

Broward County Public Schools

# Mirror Lake Elementary School



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>20</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>21</b> |

## Mirror Lake Elementary School

1200 NW 72ND AVE, Plantation, FL 33313

[ no web address on file ]

### Demographics

Principal: Marlen Veliz

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2020-21 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: B (59%)<br>2017-18: B (56%)<br>2016-17: A (63%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   |  |

\* 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 Broward 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>21</b> |

## Mirror Lake Elementary School

1200 NW 72ND AVE, Plantation, FL 33313

[ no web address on file ]

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | Yes                    | 66%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 89%  |

### 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 Broward 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.**

Mirror Lake Elementary provides a learning environment with purpose and opportunity, in order to advance academic, social and emotional growth for all students with the commitment for our staff, parents, students, and our community.

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

Educating today's students for tomorrow's world by preparing them for college and career readiness by making learning engaging, accessible, and meaningful.

### 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   |
|-------------------------|---------------------|---|
| Veliz, Marlen           | Principal           | Principals put learning as the center of daily activities by shaping a vision of academic success for all students. In addition, principals create a climate hospitable to education by cultivating leadership in others and improving instruction by managing people, data, and processes.                                   |
| Passofaro, Heather Anne | School Counselor    | She provides advice and helpful resources to students regarding certain personal and academic situations. She provides counseling to students or Teachers, conducting group counseling sessions to help students develop their personal and academic skills.  |
| Hafez, Hend             | Assistant Principal | In charge of the academic and social and emotional behavior of students. In addition, the assistant principal ensures that the mission and vision of the school is followed.  |
| Johnson, Kiara          | Instructional Coach | She leads the development and improvement for pre-K -5 teachers in a school building via training, observations, model lessons, feedback conversations, data analysis and more. She serves as the literacy content expert and provides support on curriculum, high-quality interactions, and the science of teaching reading. |
| Smiley, Melissa         | Other               | She supports the teachers in the autism cluster and assists general education teachers with strategies. Many of our students are mainstreamed and support is provided by the autism coach. In addition, we promote inclusion so training and acceptance activities and training are provided by the coach.                    |
| Wilson, Sherry          | Other               | She works directly with teachers, administrators, and parents in coordinating the delivery of exceptional student programs. She provides technical assistance to ensure a continuum of service options. In addition, our ESE specialist conducts meetings to ensure compliance of Individual Educational Plans.               |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Marlen Veliz

**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.*

4

**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.*

3



**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

50

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

598

**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.**

9

**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                              | 95          | 104 | 87 | 91 | 89 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 552   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0   | 0  | 0  | 2  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

**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 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

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

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

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

Thursday 9/23/2021

**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                   | 108         | 88 | 92 | 103 | 105 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 587   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                   | 29          | 20 | 15 | 9   | 23  | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 110   |
| 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  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in Math                        | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0   | 8   | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0   | 4   | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 21    |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |    |   |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|----|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2  | 3 | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 3           | 2 | 10 | 7 | 13 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 47    |

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

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

## 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             |        |          |       | 55%    | 59%      | 57%   | 59%    | 56%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 58%    | 60%      | 58%   | 63%    | 57%      | 55%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 56%    | 54%      | 53%   | 62%    | 51%      | 48%   |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 55%    | 65%      | 63%   | 60%    | 62%      | 62%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 68%    | 66%      | 62%   | 58%    | 60%      | 59%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 68%    | 53%      | 51%   | 40%    | 47%      | 47%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 55%    | 46%      | 53%   | 53%    | 49%      | 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 | 44%    | 60%      | -16%                       | 58%   | -14%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 72%    | 62%      | 10%                        | 58%   | 14%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -44%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 52%    | 59%      | -7%                        | 56%   | -4%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -72%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 49%    | 65%      | -16%                       | 62%   | -13%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 64%    | 67%      | -3%                        | 64%   | 0%                      |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -49%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 58%    | 64%      | -6%                        | 60%   | -2%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -64%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 50%    | 49%      | 1%                         | 53%   | -3%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

### Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady - Progress Monitoring 1, 2, and 3

| Grade 1               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 72   | 76     | 78     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 27   | 23     | 26     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 5    | 4      | 4      |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 1    | 1      | 2      |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 70   | 76     | 77     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 24   | 18     | 22     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 1    | 4      | 3      |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 1    | 1      | 3      |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 70   | 76     | 77     |

| Grade 2                  |                               |      |        |        |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language<br>Arts | All Students                  | 83   | 84     | 84     |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 29   | 32     | 33     |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 9    | 9      | 7      |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 8    | 10     | 10     |
|                          |                               |      |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics              | All Students                  | 82   | 82     | 83     |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 7    | 8      | 14     |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 3    | 1      | 2      |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 0    | 0      | 4      |
|                          |                               |      |        |        |
| Grade 3                  |                               |      |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language<br>Arts | All Students                  | 93   | 96     | 96     |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 38   | 45     | 44     |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 3    | 6      | 5      |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 2    | 2      | 2      |
|                          |                               |      |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics              | All Students                  | 91   | 94     | 95     |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 9    | 22     | 29     |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 1    | 3      | 6      |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 0    | 0      | 1      |
|                          |                               |      |        |        |

| Grade 4               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 83   | 90     | 83     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 18   | 20     | 16     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 3    | 3      | 3      |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 1    | 3      | 1      |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 82   | 91     | 85     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 17   | 16     | 18     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 1    | 2      | 3      |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 2    | 2      | 1      |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
| Grade 5               |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 84   | 83     | 82     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 13   | 19     | 24     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 5    | 6      | 7      |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 2    | 2      | 3      |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 82   | 83     | 78     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 7    | 15     | 20     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 4    | 5      | 7      |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 2    | 4      | 3      |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science               | All Students               | 77   | 77     | 77     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 23   | 23     | 23     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 19   | 19     | 19     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 16   | 16     | 16     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |

**Subgroup Data Review**

| <b>2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
|--|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                 | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2019-20</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2019-20</b> |
| SWD  | 29              | 33            | 29                 | 22               | 30             | 55                  | 28              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| ELL  | 50              | 41            |                    | 37               | 25             |                     | 36              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| BLK  | 45              | 60            | 43                 | 25               | 31             | 15                  | 39              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| HSP  | 56              | 48            |                    | 43               | 32             |                     | 45              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| MUL  | 46              |               |                    | 54               |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| WHT  | 52              |               |                    | 33               |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| FRL  | 44              | 46            | 33                 | 27               | 20             | 25                  | 28              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| <b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                 | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2017-18</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2017-18</b> |
| SWD  | 33              | 52            | 52                 | 39               | 58             | 63                  | 34              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| ELL  | 58              | 56            | 54                 | 52               | 67             | 80                  | 61              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| BLK  | 52              | 58            | 54                 | 50               | 69             | 73                  | 49              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| HSP  | 56              | 58            | 64                 | 59               | 63             | 64                  | 59              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| MUL  | 80              |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| WHT  | 53              | 55            |                    | 61               | 67             |                     | 50              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| FRL  | 51              | 60            | 58                 | 49               | 66             | 69                  | 51              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| <b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                 | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b> |
| SWD  | 38              | 53            | 41                 | 40               | 43             | 26                  | 35              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| ELL  | 66              | 91            |                    | 63               | 78             |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| ASN  | 60              |               |                    | 80               |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| BLK  | 53              | 63            | 68                 | 54               | 57             | 45                  | 47              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| HSP  | 66              | 68            |                    | 64               | 63             |                     | 47              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| MUL  | 73              |               |                    | 73               |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| WHT  | 72              | 58            |                    | 72               | 56             |                     | 69              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| FRL  | 57              | 64            | 58                 | 58               | 57             | 41                  | 51              |                |                  |                          |                                |

**ESSA Data Review**

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

| <b>ESSA Federal Index</b>   |     |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  |     |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 38  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 4   |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 38  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 303 |

| ESSA Federal Index   |     |
|--|-----|
| Total Components for the Federal Index   | 8   |
| Percent Tested   | 96% |
| Subgroup Data  |     |
| Students With Disabilities   |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     | 35  |
| 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                                      | 38  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES |
| 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                                | 37  |
| 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   | 50  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | NO  |



| Multiracial Students   |     |
|--|-----|
| 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   | 43  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      |     |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 33  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| 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?

SWD scored lower than their peers in both ELA, Math, and Science. In addition, economically disadvantaged students also scored low in ELA and Math based on the 2019 FSA.

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

Reading comprehension using integration of Science and Social Studies texts.  
Math number sense, conceptual understanding, and fluency.

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

There was a lack of student engagement during the 2019 school year.  
This year there is a focus on attendance and the implementation of authentic and meaningful lessons. In addition, we are closely monitoring student progress, implementing researched based programs with fidelity, and incorporating more small group instruction in all content areas.

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

Multi-racial students increased in ELA achievement. Black students increased in Math learning gains and Science achievement. Economically disadvantaged students maintained in Science achievement.

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

Students were consistent in their attendance, increased small group instruction, and students had opportunities to participate in extended learning before and after school.

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

Culturally responsive teaching practices, reinforcement of small group instruction, fluent grouping based on data collection, and effective implementation of ESE accommodations.

**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.**

Leaders and teachers will be provided with opportunities to participate in various professional developments such as, LLI, i-Ready, and Reading interventions.

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

Utilizing our Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief Fund teachers to provide additional support through pull-out/push-in small group instruction to assist in closing the achievement gaps.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Mirror Lake Elementary will be focusing on ELA proficiency Level. Based on our FSA ELA Data, our ELA proficiency level in 2021 had a decrease of 7 percentage points. 2019 we earned 56% but in 2021 we dropped to 49%. Our focus this year is to improve our Tier I and Tier 2 instruction utilizing higher order questions with higher text complexity as well as additional small group instruction.

**Measurable Outcome:** Increase ELA learning gains of the lowest 30% students from 29% to 55 % by the end of 2021-2022 school year.

**Monitoring:** Student progress will be closely monitored through iReady data and via classroom observations and monthly data collections.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Hend Hafez (hend.hafez@browardschools.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Implementation of IReady LAFS Resource and Online Instruction, and Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) for students working below level.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** These are research based strategies and have proven great results.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Literacy Coach responsible for monitoring the following steps (kiara.johnson@browardschools.com):

- 1) FSA Camps will be offered for all students in grades 2-5
- 2) Vocabulary: implementation of Vocabulary Workshop, Wordly Wise, and National Vocabulary- In addition, students utilize Tier II vocabulary daily as shared on daily announcements.
- 3) Proper prescription given to Rtl students- ensure small group daily instruction- interventions done with fidelity
- 4) Comprehension- higher order thinking stem questions used during ELA- incorporating science and social studies information text in ELA block
- 5) Use visual cues such as Thinking Maps to breakdown information and organize thoughts

**Person Responsible** Kiara Johnson (kiara.johnson@browardschools.com)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

**School name was not found on the website provided. Therefore no data was available to retrieve.**

## 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.

Administration and support staff worked collaboratively to develop a school wide positive behavior plan that addresses the school vision and goals. Due to unstructured time in the hallways, a positive behavior incentive program is needed to decrease hallway behavior by 50%. Our goal is to decrease hallway incidents by 50% by the beginning of 2nd quarter. Data will be checked by administration weekly.

All staff will keep track of positive behaviors in the hallways by class and turn individual Dolphin Dollars into administration on a daily basis. Names will be pulled from the box three times a week and announced on a daily basis. Names will be pulled from the box three times a week and announced on the morning ITV show.

Students with winning Dolphin Dollars will be given prizes by the administration.

All staff will be trained by administration on the criteria for giving Dolphin Dollars to students. Teachers will keep charts in their classrooms to track the dollars weekly. Administration will use the CHAMPS 7-Up Checklist to monitor and assess on a weekly basis.

As classes demonstrate an increase in overall positive behaviors, the amount of students chosen will increase. Hallways will have bulletin boards with photos of students receiving prizes from administration. Students with multiple wins will be invited to have a special lunch with administration.

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

Marlen Veliz-Principal  
 Hend Hafez- Assistant Principal  
 Heather Passofaro- Guidance Counselor  
 Dymond Cross, PTO President Parent/Community Representation  
 Kristi Heath- . PK Team Leader  
 Pryscilla Maxwell- Kindergarten Team Leader  
 Andrea Gresham - 1st Grade Team Leader/BTU Rep  
 Andrea Cutrone - 2nd Grade Team Leader  
 Jessica Lane- 3rd Grade Team Leader  
 Jannette Hill - 4th Grade Team Leader  
 Lawrence Hennequin - 5th Grade Team Leader

All mentioned stakeholders play an essential role in promoting a positive culture and environment within our school. Stakeholders work collaboratively to develop the school wide positive behavior plan, which is fully implemented throughout the school year. They also work closely with the teachers to ensure effective and successful implementation of the plan.

## Part V: Budget

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

|               |               |  |   |                 |       |                   |
|---------------|---------------|--|---|-----------------|-------|-------------------|
| <b>1</b>      | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA</b> |   |                 |       | <b>\$6,460.00</b> |
|               | Function      | Object   | Budget Focus                                | Funding Source  | FTE   | 2021-22           |
|               | 6500          | 120-Classroom Teachers                             | 1841 - Mirror Lake Elementary School        | Title, I Part A | 603.0 | \$6,460.00        |
|               |               |  | <i>Notes: iReady Tool Box Site Licenses</i> |                 |       |                   |
| <b>Total:</b> |               |  |   |                 |       | <b>\$6,460.00</b> |