

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Christina M. Eve Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 26 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Christina M. Eve Elementary School

16251 SW 99TH ST, Miami, FL 33196

<http://cme.dadeschools.net/>**Demographics****Principal: Lidia Gonzalez M**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/20/2021

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2020-21 Title I School | No |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 73% |
| 2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: B (61%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Dade County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Christina M. Eve Elementary School

16251 SW 99TH ST, Miami, FL 33196

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

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School PK-5 | No | 63% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 96% |

School Grades History

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

Christina M. Eve Elementary School will strive to form a true partnership between home, school, and community that is committed to providing a quality educational program meeting the individual needs of our students. This will be accomplished through a research-developed curriculum infused with technology and character development while providing a safe and inviting learning environment that will result in productive citizens prepared to compete in a global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Christina M. Eve Elementary School is committed to the pursuit of excellence, seeking to maximize students' academic, social and patriotic potential, thus enabling them to become life long learners and productive citizens.

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 |
|------------------|---------------------|---|
| Gonzalez, Lidia | Principal | Mrs. Gonzalez, the principal of Christina M. Eve Elementary School, ensures that instruction is aligned to state academic standards, assesses teaching methodologies, monitors student achievement, encourages parental involvement, enforces policies and procedures, manages the school's budget, hires and evaluates staff, oversees the facility, and maintains a safe learning environment for all students and staff. |
| Tourino, Maria | Assistant Principal | The assistant principal assists the school principal in the leadership, coordination, supervision and management of the school program and daily operation. The assistant principal assists in enforcing school policies and guidelines for students, staff, and faculty, with emphasis on monitoring the effective implementation of the school's Gifted and Bilingual programs. |
| Diaz, Wilfredo | Assistant Principal | The assistant principal assists the school principal in the leadership, coordination, supervision and management of the school program and daily operation. The assistant principal assists in enforcing school policies and guidelines for students, staff, and faculty, with emphasis on monitoring the effective implementation of the school's Exceptional Student Education program. |
| Olivera, Adamary | Reading Coach | The reading coach assists elementary teachers and students in the effective implementation of the Elementary English Language Arts program. The reading coach analyzes data, facilitates peer coaching activities, shares best practices, and coordinates onsite professional development opportunities. |
| Blanco, Julie | Math Coach | The mathematics coach assists elementary teachers and students in the effective implementation of the Elementary Mathematics program. The mathematics coach analyzes data, facilitates peer coaching activities, shares best practices, and coordinates the school's digital convergence. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 8/20/2021, Lidia Gonzalez M

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.*

34

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.*

15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Total number of students enrolled at the school

584

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

0

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

0

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|-------------|----|----|-----|----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 88 | 90 | 71 | 102 | 79 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 541 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 5 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 4 | 9 | 12 | 42 | 14 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 99 |

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 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |

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 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/11/2021

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 | 97 | 78 | 97 | 88 | 124 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 595 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 11 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |

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 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |

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 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| 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 | | | | 80% | 62% | 57% | 80% | 62% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 69% | 62% | 58% | 72% | 62% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 54% | 58% | 53% | 65% | 59% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 70% | 69% | 63% | 72% | 69% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 57% | 66% | 62% | 59% | 64% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 43% | 55% | 51% | 61% | 55% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 53% | 55% | 53% | 53% | 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 | 73% | 60% | 13% | 58% | 15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 77% | 64% | 13% | 58% | 19% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -73% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 75% | 60% | 15% | 56% | 19% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -77% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 74% | 67% | 7% | 62% | 12% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 74% | 69% | 5% | 64% | 10% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Cohort Comparison | | -74% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 58% | 65% | -7% | 60% | -2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -74% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 49% | 53% | -4% | 53% | -4% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

In order to compile the data below, i-Ready diagnostic results and other assessments for other subject areas and grade levels were utilized as progress monitoring tools.

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 51.4% | 58.3% | 80.6% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 45.5% | 47.7% | 72.7% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 53.8% | 38.5% | 69.2% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 38.9% | 43.1% | 73.6% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 31.8% | 31.8% | 68.2% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 30.8% | 46.2% | 53.8% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 0% |

| Grade 2 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 50.6% | 56.2% | 60.7% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 40.7% | 44.4% | 57.4% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 6.3% | 6.3% | 6.3% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 31.8% | 41.4% | 64.0% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 25.9% | 30.2% | 61.1% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 18.8% | 13.3% | 18.8% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| | | | | |
| Grade 3 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 61.9% | 72.3% | 81.0% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 54.7% | 71.4% | 78.1% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 30.8% | 33.3% | 69.2% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 25.0% | 42.2% | 57.1% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 21.9% | 38.1% | 53.1% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 7.7% | 8.3% | 38.5% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| | | | | |

| Grade 4 | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 48.7% | 66.7% | 73.7% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 41.6% | 59.2% | 69.7% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0% | 6.7% | 20.0% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 37.7% | 56.1% | 71.3% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 31.6% | 51.3% | 66.2% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0% | 0% | 6.7% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| | | | | |
| Grade 5 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 43.9% | 58.0% | 59.0% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 37.1% | 51.4% | 55.6% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 9.1% | 26.1% | 39.1% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 23.0% | 42.9% | 57.6% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 19.4% | 42.9% | 49.3% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0% | 13.6% | 30.4% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students | | 16.0% | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 13.0% | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 13.0% | |
| | English Language Learners | | 25.0% | |
| | | | | |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 26 | 33 | 50 | 7 | 4 | 8 | 9 | | | | |
| ELL | 72 | 54 | 61 | 53 | 17 | 13 | 30 | | | | |
| HSP | 73 | 56 | 63 | 47 | 14 | 10 | 37 | | | | |
| WHT | 80 | | | 70 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 67 | 47 | 56 | 41 | 14 | 10 | 27 | | | | |
| 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 | 52 | 55 | 35 | 44 | 58 | 56 | 25 | | | | |
| ELL | 77 | 71 | 54 | 66 | 59 | 49 | 43 | | | | |
| HSP | 82 | 71 | 56 | 70 | 58 | 45 | 52 | | | | |
| WHT | 85 | | | 77 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 80 | 70 | 61 | 64 | 54 | 40 | 51 | | | | |
| 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 | 42 | 53 | 46 | 42 | 62 | 68 | 14 | | | | |
| ELL | 70 | 70 | 67 | 64 | 60 | 67 | 41 | | | | |
| ASN | 75 | | | 83 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 82 | | | 64 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 80 | 72 | 65 | 72 | 58 | 61 | 56 | | | | |
| WHT | 83 | | | 67 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 77 | 68 | 60 | 68 | 57 | 62 | 51 | | | | |

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 | 43 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 55 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 342 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |
| Subgroup Data | |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 24 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 44 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Native American Students | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 44 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| White Students | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - White Students | 75 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 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?

The percentage of students in grades 3 through 5 at Christina M. Eve Elementary School scoring at Level 3 or above on the 2021 ELA decreased by 7 points, from 80% in 2019 to 73% in 2021. When compared to the district, however, the percentage of students in grades 3 through 5 at Christina M. Eve Elementary attaining a Level 3 or above surpassed the district by 17 percentage points.

In Mathematics, the percentage of Christina M. Eve Elementary students in grades 3 through 5 scoring at Level 3 or above decreased by 21 percentage points, from 70% meeting proficiency in 2019 to 49% in 2021. Christina M. Eve Elementary matched the district's percentage of proficiency in 2021, with both the school and district achieving 49% proficiency.

When analyzing science performance, the percentage of students in grades 3 through 5 at Christina M. Eve Elementary School scoring at Level 3 or above on the Statewide Science Assessment declined 16 percentage points, from 53% in 2019 to 37% in 2021. A comparison of science achievement scores at the school and district levels indicates that the percentage of students in grades 3 through 5 at Christina M. Eve Elementary earning a Level 3 or above was six percentage points below the district average.

In analyzing performance data, it is evident that Christina M. Eve Elementary School consistently performs considerably higher in ELA than in Mathematics.

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

Based on progress monitoring data and 2021 state assessment scores, Mathematics data components demonstrate the greatest need for improvement.

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

Mathematical problem solving and analytical skills were contributing factors to this need for improvement. Increased efforts to closely analyze progress monitoring data and enhance

collaborative planning to address learner deficiencies would need to be implemented to address this need for improvement.

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

Based on progress monitoring data and 2021 state assessment scores, ELA data demonstrates the most improvement.

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

Contributing factors for this improvement include differentiated instruction, interventional support, and continued data analysis to monitor learning and guide instruction.

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

Professional development activities to enhance teaching skills, collaborative planning, and data chats will need to continue to be implemented in order to accelerate learning across all grade levels.

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.

In order to better support teachers and instructional leaders, professional development opportunities that enhance data collection and analysis will be provided at the school site.

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

To ensure sustainability of improvement in the next academic year and beyond, increased intervention practices and instructional support will be provided to all students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | The need for enhanced collaborative planning is evidenced by the fact that some grade level team members are not fully committed to the notion of planning lessons collaboratively with their peers. While all teachers are dedicated to providing appropriate instruction that exceeds district and state expectations, some may not continually follow the District's Pacing Guides with fidelity. Special emphasis must be placed on working collaboratively to plan instruction and intervention targeting mathematical concepts for those students in grades 4 and 5 scoring below a Level 3 on the 2021 Mathematics FSA. |
| Measurable Outcome: | Christina M. Eve Elementary School aims to achieve the measurable outcome of all students at each grade level being taught the same instructional material at the same time. Thus, it is expected to attain a closer average of student achievement scores in post tests and standardized tests. |
| Monitoring: | Teachers are encouraged to request assistance from PLST members, and/or content-area experts (subject-area liaisons). If needed, these experts will work collaboratively with the administration to schedule classroom visits to assist the teachers. Administrators will consistently monitor grade-level planning meetings, lesson plans, classroom instruction. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Lidia Gonzalez (pr1691@dadeschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Teachers are implementing standards-aligned instruction. As such, educators are creating clear lesson plans with specific, attainable goals that include strategies such as the "I do, we do, you do" and the E5 Instructional Model Strategy, where they describe the exact steps to engage, explore, explain, elaborate, and evaluate. All teachers at each grade-level must be working on the same standards, even if there is flexibility in the instruction and lessons, to better meet the needs of all students. The administration will monitor proper implementation through daily walk-throughs and ensure that the lesson plans meet established criteria. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Using these strategies ensures that teachers are carefully reflecting on the steps of each lesson, its effectiveness during instruction, and its impact on student learning. The implementation of the E5 Instructional Model will be evident in instruction and in the project-based activities that will result. From the lesson plans, the instruction, and the finished product, the administration will be able to assess the proper implementation of the strategy. Depending on the results, the observation, and student achievement, the administration will decide if more instructional support is warranted. If so, specific teachers will be advised of needed intervention, and assistance from the PLST team and content-experts will be scheduled. Further monitoring will be on-going. |

Action Steps to Implement

1. The administration and the PLST team will present a Leadership PD to the faculty. The topic of collaborative planning will be discussed and teachers will have the first opportunity to meet with their grade-level team to prepare a Yearly Plan that details that grade-level's monthly themes and standards, which will encompass all subjects. The team must use the standards and Pacing Guides for all subjects as the framework for their Yearly Plan. A quarterly standards-based project will be created by each grade level demonstrating skills learned across the curriculum. Each grade-level will submit the Yearly Plan to their respective Assistant Principal. 8/19/21.

Person Responsible Lidia Gonzalez (pr1691@dadeschools.net)

2. The administration will monitor lesson plans and classroom instruction, and specifically look for uniformity of standards taught within all grade-levels as well as adherence to the Yearly Plan. 8/23/21- 10/11/21.

Person Responsible Lidia Gonzalez (pr1691@dadeschools.net)

3. The administration and the content-area experts will meet with grade-levels during Data Chats to analyze student data, discuss student progress, and/or address any concerns. 8/23/21- 10/11/21.

Person Responsible Lidia Gonzalez (pr1691@dadeschools.net)

4. Vertical Team meetings will be conducted to assist primary teachers to plan appropriately for concepts that need to have a strong basis in certain subjects where deficiencies are observed. 8/23/21- 10/11/21

Person Responsible Lidia Gonzalez (pr1691@dadeschools.net)

5. Schedules will be reviewed and adjusted to ensure that grade-level teachers will have ample time to engage in collaborative planning. 11/1/21- 12/21/21.

Person Responsible Lidia Gonzalez (pr1691@dadeschools.net)

6. Professional development activities will be conducted to better familiarize teachers with the recently adopted Wonders reading series. Additional support will be provided by the district's language arts department and the publisher of the series. 11/1/21- 12/21/21.

Person Responsible Lidia Gonzalez (pr1691@dadeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

As demonstrated by the FSA Proficiency Three-Year Trend Bar Graph, the data shows that both Mathematics and ELA mastery are predicted to decline for the 2022 administration. In particular, Mathematics has decreased steadily in the past three years. The 2021 Mathematics FSA scores demonstrate that the percentage of students in grades 3 through 5 achieving a Level 3 or above decreased by 21 points when compared to 2019, with 49% of students attaining proficiency in 2021 versus 70% in 2019. Additionally, mathematical gains also decreased in 2021, with 14% of students achieving learning gains versus 57% in 2019.

An analysis of the most recent subgroup data found on the 2019 FSA Data Performance graph shows that the Black Ethnicity subgroup is performing at the lowest level in ELA (38%) and Mathematics Proficiency (50%) and showing Learning Gains in ELA (29%) and in Math (43%). The Hispanic subgroup's performance is more stable across the curriculums (ELA -82%, Math -70%) and is demonstrating Learning Gains (ELA -71%, Math 57%).

The Demographic Subgroups Data indicates that the ELL group falls behind the ESE group in ELA Proficiency (43% versus 52%) and Learning Gains (50% versus 55%). When analyzing the ELA Lowest 25%, the ELL subgroup makes up 52% of the total versus ESE, with 32%. This data reflects that the ELL group is trailing behind all other subgroups in ELA due to the language deficiency. Yet, the results differ in the area of Mathematics. The ESE group shows a slight advantage to the ELL in proficiency (44% versus 43%). In comparing Learning Gains, however, the ESE group fell behind (58% versus 66%). The Lowest 25% were close for both groups, ELL- 59%, and ESE- 56%. Overall, the data suggests that both groups are in need of improvement.

The need to improve students' mathematical achievement calls for increased emphasis on instructional differentiation.

Measurable Outcome:

With differentiated instruction focusing on the academic areas of deficiencies for each of the subgroups as demonstrated on the i-Ready Reading and Math Diagnostic Tests, Christina M. Eve Elementary School will see 80% of the at-risk students identified in the subgroups mentioned improve in the subsequent i-Ready administrations.

Monitoring:

Christina M. Eve Elementary School will monitor the identified students with logs demonstrating the days and times differentiated instruction is offered, and schedules of the days and times the students participate in intervention aside from their regular class time. After each i-Ready Diagnostic Test administration, Data Chats will be conducted with the administration and the teachers to analyze student data and ensure that the proper skill-based lessons are being retaught during differentiated instruction. Emphasis will also be placed in making certain that necessary resources are available and effectively utilized and intervention is being offered, if necessary. Overall, an increase in the percentage of students demonstrating mastery within the subgroups will demonstrate the success of the whole process.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lidia Gonzalez (pr1691@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

The teachers implement collaborative learning structures, with focus on several evidence-based strategies that are consistently used among educators. Primarily, each teacher sets up small groups to work with throughout the week. The groups are fluid and change as the students are retested and their deficiencies are identified. Depending on the skills that need to be revisited and the learning styles of each group, certain instructional strategies may be

implemented. Some of these may be creating learning stations, using task cards, implementing the think-pair-share strategy, student journaling, and/or running literature circles. In addition, other strategies may include conducting reflection and goal-setting exercises, providing individual learning activities, assigning different sets of reading comprehension activities and open-ended projects, and/or providing opportunities for students to propose project ideas.

**Rationale
for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

Establishing groups properly is essential. The students must be grouped with other students who have difficulties with similar skills and share common learning styles. This allows the teacher to drive instruction in a direction that uses strategies that will enhance all of the group's skills while focusing on the commonalities of learning styles. Using the data from the i-Ready Diagnostic Tests, the teacher can easily identify the students who are demonstrating difficulties in the same academic areas. If there are many students in need of instruction in a particular skill or standard, the teacher may divide the group by learning styles. One group can be taught using a lesson aligned to its learning style, while another group's lesson can focus on a different learning style. If most of the class is lacking mastery of a certain skill, the teacher should reteach that lesson using a different strategy or activity.

Action Steps to Implement

1. The administration will conduct quarterly Data Chats with each grade level to identify the students in need of instructional support and the areas of focus. 8/23/21- 10/11/21.

Person Responsible Lidia Gonzalez (pr1691@dadeschools.net)

2. The administration and the PLST Team will conduct classroom visits to assist teachers in implementing differentiated instruction. They will visit during grade-level planning and reading or mathematics instructional periods. 8/23/21- 10/11/21.

Person Responsible Lidia Gonzalez (pr1691@dadeschools.net)

3. The PLST Team/PD Liaison will offer a PD on Differentiated Instruction at the school location to facilitate teacher participation. 10/29/21

Person Responsible Adamary Olivera (spaolivera@dadeschools.net)

4. After each i-Ready Diagnostic Test, the administration will conduct a Data Chat to analyze student achievement data, and observe the areas of growth and decline. Discussions should lead to adjustments in the differentiated instructional strategies in each classroom to ensure they meet the needs of individual learners. 8/23/21- 10/11/21.

Person Responsible Wilfredo Diaz (widiaz@dadeschools.net)

5. Teachers will be provided with opportunities to visit the classrooms of model teachers and observe best practices related to differentiated instruction. 11/1/21- 12/21/21.

Person Responsible Adamary Olivera (spaolivera@dadeschools.net)

6. Model teachers will visit classrooms and assist peers with the planning and implementation of differentiated instruction. 11/1/21- 12/21/21.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

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

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | As indicated by the Student Survey, student perception of the role of the teacher decreased in 2019-2020 when compared to 2018-2019. For instance, student perception that adults in the school help them declined by 6%, from 90% to 84%. A decrease was also noted in the percentage of students who felt that the adults care about them, from 78% to 71%. The students who found their teachers friendly and easy to talk to declined by 5%, from 86% to 77%. Finally, the percentage of students who felt that their teachers let them know how they are doing on their work decreased by 18%, from 95% to 77%. |
| Measurable Outcome: | Christina M. Eve Elementary School will ensure that all teachers participate in Mental Health PD's offered, and are aware of their individual students' emotional/mental needs. Furthermore, teachers must effectively include Social-Emotional Learning lessons and strategies in their weekly instruction. The counselor will keep a record of all students demonstrating behavioral and/or emotional issues, and schedule them for counseling sessions and/or parent conferences. |
| Monitoring: | The administration and counselor will closely monitor cases of students exhibiting behavioral and/or emotional concerns as reported by the teachers, parents, or students themselves. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Katherine DelaCalle (kdelacalle@dadeschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | The teachers and counselor will be able to infuse social-emotional learning into their classroom instruction and environment. Small-group or individual counseling sessions will be conducted using the latest research on identifying social-emotional intelligence and incorporating SEL strategies that focus on problem-solving techniques, managing stress, and promoting "caring conversations" in order to promote a healthy social environment and student achievement. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | A considerable number of students are dealing with emotional issues at home, and have lacked opportunities for socialization due to their participation in virtual school. As such, Christina M. Eve Elementary School aims to ensure that all instructional personnel is trained to effectively address students' social-emotional concerns. Strategies described in "The educator's guide to emotional intelligence and academic achievement: Social-emotional learning in the classroom" will be presented to teachers via a book study PLC for them to implement in their instruction and counseling sessions. |

Action Steps to Implement

1. The counselor will meet with individual students or small groups for counseling sessions emphasizing social-emotional learning. 8/23/21- 10/11/21.

Person Responsible Katherine DelaCalle (kdelacalle@dadeschools.net)

2. The counselor will promote SEL through activities presented during morning announcements. 8/23/21- 10/11/21.

Person Responsible Katherine DelaCalle (kdelacalle@dadeschools.net)

3. The counselor will conduct SEL presentations to each grade level focused on issues that impact that age group. 8/23/21- 10/11/21.

Person Responsible Katherine DelaCalle (kdelacalle@dadeschools.net)

4. Christina M. Eve Elementary School will continue to promote "kindness" through the Character Traits Awards given to students during morning announcements. 8/23/21- 10/11/21.

Person Responsible Lidia Gonzalez (pr1691@dadeschools.net)

5. Students who exhibit exemplary character traits will be recognized during monthly "Gator of the Month" recognitions. 11/1/21- 12/21/21.

Person Responsible Lidia Gonzalez (pr1691@dadeschools.net)

6. Civic instruction will be incorporated across the curriculum in an effort to enhance students' civic awareness. 11/1/21- 12/21/21.

Person Responsible Lidia Gonzalez (pr1691@dadeschools.net)

#4. Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: As evidenced by the findings of the SIP Survey provided to teachers, 78% believe that staff members have the opportunity to be considered for leadership roles. The administration has offered leadership roles and encouraged all who have shown an interest and desire to lead. Unfortunately, only a small group of educators are compelled to take on leadership responsibilities at the school site.

Measurable Outcome: By September 2021, Christina M. Eve Elementary School aims to achieve 100% teacher participation in a leadership role of their choosing. Depending on individual interest, every teacher will become part of a school-site committee, join the Leadership Team, engage in the PLST Team or EESAC, or lead a grade-level team.

Monitoring: To monitor this Area of Focus, the administration will maintain updated lists of all leadership teams and committees, sign-in sheets and agendas of meetings, schedules of the meeting dates, and physical evidence of tasks accomplished. The administration will periodically attend the meetings to support teachers' leadership development and provide mentorship.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lidia Gonzalez (pr1691@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: As highlighted in the article, "You Can't Do It All! A Sensible Way to Distribute School Leadership Roles", by Kise and Russell, administrators should lead from their strengths. The authors' review of essential school leadership responsibilities led them to also write "Differentiated School Leadership: Effective Collaboration, Communication and Change through Personality Type," which identify separate roles for school principals that have an impact on student achievement. Since no one person can fill all roles, opportunities should be offered to others to add their strengths and ideas to school leadership. The article discusses the use of personality type theory to make the most of the administrator's natural style and build effective teams to share leadership in an effective, efficient way.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The administration at Christina M. Eve Elementary School has good rapport with the teachers and staff and emphasizes shared leadership. The sense of collegiality and support displayed by the administrators, along with valuing each teacher's strength, has proven to give some teachers the confidence they need to take on leadership roles. The administration's aim is to identify and nurture the strengths and talents of teachers that have not demonstrated any interest in pursuing leadership roles and express the need for them to assume these responsibilities in order to facilitate curriculum uniformity, enhance teacher productivity, and improve student achievement scores.

Action Steps to Implement

1. The PD Liaison facilitated a Leadership PD for all teachers, sharing the importance of all educators assuming a leadership role within the school. 8/19/21.

Person Responsible: Adamary Olivera (spaolivera@dadeschools.net)

2. The administration will discuss and thoroughly highlight the expectations set for the PLST Team and the school committees during the first faculty meeting. 8/17/21.

Person Responsible: Lidia Gonzalez (pr1691@dadeschools.net)

3. The administration and the PLST will monitor and assist teachers undertaking new leadership roles by joining their meetings, providing the necessary guidance and resources, and monitoring staff and student participation and growth. 8/23/21- 10/11/21.

Person Responsible Lidia Gonzalez (pr1691@dadeschools.net)

4. The administration will oversee that each committee's goal is effectively attained. 8/31/21- 10/11/21.

Person Responsible Lidia Gonzalez (pr1691@dadeschools.net)

5. The school committees will convene with fidelity and establish a timeline for events to be implemented throughout the year. 11/1/21- 12/21/21.

Person Responsible Lidia Gonzalez (pr1691@dadeschools.net)

6. Selected teacher leaders will disseminate information to their peers related to supplemental educational programs adopted by the district and monitor their effective implementation across all grade levels. 11/1/21- 12/21/21.

Person Responsible Lidia Gonzalez (pr1691@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.

While there is no discipline data for Christina M. Eve Elementary School on the Safe Schools site, the school closely monitors information derived from participation in incentive programs, students' conduct grades, counselor referrals, and teacher updates on at-risk learners. Analysis of this data demonstrates a need for further improvement in areas that affect student discipline. Specifically, emphasis will be placed on addressing the issues of students being sent to the office continuously for behavioral issues, consistent tardies, and/or poor attendance. Students will participate in classroom and school-wide incentives to improve behavior or attendance issues.

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.

Christina M. Eve Elementary School has continuously established a positive school culture and environment by establishing positive incentive programs which promote attendance, good behavior, and academic achievement. From the beginning of the academic year, Christina M. Eve Elementary School assigns a school-wide theme that promotes a positive message. During the school year, attendance is promoted through parent involvement connections and school-wide activities, such as Sock Hop and recognition during the Gator of the Month and Honor Roll assemblies. Good behavior is recognized daily during morning announcements, with a focus on Character Traits. Academic Achievement is supported by the Gator of the Month recognition, Honor Roll Assemblies, and school-wide competitions.

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

Christina M. Eve Elementary School has established explicit tasks for each of the pertinent stakeholders. In regards to attendance, the assistant principals, counselor, and teachers have specific roles, from motivators to monitoring and contacting parents. The counselor recognizes positive behavior identified by the teachers through incentives and rewards during morning announcements. The administration highlights the Character Traits recipients during the Gator of the Month recognitions. When feasible, parents are invited to witness their child receiving attendance and academic awards in Honor Roll Assemblies.