

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# Dr. Robert B. Ingram 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>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>26</b>

# Dr. Robert B. Ingram Elementary School

600 AHMAD ST, Opa Locka, FL 33054

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

## Demographics

Principal: Cynthia Clay

Start Date for this Principal: 10/16/2013

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (47%)
<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 Dade County School Board.

**SIP Authority**

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](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>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>26</b>

# Dr. Robert B. Ingram Elementary School

600 AHMAD ST, Opa Locka, FL 33054

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

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">94%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>

## 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 Dade County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

We will encourage and empower students to find value and purpose in education to become life long learners.

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

To build a vibrant community of learners through high quality educational opportunities and self-discipline.

### 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
Clay, Cynthia	Principal	To supervise all aspects of the school's operation.
Negron, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	To assist the principal in supervising all aspects of the school's operation.
Bazile, Debra	Reading Coach	Will provide direct instructional services related to literacy for students and provide technical assistance to teachers implementing the K-12 Comprehensive Research-based Reading Plan at the school level for primary.
Wazidali, Bibi	Reading Coach	Will provide direct instructional services related to literacy for students and provide technical assistance to teachers implementing the K-12 Comprehensive Research-based Reading Plan at the school level for intermediate.
Rodriguez, Adeline	Math Coach	Provide direct instructional services related to mathematics for students and provide technical assistance to teachers implementing the Comprehensive Mathematics Plan at the school level. Emphasis will be on utilizing the coaching model to facilitate the successful implementation of research-based mathematics instruction.

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 10/16/2013, Cynthia Clay

**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.*

14

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

17

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

235

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

1

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

1

**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	30	44	31	49	41	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	235
Attendance below 90 percent	13	19	17	26	20	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	6	2	12	17	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Course failure in Math	0	6	3	4	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	6	15	16	29	20	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102

**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	4	10	5	11	18	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

**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	6	10	3	7	15	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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

Wednesday 6/30/2021

**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	46	48	49	56	61	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	325
Attendance below 90 percent	14	24	23	24	27	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	7	8	21	20	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
Course failure in Math	0	8	1	14	16	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
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	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16



**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	4	12	8	20	25	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91

**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	6	10	3	7	16	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

**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				31%	62%	57%	32%	62%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				42%	62%	58%	52%	62%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	58%	53%	63%	59%	48%
Math Achievement				38%	69%	63%	41%	69%	62%
Math Learning Gains				47%	66%	62%	48%	64%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62%	55%	51%	56%	55%	47%
Science Achievement				19%	55%	53%	29%	58%	55%

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	28%	60%	-32%	58%	-30%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	32%	64%	-32%	58%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				
05	2021					
	2019	30%	60%	-30%	56%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	41%	67%	-26%	62%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	29%	69%	-40%	64%	-35%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
05	2021					
	2019	34%	65%	-31%	60%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-29%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	18%	53%	-35%	53%	-35%
Cohort Comparison						

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

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

The monitoring tool is i-Ready for English Language Arts and Mathematics. For 5th grade science is Mid-year assessment.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	21.2	26.7	39.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	19.4	25.0	38.7
	Students With Disabilities		40.0	40.0
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	3.1	25.0	37.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	3.3	23.3	33.3
	Students With Disabilities		20.0	40.0
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	22.9	18.9	33.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	22.9	18.9	33.3
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8.3	10.8	27.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	8.3	10.8	27.8
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	36.2	34.8	46.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	36.2	34.8	46.7
	Students With Disabilities	20.0		
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8.5	21.7	27.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	8.5	21.7	27.3
	Students With Disabilities	20.0	20.0	
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	17.4	30.4	26.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	17.4	30.4	26.1
	Students With Disabilities	9.1	18.2	18.2
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17.4	25.5	43.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	17.4	25.5	43.2
	Students With Disabilities	10.0		30.0
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	12.2	32.0	37.0
	Economically Disadvantaged	12.2	32.0	37.0
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	18.4	32.7	51.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	18.4	32.7	51.2
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students		12	
	Economically Disadvantaged		12	
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

**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	17			11							
ELL	43	58		38	42						
BLK	28	45	70	21	24		21				
HSP	42	63		38	30		35				
FRL	31	51	67	25	26	13	25				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	17	35		4	35						
ELL	37	40		49	65		43				
BLK	25	42	57	31	43	53	11				
HSP	45	44		55	60		35				
FRL	30	42	52	37	47	62	19				
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	13	64		13	17						
ELL	41	44		33	50	55					
BLK	27	53	78	38	45	56	23				
HSP	47	50		49	53	55	45				
FRL	32	53	65	41	48	58	29				

**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	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	311
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	

<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	14
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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%	
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
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	39
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?

##### Grade Level

According to the 2020-2021 FSA proficiency report, the 3rd grade ELA data reflected 22%, which was a six percentage point decrease from the 3rd grade proficiency score of 28% in 2018-2019.

According to the 2020-2021 FSA proficiency report, the 3rd grade Math data reflected 18%, which was a twenty-three percentage point decrease from the 3rd grade proficiency score of 41% in 2018-2019.

According to the 2020-2021 FSA proficiency report, the 4th grade ELA proficiency data reflected 29%, which was a three percentage point decrease from the 4th grade proficiency score of 32% in 2018-2019.

According to the 2020-2021 FSA proficiency report, the 4th grade proficiency Math data reflected 18%, which was an eleven percentage point decrease from the 4th grade proficiency score of 29% in 2018-2019.

According to the 2020-2021 FSA proficiency report, the 5th grade ELA proficiency data reflected 34%, which was a four percentage point increase from the 5th grade proficiency score of 30% in 2018-2019.

According to the 2020-2021 FSA proficiency report, the 5th grade Math data reflected 25%, which was a nine percentage point decrease from the 5th grade proficiency score of 34% in 2018-2019.

According to the 2020-2021 Science proficiency report, the 5th grade Science proficiency data reflected 25%, which was a six percentage point increase from the 5th grade proficiency score of 19% in 2018-2019.

##### Subgroups

According to the subgroup trend, the data shows our Hispanic students are outperforming African American students in ELA proficiency and learning gains.

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

According to the Science Proficiency Report, the 5th grade Science proficiency data in 2019 was 19%, which was a decrease of ten percentage points from the proficiency scores of 29% in 2018.

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

Possible contributing factors were students were not meeting proficiency on various topic assessments, remediation of these benchmarks were not monitored using data trackers. Students' topic assessments will be tracked and monitored to adjust instruction. The Science CSS will provide instructional support as needed.

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

According to the 2017-2018 FSA Proficiency Report, the 5th grade ELA proficiency data in 2019 was 30%, which was a significant increase of ten percentage points from the proficiency scores of 20% in 2018.

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

Contributing factors were focused standards-based instruction, planning for differentiated instruction and Intervention during collaborative planning.

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

Data-driven instruction, differentiated instruction, interventions/RTI, standards based collaborative planning, student engagement.

**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.**

The PLST team and coaches will facilitate continuous professional development opportunities focusing on strategies to enhance student engagement, analyze data, and differentiate instruction through the effective use of resources for mathematics, science and reading from the Reading Horizons Intervention Program, the new McGraw Hill reading series.

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

Extended learning opportunities will be provided with before and after school tutoring and interventions as well as Saturday School Academy, Spring Break Academy, and special camps, T.A.L.E.N.T.S Clubs, and STEM-based clubs.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:



**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Based on the data, due to having 40% of MSO students last year, the students failed to meet proficiency on various Topic and Bi-weekly assessments, and the ELA and Math Florida Standards Assessment. Student engagement is a critical component to students' instruction.

**Measurable Outcome:** If teachers implement effective engagement strategies with fidelity, then 70% of students will show Learning Gains in grades 3-5 on the 2021-22 Florida Standards Assessment.

**Monitoring:** Student engagement will be monitored by administration through classroom observations, data chats, and student work folders.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Cynthia Clay (pr4121@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The evidence based strategy Hands-On Learning. Active learning through hands-on activities and effective questioning through collaborative conversations will be implemented across all grades and subject areas.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** If teachers and students engage in hands-on activities and collaborative conversations, then students will better understand the content that is being taught and there will be an improvement in assessments. Resources will include i-Ready Discourse cards, manipulatives and hands-on materials.

**Action Steps to Implement**

During Collaborative Planning sessions, select hands-on activities, manipulatives, and/or questions from i-Ready Discourse Cards aligned to standards will be on going starting August 20, 2021. Coaches and teachers will model how lessons can be taught explicitly and discuss strategies on how activities can be taught effectively.

**Person Responsible** Cynthia Clay (pr4121@dadeschools.net)

Daily Classroom Walkthrough visits by Dr. Clay and Mrs. Negron beginning August 24, 2021 will be ongoing. Specific Look Fors will be established weekly based on focused areas determined by administration and Collaborative Planning feedback.

**Person Responsible** Cynthia Clay (pr4121@dadeschools.net)

Immediate feedback on a Feedback Form will be provided to teachers by Dr. Clay and Mrs. Negron beginning August 24, 2021 and will be ongoing.

**Person Responsible** Cynthia Clay (pr4121@dadeschools.net)

Open classroom dialogues with all stakeholders by Dr. Clay and Mrs. Negron beginning August 24, 2021 and will be ongoing. Teachers will share best practices across grade levels every third Wednesday during a Power Hour session. Students will be allowed to collaborate in the classrooms to share and discuss questions using the i-Ready Discourse Standards-based cards.

**Person Responsible** Cynthia Clay (pr4121@dadeschools.net)

During collaborative planning, develop student generated end products to promote student accountability beginning November 1, 2021 through December 17.

**Person Responsible** Cynthia Clay (pr4121@dadeschools.net)

During collaborative planning, identify collaborative structures that will promote best classroom practices as it relates to transitions, collaborative conversations, and classroom routines beginning November 1, 2021 through December 17.

**Person Responsible** Cynthia Clay (pr4121@dadeschools.net)

## #2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

### Area of Focus

**Description and Rationale:** Based on the staff climate survey 94% of staff felt a lack of parental concern and support.

### Measurable Outcome:

By October 28th 2021, 30% of parents will be involved in the school either by school activities or Class Dojo communication.

### Monitoring:

Parental involvement will be monitored via parent sign-in sheets at school activities and teacher communication logs. Parent survey responses will be utilized to plan student and family engagement activities. Each grade level has been assigned a month to plan family engagement activities to continuously build school-home relationships.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sherelean Edwards (241417@dadeschools.net)

### Evidence-based Strategy:

The evidence-based strategies being implemented Family Engagement.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is that Family Engagement studies show that parent involvement is a major factor in student outcomes, including closing the achievement gap between various groups of students. Different families have different capacities for involvement, meaning schools should provide a range of ways for parents to be involved. Examples of Family Engagement activities include, but are not limited to, open houses, orientations, parent workshops, home visits, volunteer opportunities, and community events. The most important elements of a Family Engagement program are (1) creating genuine and collaborative relationships with families, (2) creating interactive sessions between staff and families, and (3) linking all interactions to learning to help build families' capacities in supporting their students' academic growth.

Empowering all stakeholders by keeping them engaged, informed, and accountable.

## Action Steps to Implement

Open House parent Meeting will be September 22, 2021.

### Person Responsible

Cynthia Clay (pr4121@dadeschools.net)

\*Parent Needs Surveys completed at the open House Meeting on September 22, 2021.

### Person Responsible

Cynthia Clay (pr4121@dadeschools.net)

Student Interests Survey to be completed by September 22, 2021.

### Person Responsible

Cynthia Clay (pr4121@dadeschools.net)

\*Monthly family meetings will be scheduled to provide support according to survey data by October 28, 2021.

**Person Responsible** Cynthia Clay (pr4121@dadeschools.net)

Beginning November 1, 2021 through December 17, parents will receive a weekly telephone call to inform them about the activities taking place during the week.

**Person Responsible** Cynthia Clay (pr4121@dadeschools.net)

Beginning November 1, 2021 through December 17, grade level chairperson and the leadership team will meet to discuss monthly grade level activities.

**Person Responsible** Cynthia Clay (pr4121@dadeschools.net)

### #3. Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Based on the staff climate survey, 95% of staff members have indicated they feel that their ideas are listened to and considered, and work together as a team, however, only a small amount have actively participated in leadership roles.

**Measurable Outcome:** By October 28th, 2021, 50% of teachers will be actively working in a leadership capacity as Grade Chairpersons and/or leading school-wide club activities.

**Monitoring:** Surveys, agendas, and sign-in sheets will be used to monitor designated leadership responsibilities.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Cynthia Clay (pr4121@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The evidenced-based strategy being implemented is Involving Staff in Important Decision Making

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Involving Staff in Important Decision Making allows your staff to gain professional and personal stake in the school and its overall success. This commitment leads to the increased productivity as members of the staff are actively participating in various aspects of the school and wish to see their efforts succeed. Engaging all stakeholders in working together to provided students with academic and nonacademic afterschool activities, thus ensuring all participants share responsibility and accountability.

#### Action Steps to Implement

Identify leadership roles of Grade Level Chairpersons by August 18, 2021.

**Person Responsible** Cynthia Clay (pr4121@dadeschools.net)

Surveying teachers and staff about school-wide club activities by September 2, 2021.

**Person Responsible** Cynthia Clay (pr4121@dadeschools.net)

Identifying school-wide Club Leaders by September 8, 2021.

**Person Responsible** Cynthia Clay (pr4121@dadeschools.net)

Grade Level Chair Meetings the second Tuesday of every month starting in September.

**Person Responsible** Cynthia Clay (pr4121@dadeschools.net)

Beginning November 1, 2021 through December 17, during monthly Power Hour sessions, teachers will share their best classroom practices with their peers.

**Person Responsible** Kimberly Negrón (knegrón@dadeschools.net)

Beginning November 1, 2021 through December 17 teachers will collaborate to conduct peer-to-peer observations.

**Person Responsible** Kimberly Negrón (knegrón@dadeschools.net)

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Based on the data, Differentiated Instruction is critical for student achievement because we have a large percentage of students who failed to meet proficiency on various assessments. Differentiated Instruction is beneficial for all students because it provides instruction at the students' academic levels.

**Measurable Outcome:** If teachers provide explicit differentiated instruction with fidelity then there will be a 10 percent increase of students being on grade level on the i-Ready AP2 Diagnostic as compared to the i-Ready AP1 Diagnostic.

**Monitoring:** Differentiated Instruction will be monitored through Student and Teacher OPM Data Trackers, classroom observations, and student folders

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Cynthia Clay (pr4121@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Teachers will implement effective strategies during Differentiated Instruction to meet the needs of all students. Strategies will be acquired through professional development, collaborative planning, coaching cycles, and mentorship.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** If students are provided with effective and purposeful strategies during Differentiated Instruction, then the achievement gap will be closed. Differentiated Instruction is a framework or philosophy for effective teaching that involves providing different students with different avenues to learning (often in the same classroom) in terms of: acquiring content, processing, constructing, or making sense of ideas, and developing teaching materials and assessment measures so that all students within a classroom can learn effectively, regardless of differences in ability.

#### Action Steps to Implement

8/19/21- Provide Professional Development for teachers on effective implementation of differentiated instruction that is aligned to the school goals based on data. As a result, teachers will develop classroom systems that are conducive to small group instruction such as allocated space, student folders, and posted groups on Differentiated Instruction rotation charts.

**Person Responsible** Cynthia Clay (pr4121@dadeschools.net)

8/31-10/11- Plan for Differentiated Instruction and align resources to student levels. Facilitate weekly collaborative planning meetings to provide teachers with an opportunity to collaborate and brainstorm challenges, needs, and shared best practices. Teachers will attend collaborative planning and take turns taking the lead and modeling explicit instruction during small groups.

**Person Responsible** Cynthia Clay (pr4121@dadeschools.net)

8/31-10/11-Teachers will develop lesson plans that are inclusive of DI instruction. As a result, teachers will have student groups, appropriate resources and lesson plans that reflect DI - Differentiated Instruction for identified groups.

**Person Responsible** Cynthia Clay (pr4121@dadeschools.net)

8/31-10/11- \*Monitor and Track Ongoing Progress Monitor - Student and Teacher Trackers. Teachers will collaboratively develop data trackers that can be used to track mini-assessments that are aligned to weekly small group instruction. Teachers will use data trackers to monitor student progress and adjust instruction as necessary.

**Person Responsible** Cynthia Clay (pr4121@dadeschools.net)

Coaching Teacher Collaborations will focus on ensuring the implementation of differentiated instruction with fidelity beginning November 1, 2021 through December 17.

**Person Responsible** Kimberly Negrón (knegrón@dadeschools.net)

Beginning November 1, 2021 through December 17, students will be regrouped based on iReady data, topic assessments, and ongoing progress monitoring.

**Person Responsible** Kimberly Negrón (knegrón@dadeschools.net)

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Based on the data review, our school will implement the Targeted Element of ELA. We selected the overarching area of ELA based on our findings that demonstrated 31% proficiency in ELA for grades 3 – 5 on the 2021 FSA. We compared the current 2021 ELA FSA data of 31% proficiency to the 2019 FSA ELA proficiency of 31% and over the last two years, ELA proficiency remained the same with Tier 1 instruction, in both planning and delivery, Therefore, we will strategically develop, explicitly deliver, and systematically monitor tier 1 instruction to increase ELA proficiency.

**Measurable Outcome:** If we successfully develop, deliver, and monitor Tier 1 instruction, then our ELA Proficient students will increase by a minimum of 5 percentage points as evidenced by the 2022 State Assessments.

**Monitoring:** The Leadership team will participate in weekly collaborative planning, following up with targeted walk-throughs that monitor the alignment of planning to instructional delivery. Explicit feedback will be provided weekly and instructional shifts in planning will occur, based on feedback. Transformation coaches will collaboratively plan with teachers, utilizing instructional resources that define the expectation of the standards. Collection of observational data and explicit feedback will be utilized to adjust planning and instruction. Data analysis of bi-weekly progress monitoring assessments, as well as the review of products, will be utilized to track progress and determine the effectiveness of instructional delivery and planning.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Cynthia Clay (pr4121@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Within the Targeted Element of ELA, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of: Standards-Based Collaborative Planning. Standards based collaborative planning brings teachers together to learn from each other and collaborate. These collaborations will result in improved lesson quality, instructional effectiveness, and student achievement. Standards based collaborative planning will be monitored by observation of developed instruction, product reviews, and progress monitoring performance.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Standards-Based Collaborative Planning will ensure teachers plan rigorous and aligned lessons that translate into effective delivery. Continual feedback related to delivery, product effectiveness, and assessment performance will guide shifts and enhancements in instructional delivery and student performance.

**Action Steps to Implement**

8/31 – 10/11 Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning, with a focus on standards aligned instruction, resulting in an explicit lesson plan that scaffolds instruction.

**Person Responsible** Cynthia Clay (pr4121@dadeschools.net)

8/31 – 10/11 Instructional delivery will include a stated purpose, daily learning target, and end product, to ensure that what was planned for is delivered.

**Person Responsible** Cynthia Clay (pr4121@dadeschools.net)

8/31 – 10/11 Product reviews, bi-weekly, will be conducted in collaborative planning for the purpose of assessing the impact of the instructional delivery.



**Person Responsible** Cynthia Clay (pr4121@dadeschools.net)

8/31 -10/11 Data analysis of progress monitoring assessments will be conducted bi-weekly to assess the delivery of content on student performance.

**Person Responsible** Cynthia Clay (pr4121@dadeschools.net)

Beginning November 1, 2021 through December 17, Coaching Teacher Collaborations will take place to ensure that teachers are providing explicit instruction utilizing the gradual release model.

**Person Responsible** Cynthia Clay (pr4121@dadeschools.net)

Beginning November 1, 2021 through December 17, teachers will plan for collaborative strategies during common planning.

**Person Responsible** Cynthia Clay (pr4121@dadeschools.net)

### 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.

**The area identified as a concern for our school is bullying at 0.29%. This area will be addressed school-wide through morning announcements, weekly class visits by the School Counselor and Success Coach, small group counseling sessions and Restorative Justice circle activities.**

### Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

### Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

School leadership is accessible and supportive of school staff and facilitates an environment where everyone feels safe and comfortable sharing thoughts and ideas. Leadership and teaching staff celebrate the success of both students and staff throughout the year. Leadership also fosters professional relationships between school staff that support effective collaboration and encourages family and community participation and engagement with the school.

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

Stakeholders are administration, teaching staff, support staff, students, families, and the community. Administration, instructional staff, and support staff promote a positive culture and environment by modeling those positive behaviors, encouraging each other and students, as well as promoting an inclusive and authentic environment.

**Part V: Budget**

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Leadership Development	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>