 & 2021 administration of the English Language Arts (ELA) Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), academic needs were identified.

*Third, fourth and fifth grade students attaining proficiency decreased by 14 percentage points (67% to 53%). Students demonstrating one year of academic growth decreased by 20 percentage points (63% to 43%). Thirty-nine percent of least proficient learners labeled as the "Lowest Quartile" demonstrated a learning gain, as opposed to 47% during the 2018-2019 school year.

*Based on the 2020-2021 Assessment Period 3 iReady Reading Diagnostic results, 41% of students in Kindergarten through 3rd grade are not on track to score a Level 3 or above on the statewide standardized grade 3 English Language Arts assessment.

Based on the data review our school will implement the Targeted Element of Standards-Based Collaborative Planning. Deep Collaborative Planning will allow teachers to target deficiencies created due to learning loss and create an opportunity for professionals to share insight, and constructive feedback to improve student products based on the demand of the standards. Considering the factorization of the FSA text-based writing assessment, concentration will be given to the alignment of explicit instruction, personalized lessons and assessments regarding the areas of Reading Comprehension and the Writing Process (informative/opinion). Professional discussions among teachers will strengthen their knowledge on Standards-Based lessons and in return address learning loss.

Measurable Outcome:

If we successfully implement Standard Based Collaborative Planning, then our ELA proficiency and learning gains will increase by 10 percentage points on the 2022 State Assessment.

Monitoring:

Administration and the Leadership Team members will monitor Common Planning by attending meetings on a weekly basis. Administration will provide constructive feedback, when needed to share insight on the effectiveness of Common Planning through the evidence of student improvement that will be reflected on district assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kisa Humphrey (kdhump@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Within the Targeted Element of Collaborative Planning, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of: Standards-Based Collaborative Planning. Collaborative Planning primary purpose is to bring teachers together to learn from one another and collaborate on projects that will lead to improvements in standards-aligned lesson quality, instructional effectiveness, and student achievement

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Collaborative Planning improves collaboration among teachers and promotes learning, insights, and constructive feedback that occur during professional discussions among teachers. Standards-Based lessons, units, materials, and resources are improved when teachers work on them collaboratively.

Action Steps to Implement

Administration will meet with the Leadership Team on August 30, 2021 to review Collaborative Planning times and delineate responsibilities and expectations of weekly meetings.

Person Responsible Kisa Humphrey (kdhump@dadeschools.net)

Administration will begin to attend weekly sessions the week of September 8th, 2021 to ensure Collaborative Planning is occurring and grade level teachers are attending.

Person Responsible Kisa Humphrey (kdhump@dadeschools.net)

The Leadership Team will meet on September 21, 2021 to discuss the progress on Standard-Based Collaborative Planning and provide feedback based on the effectiveness as evident through student writing samples and formative assessment data in the areas of English Language Arts.

Person Responsible Kisa Humphrey (kdhump@dadeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	When comparing student results from the 2019 & 2021 administration of the Mathematics FSA, academic needs were identified. Third, fourth and fifth grade students attaining proficiency decreased by 21 percentage points (62% to 41%). Students demonstrating one year of academic growth decreased by 22 percentage points (50% to 28%). However, 50% of least proficient learners labeled as the "Lowest Quartile" demonstrated a learning gain, this is an increase of 15 percentage points (35% to 50%). Based on the data review our school will implement the Targeted Element of Standard-Aligned Instruction with a focus in Data Driven Instruction. This is a critical area identified in order to address the learning loss in the area of Learning Gains in the area of Mathematics. Teachers will use Data Driven instruction to analysis and create actions to meet student's needs.
Measurable Outcome:	If we successfully implement Data Driven Instruction, then our Math Proficiency and Learning Gains will increase by ten percentage points on the 2022 State Assessment.
Monitoring:	Administration and the Leadership Team members will monitor Data Driven Instruction in Math by attending quarterly Data Chats after the administration on i-Ready Assessment, in addition to ongoing progress monitoring assessment in Mathematics.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kisa Humphrey (kdhump@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Data-Driven Instruction is an educational approach that relies on the teacher's use of student performance data to inform instructional planning and delivery. This systematic approach of instruction uses assessment, analysis, and actions to meet student's needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Data- Driven Instruction uses data to inform teachers on specific standards that need targeting throughout the year to address students' needs and in return show growth over time.

Action Steps to Implement

The Professional Learning Team (PLST) will provide a Professional Development on September 28th, 2021. The topic will address how to analyze i-Ready Math and Topic Assessment data to systematically create an Instructional Focus Calendar to target areas of deficiency.

Person Responsible	Kisa Humphrey (kdhump@dadeschools.net)

Teachers will rank the areas of need based on i-Ready and Topic Assessment data and create an Instructional Focus Calendar by October 11, 2021 and submit to administration.

Person Responsible	Kisa Humphrey (kdhump@dadeschools.net)

Between September 2021 through October 1, 2021, Instructional Focus Calendars will be used in Mathematics to address the Mathematics Domains with the greatest needs until the administration of the i-Ready Winter Assessment.

Person Responsible	Kisa Humphrey (kdhump@dadeschools.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Power Bi data of our Attendance and Early Warning System reveals an increase in students with 31 or more absences. This is a critical area identified in order to address Targeted Element of Early Warning Systems with a focus on Response to Early Warning Systems.
Measurable Outcome:	If we successfully implement Targeted Elements of Early Warning System , then students with 31 or more absences will decrease by five percentage points.
Monitoring:	Administration and the Attendance Review Committee (ARC) will be established and monitor students and intervein, as needed, when students have five unexcused absences.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kisa Humphrey (kdhump@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Response to Early Warning Systems (EWS) involves establishing a system based on student data to identify students who exhibit behavior or academic performance that puts them at risk.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Response to EWS identifies off-track or at-risk students, targets interventions, and reveals patterns and root causes that will increase the probability of student success.

Action Steps to Implement	
Administration will establish the Attendance Review Committee by August 30, 2021.	
Person Responsible	Kisa Humphrey (kdhump@dadeschools.net)
Administration will identify individuals and outline expectations of the Attendance Review Committee by September 15th, 2021.	
Person Responsible	Kisa Humphrey (kdhump@dadeschools.net)
The Attendance Review Committee will create an Attendance Plan to identify and intervene when students are at risk and share with all staff members on September 28, 2021.	
Person Responsible	Kisa Humphrey (kdhump@dadeschools.net)
Administration will meet with the ARC Team on October 6th, 2021 to address any students exhibiting at-risk attendance patterns.	
Person Responsible	Kisa Humphrey (kdhump@dadeschools.net)
Administration will establish the Attendance Review Committee by August 30, 2021.	
Person Responsible	Kisa Humphrey (kdhump@dadeschools.net)
Administration will identify individuals and outline expectations of the Attendance Review Committee by September 15th, 2021.	
Person Responsible	Kisa Humphrey (kdhump@dadeschools.net)

The Attendance Review Committee will create an Attendance Plan to identify and intervene when students are at risk and share with all staff members on September 28, 2021.

Person Responsible Kisa Humphrey (kdhump@dadeschools.net)

Administration will meet with the ARC Team on October 6th, 2021 to address any students exhibiting at-risk attendance patterns.

Person Responsible Kisa Humphrey (kdhump@dadeschools.net)

Administration will establish the Attendance Review Committee by August 30, 2021.

Person Responsible Kisa Humphrey (kdhump@dadeschools.net)

Administration will identify individuals and outline expectations of the Attendance Review Committee by September 15th, 2021.

Person Responsible Kisa Humphrey (kdhump@dadeschools.net)

The Attendance Review Committee will create an Attendance Plan to identify and intervene when students are at risk and share with all staff members on September 28, 2021.

Person Responsible Kisa Humphrey (kdhump@dadeschools.net)

Administration will meet with the ARC Team on October 6th, 2021 to address any students exhibiting at-risk attendance patterns.

Person Responsible Kisa Humphrey (kdhump@dadeschools.net)

Administration will establish the Attendance Review Committee by August 30, 2021.

Person Responsible Kisa Humphrey (kdhump@dadeschools.net)

Administration will identify individuals and outline expectations of the Attendance Review Committee by September 15th, 2021.

Person Responsible Kisa Humphrey (kdhump@dadeschools.net)

The Attendance Review Committee will create an Attendance Plan to identify and intervene when students are at risk and share with all staff members on September 28, 2021.

Person Responsible Kisa Humphrey (kdhump@dadeschools.net)

Administration will meet with the ARC Team on October 6th, 2021 to address any students exhibiting at-risk attendance patterns.

Person Responsible Kisa Humphrey (kdhump@dadeschools.net)

#4. Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the qualitative data from the School Climate Survey, 30% of professional feel they would benefit from Professional Learning Communities and Leadership Development. Through the Targeted Focus of Empowering Teachers, developing teachers into leaders and giving teachers opportunities to be involved in the Professional Learning Community will help teachers feel empowered.
Measurable Outcome:	If we successfully implement the Targeted Element of Leadership Development and Empowering Teachers, teacher will develop leadership skill that will in return build capacity within our school community.
Monitoring:	The Administrative Team will create opportunities for teachers to volunteer and submit request to be a part of the Professional Learning Community. Monthly Leadership Team Meetings will be scheduled and conducted. Meeting minutes will be collected as will as sign in sheets.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kisa Humphrey (kdhump@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Empowering Teachers involves providing stakeholders autonomy and agency in order to take action where necessary, problem solve, and implement best practices that will assist in meeting the needs of all students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When leaders provide teacher lead roles in initiatives and activities, teachers are empowered and contributes to a positive school culture.

Action Steps to Implement

The Principal will identify leadership roles and create a system in which teachers can apply by August 30, 2021.

Person Responsible	Kisa Humphrey (kdhump@dadeschools.net)

The Principal will select teachers as Grade Level Chairpersons and Department Leads who will serve on the school's Professional Learning Team by September 8, 2021.

Person Responsible	Kisa Humphrey (kdhump@dadeschools.net)

Administration will conduct a Leadership Team Meeting to review responsibilities and roles by September 15, 2021.

Person Responsible	Kisa Humphrey (kdhump@dadeschools.net)

Administration and Leadership Team will review the School Improvement Plan and create an action plan to address academic concerns.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, 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.

According to Power BI EWS report, a comparison between school site and District disciplinary referrals demonstrated a 1 percentage point increase in KG. MTSS/RtI Team will meet with teachers through collaborative learning structures to identify at risk learners and initiate replacement behavior strategies to decrease problem behaviors. Stakeholders will continue to model exemplary character traits using the "Values Matter" District initiative and publicly recognize learners who exemplify citizenship like behaviors quarterly through awards assemblies.

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.

Our Strengths within School Culture are in Relationships, Physical & Emotional Safety and Support, Care, and Connections. Our school creates experiences throughout the year to engage with parents and families and ensures they have necessary information to support their children. Students are supported through mentorship programs and partnerships with community organizations. Staff are provided opportunities to take part in celebrations of success during informal gatherings. We provide opportunities for both staff and students to provide ongoing feedback and suggestions to school leaders and we schedule informal conferences with staff and students to garner information about their educational/professional experience at our school. We also ensure information is provided to all stakeholders through the facilitation of grade level specific parent meetings facilitated throughout the school year. We continue to build our skill-set in ensuring our classrooms are highly engaging and foster the highest level of engagement and learning.

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

The stakeholders involved in building a positive school culture and environment are the Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coaches, Teacher Leaders and Counselor (our School Leadership Team). The Principal's role is to monitor and oversee all the school's initiatives and respond to concerns with morale by planning Team-building and morale boosting activities. The Principal will monitor the mentorship programs and assist in ensuring all information is shared with stakeholders in a timely manner. Teacher leaders and instructional coaches assist in providing and responding to feedback from stakeholders. All stakeholders

are responsible for making specific efforts to connect and build relationships with students, parents, and families.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Leadership Development	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00