

Broward County Public Schools

# Miramar 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>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</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> |

# Miramar Elementary School

6831 SW 26TH ST, M IR Amar, FL 33023

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

Principal: Joanne Schlissel

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2013

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <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>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (53%)<br>2017-18: C (51%)<br>2016-17: C (50%)   |
| <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, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |  |

## 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>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</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> |

## Miramar Elementary School

6831 SW 26TH ST, MIRAMAR, FL 33023

[ 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                    | 82%  |
| 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                     | 98%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade |         | C       | C       | C       |

### 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.**

The mission of Miramar Elementary school is dedicated to providing a safe and secure learning environment that empowers and equips each learner to excel academically through a rigorous curriculum. At Miramar Elementary we strive to educate the total child. Not only do we focus on academic achievement, but we also tend to the social-emotional needs of the child.

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

The vision of Miramar Elementary school is dedicated to providing a safe and secure learning environment that empowers and equips each learner to excel academically through a rigorous curriculum.

### 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  |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Schlissel, Joanne   | Principal                   | Principal- Oversee overall academic and operational functions of the school; Build relationships; Check in to classes; Meet with CORE tech team and TL gauge need for trainings; Individual weekly check ins as well as team meetings with all support and AP to ensure instructional team has time and is completing tasks effectively; Check in with support/ AP weekly; (monitor their progress) Monitor all student and teacher data; Data chats; Classroom observations 3-5/ new teachers and support; Work with coaches to ensure teachers implementing balance literacy components effectively; Provide feedback to coaches/instructional staff, to improve instruction and increase student achievement ;Praise students and teachers for efforts and achievements; Create schedules for teachers/support/ paras to maximize instructional time; |
| Dumervil, Dominique | Assistant Principal         | Assistant Principal- Build relationships; Check in to classes; Meet with CORE tech PD team to gauge need for trainings Monitor student engagement/ ensure attendance /create plan meet with social worker guidance counselor etc Ensure canvas expectations met ;Ensure grades/HW procedures met; Monitor math progress off 4th/5th grade students using Iready data and using data to improve student achievement; Monitor science data in 5th grade;Monitor referrals and incidences of referrals; Monitor effectiveness of school store and use of manatee bucks; Data chats grades K-2 ;Classroom observations specials, Pre K, ESE and K-2 teachers Provide feedback to coaches/instructional staff, in order to improve instruction and increase student achievement; Praise students and teachers for efforts and achievements;                   |
| Kunz, Elizabeth     | Reading Coach               | Reading Coach-Give CORE tests to students in grades K-5 level 1s and 2s and good cause promotions; Work with teachers/Model read alouds/small group instruction/shared reading; Create/provide differentiated PD for staff based on data; Monitor all data for Iready and assist teachers in using data to improve instruction; Work with coaches to ensure teachers implementing balance literacy components effectively Manage RTI meetings;   |
| Yassen, Robin       | Curriculum Resource Teacher | Give CORE tests to students in grades 2-5 level 1s and 2s and good cause promotions Work with select students in 1-3 Monitor progress in reading of selected students using Iready data; Assist in providing differentiated PD for staff; Monitor Iready data of students in small group; Utilize data to improve instruction; Work with coach to ensure teachers implementing balance literacy components effectively   |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2013, Joanne Schlissel

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

3

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

3

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

32

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

462

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

5

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

5

### 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                              | 73          | 82 | 83 | 79 | 72 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 463   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 26          | 16 | 19 | 17 | 20 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 172   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 2  | 0  | 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  | 4  | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 20    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4  | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 1           | 2  | 2  | 21 | 5  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 34    |

**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 | 2           | 0 | 2 | 10 | 6 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 32    |

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



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

Wednesday 9/22/2021

## 2020-21 - As Reported

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

| Indicator                                 | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|   | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled               | 67          | 79 | 81 | 75 | 70 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 443   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 2  | 4  | 1  | 5  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 4  | 1  | 0  | 2  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |
| 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 ELA assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 31 | 23 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 90    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 46 | 30 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 124   |

**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           | 3 | 2 | 13 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 24    |

**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     | 3           | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |

## 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               | 67          | 79 | 81 | 75 | 70 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 443   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 2  | 4  | 1  | 5  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 4  | 1  | 0  | 2  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |
| 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 ELA assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 31 | 23 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 90    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 46 | 30 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 124   |

#### 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           | 3 | 2 | 13 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 24    |

#### 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     | 3           | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |

## 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             |        |          |       | 47%    | 59%      | 57%   | 47%    | 56%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 55%    | 60%      | 58%   | 56%    | 57%      | 55%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 44%    | 54%      | 53%   | 54%    | 51%      | 48%   |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 61%    | 65%      | 63%   | 60%    | 62%      | 62%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 62%    | 66%      | 62%   | 57%    | 60%      | 59%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 57%    | 53%      | 51%   | 40%    | 47%      | 47%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 42%    | 46%      | 53%   | 46%    | 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 | 40%    | 60%      | -20%                       | 58%   | -18%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 50%    | 62%      | -12%                       | 58%   | -8%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -40%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 48%    | 59%      | -11%                       | 56%   | -8%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -50%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 54%    | 65%      | -11%                       | 62%   | -8%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 70%    | 67%      | 3%                         | 64%   | 6%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -54%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 52%    | 64%      | -12%                       | 60%   | -8%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -70%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 41%    | 49%      | -8%                        | 53%   | -12%                    |
| 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 Diagnostic Scales Scores Placement Tables 2020-21

| Grade 1               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 16   | 32     | 68     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 32   | 48     | 52     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 19   | 33     | 37     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 42   | 56     | 69     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 28   | 48     | 66     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 36   | 51     | 60     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 22   | 40     | 45     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 56   | 66     | 72     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
| Grade 2               |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 21   | 52     | 60     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 25   | 48     | 59     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 22   | 36     | 41     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 29   | 49     | 59     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 25   | 44     | 65     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 37   | 46     | 59     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 12   | 22     | 36     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 20   | 48     | 62     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |

| Grade 3               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 19   | 39     | 73     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 38   | 49     | 59     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 25   | 32     | 45     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 29   | 33     | 60     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 29   | 49     | 66     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 36   | 44     | 61     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 12   | 26     | 41     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 22   | 48     | 62     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
| Grade 4               |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 39   | 65     | 79     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 33   | 44     | 56     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 17   | 28     | 41     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 29   | 39     | 51     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 33   | 56     | 76     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 39   | 47     | 59     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 16   | 29     | 41     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 20   | 45     | 57     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |

| Grade 5               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 39   | 48     | 56     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 36   | 43     | 59     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 30   | 39     | 49     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 32   | 44     | 52     |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 31   | 40     | 61     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 55   | 59     | 67     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 27   | 47     | 56     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 41   | 50     | 61     |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 25   | 36     | 52     |
| Science               | Economically Disadvantaged | 36   | 50     | 66     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 32   | 42     | 54     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 18   | 25     | 32     |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 25   | 36     | 52     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 36   | 50     | 66     |

## 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                                       | 25       |        |             | 13        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 44       | 28     |             | 51        | 33      |              | 18       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 42       | 33     | 33          | 40        | 20      | 8            | 18       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 45       | 27     |             | 44        | 9       |              | 27       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 44       | 30     | 33          | 44        | 20      | 15           | 22       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 19       | 48     | 37          | 33        | 58      | 44           | 13       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 44       | 52     | 43          | 70        | 79      | 85           | 41       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 46       | 57     | 44          | 57        | 59      | 55           | 41       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 46       | 46     | 40          | 71        | 69      | 64           | 40       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 46       | 53     | 44          | 60        | 62      | 60           | 40       |         |           |                   |                     |

| 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                                       | 30       | 48     | 50          | 37        | 47      | 39           | 36       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 45       | 58     | 50          | 50        | 51      | 21           | 27       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 44       | 51     | 50          | 57        | 58      | 51           | 34       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 54       | 63     | 64          | 64        | 54      | 18           | 66       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 60       |        |             | 70        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 47       | 55     | 54          | 60        | 56      | 39           | 44       |         |           |                   |                     |

### 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  | 31  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 5   |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 50  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 248 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8   |
| Percent Tested  | 90% |
| Subgroup Data   |     |
| Students With Disabilities  |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 19  |
| 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                                       | 37  |
| 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                                    | 30  |
| 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  | 34  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | YES |
| 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                                | 32  |
| 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?**

Based on the data we need to have a laser focus on our subgroups and find ways to re-engage parents to assist us in helping their children make more academic gains in both ELA & Math.

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

The fifth grade data has the greatest need for improvement. Their scores were the lowest within the Intermediate category.

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

Some of the contributing factors is that we lost 5th grade teachers throughout the year, Although the Coaches did go in and work with staff and students to help minimize the learning gap. Many students were working remotely it was very difficult to know whether the student was actually learning or were they sitting in front of a screen but disconnected from the the actual lesson. This year all our students are back in the building and we anticipate much more growth.

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

The third and fourth grade data showed the most improvement over time. The teachers are seasoned and work collaboratively to ensure all students make progress. The team spends a lot of time planning lessons together and participates in professional learning communities to deepen their own knowledge and to build up their skills as experienced teachers.

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

A Support Person is assigned to each grade level, that support person attends their meetings and serves to assist them in all aspects of the curriculum and class management. This has been very effective because all the former coaches have been classroom teachers and have experience to support in planning, in finding the right materials, in reading the data, in making suggestions that would give the teachers ideas to accelerate the learning.

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

More teacher collaboration time and effective planning will make a huge difference. Tier 1 instruction is the foundation to growth. Instructional practices are being reviewed by Administrators and we are providing feedback on a continual basis.

**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.**

Teachers are currently being trained on Benchmark Advance and and doing the Oral Reading Record(ORR). These professional development learning opportunities are provided in house and at the District level. Our Literacy Coach offers Hot Labs in Reading for staff weekly on a voluntary basis and teams are attending the training to become better and stronger at their craft and to improve student performance at all grade levels.

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

Our Leadership Team will have to look at data differently. We must look at the data breakdown by the sub groups to ensure the needed supports are in place and to integrate culturally responsive teaching into our school to create a more positive school culture. In doing this we expect to see student achievement growth.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#### #1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | Students with Disabilities did not make the expected gains last year due to the pandemic and attendance issues. One thing we have learned last year is that we must monitor this group with frequency. Our subgroup Students with Disabilities (SWD) made 36% gains as measured by the FSA 2018-2019. This was a significant drop from prior years. |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | By June of 2022, Students with Disabilities will score at or above 41% overall from the Florida Standards Assessment in English language Arts.  |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | This will be monitored through the Leadership Team Meeting. Through the ESLS Team Meetings and through Data Chats with Administration & Support Staff.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Joanne Schlissel (joanne.schlissel@browardschools.com)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | We are using CORE tests to pinpoint the foundational gaps in reading. Teachers will use Leveled Literacy Intervention(LLI) during the intervention block to strengthen student comprehension. We will be monitoring student progress through formative assessments given after an instructional cycle.  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | Leveled Literacy Intervention is a short term, supplemental intervention system proven to improve literacy achievement of struggling readers with engaging leveled books and fast-paced systematically designed lessons.  |

#### Action Steps to Implement

The Principal will call the Leadership Meeting Weekly to monitor the progress students but especially our SWD students.

**Person Responsible** Joanne Schlissel (joanne.schlissel@browardschools.com)

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

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | Our lowest 25th percentile students scored an overall 44% as measured by the FSA 2018-2019. This was a drop from previous years by 10 percentage points.   |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | We are utilizing CORE data to pinpoint the foundational gaps in reading. Teachers will use Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) during the intervention block to strengthen student comprehension. We will be monitoring student progress and graphing their results so we can see the progress made over time.   |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | Students will be tested on key concepts every 4-6 lessons. The results will then be graphed so teachers can see at a glance whether student has made improvement or if they  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Dominique Dumervil (dominiquedumervil@browardschools.com)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | We will use LLI because it is a proven research based intervention program that allows students multiple opportunities to read leveled text at their own pace and answer questions based on the text used. LLI also had great decoding and encoding strategies that help the reader sound out the word and find its meaning in the text.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | Teachers must continually observe and assess reading behaviors to identify areas of difficulty and tailor instruction for individuals, groups, and whole classes. (Bell & Dolanski 2012; IES 2016; NCTE 2013;) Continuous monitoring enables teachers to guide in the moment teaching as well as plan teaching activities and select materials such as reading level books (Hougen 2014; ILA 2017; Clarke, Paul, Smith, Snowling and Hulme 2017) |

**Action Steps to Implement**

At Miramar Elementary School it all begins with Quality Tier 1 instruction. This is necessary as it provides a backdrop for sustainable student achievement. Next our Summative and Formative Assessments, focus on making sure the assessments match what standards are being taught and how well those students comprehend the concepts being taught. In order to make this model effective, our Support staff will work with students in classrooms to ensure students are getting quality push in support. As we continually look at the data, we will conduct data chats with teachers individually and in teams for accountability and support. Administration and Coaches will be reviewing the data consistently throughout the year to ensure growth and to provide resources to teachers and students who need additional support to make our goal.

**Person Responsible** Joanne Schlissel (joanne.schlissel@browardschools.com)

**#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:****Measurable Outcome:****Monitoring:****Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:****Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:****Action Steps to Implement***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***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.

**Through our Positive behavior Plan we anticipate a reduction in discipline infractions by 10%. By creating a warm welcoming environment and an enriching rigorous academic environment we will continue to work on modeling student expectations. The data will reflect this positive change.**

**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.**

Miramar Elementary creates a positive school culture and environment in many different areas. The teachers are actively teaching SEL lessons and integrating these lessons throughout the curriculum. The Leadership Team and Office Staff exemplify building a positive school culture because we are the first face that our parents and community members see. Our non-instructional staff focuses on professionalism and creating a nurturing environment for students. One of the ways Miramar Elementary addresses a positive school culture is by creating opportunities to communicate to all stakeholders the mission, vision, and goal of our school.

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

Principal-Joanne Schlissel promotes a positive culture by building a culture set on high expectations and promoting accountability for all stakeholders.

Assistant Principal- Marie Dumervil promotes a positive culture through developing partnerships that serve our school staff and students.

Literacy Coach-Elizabeth Kunz- promotes a positive culture through schoolwide initiatives that promote high student engagement through literacy.

English Language Learner Coordinator- Marisol Homidas-promotes a positive school culture by helping families understand how they can help their children who are identified as English Language Learners(ELL)

Cafeteria Manager-Yashie Marte-promotes a positive school culture by providing delicious nutritious meals for the students each day. Along with her staff. The students are always greeted with a smile and a tray.

Office Clerk- Jessica Camacho- promotes positive school culture with her genuine attention to detail and how she interacts with all parents with dignity and respect.

ESE Specialist- Yanique Brown-promotes a positive school culture by addressing the needs of our ESLS students. She has a laser focus on advocating for what students need and finding ways to get them the assistance needed to show forth growth.

## Part V: Budget

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

|        |          |  |                                  |                 |     |              |              |
|--------|----------|--|----------------------------------|-----------------|-----|--------------|--------------|
| 1      | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups |                                  |                 |     |              | \$0.00       |
| 2      | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA                    |                                  |                 |     |              | \$106,560.00 |
|        | Function | Object   | Budget Focus                     | Funding Source  | FTE | 2021-22      |              |
|        | 5100     | 100-Salaries   | 0531 - Miramar Elementary School | Title, I Part A |     | \$88,332.00  |              |
|        | 5100     |  | 0531 - Miramar Elementary School | Title, I Part D |     | \$18,228.00  |              |
| 3      | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:                            |                                  |                 |     |              | \$0.00       |
| Total: |          |  |                                  |                 |     | \$106,560.00 |              |