

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Lorah Park 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	18
Positive Culture & Environment	29
Budget to Support Goals	29

Lorah Park Elementary School

5160 NW 31ST AVE, Miami, FL 33142

<http://lpe.dadeschools.net>

Demographics

Principal: Tashimba Andrews

Start Date for this Principal: 8/18/2021

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	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: I (%) 2016-17: D (40%)
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	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	29

Lorah Park Elementary School

5160 NW 31ST AVE, Miami, FL 33142

<http://lpe.dadeschools.net>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>94%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>99%</p>

School Grades History

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

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.

The staff, parents, and community of Lorah Park Elementary School invest in the development of the whole child by creating a safe early learning environment that is stimulating, challenging, and fosters intellectual risk-taking which enables each child to achieve their greatest potential. Our students take accountability for their learning and meet high academic expectations in a nurturing environment that promotes healthy social/emotional, physical, and cognitive development.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to ignite a spirit of excellence in an ever-changing world within a positive, safe, supportive, and stimulating environment where children are valued. We are furthered committed to providing a relevant, high-quality education through continuous progress monitoring and assessments which will enable our students to perform at or above grade level prior to transitioning to middle school.

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
Malik, Aquilah	Reading Coach	The transformational coach is responsible for supporting ELA teachers with planning, instructional delivery, data analysis, and progress monitoring. Support includes the development and implementation of strategies to increase students' mastery of content and improvement of the teacher's craft. The ELA coach is also responsible for all scheduling interventions, aligning resources, collecting and disaggregating departmental data, and ensuring curriculum implementation with fidelity.
Ramon, Gianni	Assistant Principal	Assist the school principal in the overall monitoring of the master schedule, attendance, ESE and grant compliance, instructional programs, interventions/ differentiated instruction, discipline, school-level operations, and maintaining a positive school culture. Collaborate with the leadership team to coordinates assigned parent, student, and community engagement activities and services.
Andrews, TaShimba	Principal	Supervise the overall monitoring of the master schedule, attendance, ESE and grant compliance, instructional programs, interventions/ differentiated instruction, discipline, school-level operations, and maintaining a positive school culture. Collaborate with the leadership team to coordinates assigned parent, student, and community engagement activities and services.
Diaz, LaGloria	Math Coach	The transformational coach is responsible for supporting ELA teachers with planning, instructional delivery, data analysis, and progress monitoring. Support includes the development and implementation of strategies to increase students' mastery of content and improvement of the teacher's craft. The ELA coach is also responsible for all scheduling interventions, aligning resources, collecting and disaggregating departmental data, and ensuring curriculum implementation with fidelity.
Remelus, Daphney	Teacher, K-12	Provide literacy and social science curriculum to 4th grade students. School - site curriculum resource for novice transformational coaches. Assist with school site instructional calendars and professional development. .

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/18/2021, Tashimba Andrews

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.*

5

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.*

20

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

18

Total number of students enrolled at the school

242

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

5

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

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	37	33	55	44	37	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	244
Attendance below 90 percent	0	5	6	7	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	9	36	27	12	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	2	3	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	44	52	43	41	44	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	262
Attendance below 90 percent	5	6	6	4	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	2	1	3	2	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	11	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	1	5	8	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				52%	62%	57%		62%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				50%	62%	58%		62%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				76%	58%	53%		59%	48%
Math Achievement				45%	69%	63%		69%	62%
Math Learning Gains				41%	66%	62%		64%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				36%	55%	51%		55%	47%
Science Achievement				42%	55%	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	36%	60%	-24%	58%	-22%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	59%	64%	-5%	58%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				
05	2021					
	2019	54%	60%	-6%	56%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	18%	67%	-49%	62%	-44%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	59%	69%	-10%	64%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-18%				
05	2021					
	2019	54%	65%	-11%	60%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	41%	53%	-12%	53%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

i-Ready Diagnostics was used to compile the Progress Monitoring data below for grades 1st through 5th. Midyear science assessment data was also used to compile 5th grade science data.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
		English Language Arts	All Students	24.4%
Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities	25%		11.6%	28.9%
English Language Learners	33.0%			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
		Mathematics	All Students	29.5%
Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities	30.2%		9.3%	17.8%
English Language Learners	40.0%			33.3%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	26.3%	16.2%	34.2%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24.3%	16.7%	32.4%
	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	31.6%	10.8%	34.2%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32.4%	11.1%	35.1%
	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	36.4%	48.5%	59.4%
	Economically Disadvantaged	36.4%	48.5%	59.4%
	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	25%	39.4%	40.6%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25%	39.4%	40.6%
	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	21.6%	33.3%	32.4%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21.6%	33.3%	32.4%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13.5%	28.6%	24.3%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13.5%	28.6%	24.3%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	14.7%	23.5%	38.2%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15.2%	24.2%	36.4%
	Students With Disabilities	9.1%		27.3%
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8.8%	12.1%	29.4%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9.1%	12.5%	30.3%
	Students With Disabilities	9.1%	18.2%	36.4%
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students		23%	
	Economically Disadvantaged		24%	
	Students With Disabilities		17%	
	English Language Learners		27%	

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	9	15		10	8						
ELL	29			31							
BLK	30	20		11	7		11				
HSP	29			31							
FRL	31	22		15	11		12				
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	42	88	100	15	13						
ELL	65	73		53	45						
BLK	50	48	76	42	39	32	42				
HSP	70	57		55	50		50				
FRL	53	50	75	45	40	33	41				
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

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	27
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	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	159
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	8
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	16
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	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	
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	27
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?

2019:

The school to district comparison reveals a widened achievement gap in accountability grades 3 through 5 in math. All subgroups performed a minimum of 10 percentage below the district's.

All ELA Subgroups achieved above the 41% threshold. Specifically in ELA out ESE students in the L25 quartile all made learning gains.

All ELA Subgroups Learning Gains decreased except for Hispanic students, which increased by 6 percentage points.

All math learning gains were below the district average in each grade level.

Math proficiency as a school decreased by 19 percentage points.

Science proficiency decreased by 2 percentage points.

2021:

Overall, the school data decreased in every category (ELA and math).

Learning gains across the board in math, for all grade levels and subgroups decreased; we did not have any students in the lowest 25 quartile make any learning gains.

Although ELA scores were slightly higher than math, our ELA proficiency decreased by 22 percentage points. Utilizing progress monitoring data, we did see increases among all grade levels from the beginning of the year to the end of the year with the exception of students in Kindergarten and first grade.

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

2019: Based off of 2019 state assessments, there is a great need for improvement in all areas/ components of math. With decreased among all subgroups and grade levels, a focus on math will be crucial.

2021: Based on progress monitoring data collected throughout the 2020-2021 school year, there is a need for improvement in the first grade for both ELA and math, with decreased proficiencies from the beginning of the year to the end of the year in both subjects.

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

2019:

During the 2019 school year, although there was a focus on differentiated instruction, there was an inconsistency with implementation due to changing personnel. Inconsistent implementation of a teacher led center does not provide students with the instruction necessary to close the learning gap.

Therefore, consistent, schedules, and monitored differentiated instruction will need to take place. Ensuring time is provided in the schedule and personnel remains consistent throughout the year.
2021:

Reflecting on the previous school year, inconsistency with our physical and MSO students contributed to the decreases in both ELA and Math. A focus in first grade builds the foundation both in reading for phonics and in math. Support from instructional coaches and supplemental personnel will need to be in place to address this concern.

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

2019:

Based on the 2019 state assessments, third grade students learning gains/ learning gains for the lowest 25 quartile, had the most increases and improvement.

2021:

Based off the 2021 progress monitoring data, students in third grade, our economically disadvantaged, showed the most improvement from the beginning of the year to the end of the year with an increase of 23 percentage points in ELA.

Similarly, those students in our economically disadvantaged subgroup in 5th grade showed improvement of 21.2 percentage points in math from the beginning of the year compared to the end of year data.

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

2019:

During this school year we implemented interventions for our tier 2 and tier 3 with fidelity. We developed a schedule that ensured that we were able to target our fragile students and continuously monitored implementation and data to adjust instruction.

2021: The factors that contributed greatly to this improvement were an increased priority in Intervention efforts in math, including but not limited to the development of a schedule that allotted for minimally 25 minutes of intervention and recruitment of intervention teacher.

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

Strategies to accelerate learning include collaborative planning, goal setting, raising expectation levels for students and consistency in differentiated instruction.

We will also implement extended learning opportunities to accelerate learning.

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.

We will provide professional development opportunities during and after school that will support the current learning loss. The professional development will include but is not limited to implementation of differentiated instruction, on student engagement, and the implementation of curriculum based programs such as Reflex Math and Accelerated Reader.

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 academic improvement, additional tutoring services will be provided. Services will include, before and after school tutoring, Spring Break Academy, Saturday Academy, and Title III.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Mathematics learning gains were identified as an area of critical need after reviewing 3-year trend data. Students' learning gains decreased from 67% in 2018 to 41% in 2019, a difference of 26 percentage points. While students did not test in 2020, students' learning gains decreased again from 41% in 2019 to 11% in 2021, a difference of 30 percentage points. Similarly, learning gains for the lowest quartile decreased from 50 in 2018 to 0% in 2021, a difference of 50 percentage points.

Measurable Outcome:

If we successfully implement the evidenced-based strategy Differentiated Instruction, then teachers will use a systematic approach of instruction, assessment, analysis, and actions to increase overall learning gains performance to 48% overall and 55% in the lowest quartile

Monitoring:

This area of focus will be monitored through the coach's collaborative planning agenda, and end products; and the teacher's lesson plans with identifiable DI rotations, data-aligned curriculum, and student leveled work products. Coaches and teachers will work collaboratively to disaggregate OPM and topic assessment data to adjust instructional lessons and provide fluidity to grouping. Administrators will conduct observations and walk-throughs to ensure fidelity of implementation and consistency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

TaShimba Andrews (pr3041@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Differentiated Instruction requires teachers to identify diverse learners and their learning styles to develop differentiated lessons that meet their needs. Lessons require varying levels of complexity with reading, writing, thinking, problem-solving, and speaking.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Differentiated Instruction is being implemented because it allows teachers to use reteaching resources and data derived from topic assessments to determine the instructional needs of students. Students get the opportunity to collaborate in pairs and in small groups facilitated by the teacher. Grouping membership changes according to the skill, topic, or standards requiring remediation. Coaches assist teachers with disaggregating data, regrouping students, and differentiating assignments based on the data. Teachers assign and use DI folders to confirm connections between teacher instruction student learning. Through differentiated instruction, we work towards closing the achievement gap by increasing learning gains. This strategy provides an opportunity for all students at every level to receive the lesson at their instructional level.

Action Steps to Implement

During the opening of schools' meetings, provide a Differentiated Instruction Professional Development to all instructional staff that is interactive and will help teachers meet students at their instructional level.

Person Responsible

Daphney Remelus (dremelus@dadeschools.net)

Beginning the week of August 31, teachers and instructional coaches will utilize data from the 2021 Spring FSA and AP3 iReady diagnostic (while awaiting topic assessment and AP1 iReady Data) to group students based on their Achievement Level and/or Tier. DI groups are designed to be fluid and will change according to the data from each topic assessment and/ or iReady administration. This is a reoccurring action step that will also allow for progress monitoring towards students' mastery of previously missed skills.

Person Responsible

LaGloria Diaz (mrs.diaz@dadeschools.net)

Beginning the week of August 31, provide DI mini PD sessions during collaborative planning using actual student data and end products. Coaches will also collaborate with teachers to develop an instructional framework that lends itself to daily DI tiered rotations and readiness, interest, and learning profile.

Person Responsible LaGloria Diaz (mrs.diaz@dadeschools.net)

Monitor implementation of the rotations, grouping, and lessons weekly beginning the week of September 6. The coaches will assist the teachers to disaggregate OPM data and utilize the results to adjust instruction.

Person Responsible Gianni Ramon (gramon@dadeschools.net)

Beginning November 1st, implement and monitor systems and routines for differentiated instruction and intervention aligned to data.

Person Responsible TaShimba Andrews (pr3041@dadeschools.net)

Beginning the week of November 8, 2021, coaches will model how to provide explicit and corrective feedback on student whole group, and independent assignments during the Teacher-led rotation of differentiated instruction. Coaches will also model how to provide immediate feedback on bellringers.

Person Responsible LaGloria Diaz (mrs.diaz@dadeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Mathematics proficiency was identified as an area of critical need after reviewing 3-year trend data. Students' proficiency decreased from 62% in 2018 to 43% in 2019, a difference of 19 percentage points. While students did not test in 2020, students' proficiency decreased again from 43% in 2019 to 15% in 2021, a difference of 28 percentage points. The proficiency decreased by 19 percentage points from 2018 to 2019 and doubled to 28 percentage points from 2019 to 2021.

Measurable Outcome: If we successfully implement the evidenced-based strategy Standards-Aligned Instruction, then the teacher's use of student performance data to inform standard-based instructional planning and delivery will lead to increased proficiency.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored through the coach's collaborative planning agenda, and end products; and the teacher's lesson plans with identifiable standard-aligned lessons and learning targets, data-aligned curriculum, and student leveled work products. Coaches and teachers will work collaboratively to disaggregate OPM and topic assessment data to adjust instructional lessons and provide fluidity to grouping. Administrators will conduct observations and walk-throughs to ensure fidelity of implementation and consistency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tashimba Andrews (tandrews@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Standards-Aligned Instruction refers to teachers executing lessons based on the standards and/ or learning targets to ensure that all student work products and teaching techniques are aligned to the depth and breadth of the assessment limits.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Standard-aligned Instruction is being implemented because it requires teachers to deliver lessons and guide students through the demands of the standards and learning targets. Students will have to show evidence of mastering the lesson's objective through their work products. This strategy also elicits explicit instruction from teachers while enhancing collaborative planning systems during collaborative planning. Lessons are created based on the state's standards using district-adopted curricular resources. It also provides disaggregation protocols for data-driven differentiated instruction and a framework to guide educational practices that improve student achievement, increase instructional capacity and reduce instructional barriers.

Action Steps to Implement

Instructional Staff will receive a PD on planning for standard-aligned instruction that uses an interactive approach and will help the students receive instruction that meets the rigor and depth of the standard. Lessons will include student-friendly learning targets.

Person Responsible: LaGloria Diaz (mrs.diaz@dadeschools.net)

Transformation Coaches will support teachers during Common Planning to develop standards-aligned lessons plans that are rigorous, student-centered, and aligned to the breadth and depth of the standards.

Person Responsible: LaGloria Diaz (mrs.diaz@dadeschools.net)

Administrative staff will conduct targeted walk-throughs to focus on evidence of standard-aligned lessons and transformational coaches will identify teachers in need of support with lesson development.

Person Responsible: Tashimba Andrews (tandrews@dadeschools.net)

Teachers in need of additional assistance will participate in peer observations to view models of standard aligned planning and instruction.

Person Responsible Tashimba Andrews (tandrews@dadeschools.net)

Beginning November 1st, coaches will model how to use lesson plans to drive Common Board Configuration (CBC) to convey to students what is expected of them on a daily basis. The use of a common board in classrooms demonstrates a sense of continuity across subjects, grade levels, and serves as a reminder to teachers during instructional delivery and student end products.

Person Responsible LaGloria Diaz (mrs.diaz@dadeschools.net)

Beginning the week of November 8, 2021, plan for explicit instruction of the Gradual Release Model - (I Do, We Do, They Do, You Do) with a specific focus on collaborative activities -They Do.

Person Responsible Gianni Ramon (gramon@dadeschools.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Based on the data provided through PowerBi, 71% of Lorah Park students have 6 or more absences during the 2020-2021 school year. of the 71%, 45% of the students missed more than 10 school days.

Measurable Outcome: If we successfully implement the targeted strategy, we will see an increase in overall school attendance. Our goal is average over 93% of students in school on a daily basis.

Monitoring: The leadership team will be monitoring this area of focus utilizing daily attendance bulletins and district dashboard to determine if student attendance percentage increases. We will monitor school wide, and students individually to address specific needs as it related to truancy. We will identify the areas of need or specific students and readjust strategy and implementation to target those students with truancy.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: TaShimba Andrews (pr3041@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will implement rewards and incentives as it relates to the attendance initiatives in order to build and increase daily attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We have selected the rewards/incentives strategy in order to motivate and encourage our students to attend school daily. Learning takes place when students are present at school consistently.

Action Steps to Implement

In collaboration with the school attendance committee, develop a school-wide incentive attendance plan that targets school-wide, classroom, and individual student goals. This plan will be created by September 16, 2021, for review with the school's leadership team. The plan should be shared with parents and students during the week of September 20, 2021.

Person Responsible Gianni Ramon (gramon@dadeschools.net)

Discuss and provide faculty with explanations and guidance to implement an incentive plan during the September 2021 faculty meeting. The plan will include incentives for teachers and students.

Person Responsible TaShimba Andrews (pr3041@dadeschools.net)

Beginning the week of September 20, we will implement the incentive plan with fidelity and consistency. Use the morning and afternoon announcements to remind students of the rewards/incentive being provided for attendance and participation at school. Establish a school-wide Dojo to push out reminders text messages to parents about the initiative. This will be a recurring action step.

Person Responsible Gianni Ramon (gramon@dadeschools.net)

Beginning October 18, 2021, the administration will monitor implementation and reassess effectiveness after 4 weeks of implementation.

Person Responsible TaShimba Andrews (pr3041@dadeschools.net)

Beginning November 1, 2021, homeroom classes will have the opportunity to be recognized after just 4 perfect attendance days. Students will earn a number or symbol (1 0 0 %) each day of perfect attendance and after four days the school will incentivize the class in order to increase immediate gratification for students. Teachers will be incentivized upon their homeroom reaching 20 days of Perfect Attendance (1 0 0 P E R C E N T A T T E N D A N C E) and quarterly for personal perfect attendance.

Person Responsible Gianni Ramon (gramon@dadeschools.net)

By December 15, a Community Involvement Specialist will be on-boarded to assist with home visits with families to increase daily school attendance.

Person Responsible TaShimba Andrews (pr3041@dadeschools.net)

#4. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the qualitative data from the School Climate survey, SIP survey, and the review of the Core Leadership Competencies, we selected Instructional Leadership Team as a critical area of need because as leaders we want to ensure consistency of implementation of schoolwide expectations. As leaders, we want to be a part of instructional decision-making and work in collaboration with teachers to move the mark.

Measurable Outcome: If we successfully implement the targeted element of instructional leadership team, all stakeholders will take ownership for students learning. We will see evidence of stakeholders engaging in conversations about data and improving instruction.

Monitoring: The school leadership team will focus on the evidence based strategy of taking ownership for students learning. Through data chats and instructional decision making in collaborative planning, all stakeholders will take ownership for students' learning. Through this, we hope accountability for students learning is a shared responsibility and everyone puts their role into perspective.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: TaShimba Andrews (pr3041@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will implement the evidence-based strategy that promotes Taking Ownership of Students' Learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: All stakeholders will be active participants in students learning academically and socially by conducting data chats and facilitating school-wide SEL lessons/ matter initiatives. Student journals, data chats, and data trackers will allow stakeholders to monitor students' progress towards their desired goals.

Action Steps to Implement

After the successful administration of iReady AP1, display data in a high-frequency area of the school (corridor to the multi-purpose room). Data charts will be interactive and include district, tiered, and school progress monitoring by subgroups, teachers, and grade levels to promote friendly competition and set high expectations. School trend data with desired goals will be posted in every classroom.

Person Responsible TaShimba Andrews (pr3041@dadeschools.net)

The leadership team will schedule and conduct data chats with all teachers beginning in October. Teachers will conduct student data chats with each child using student trackers to monitor student mastery and progress towards their set goal.

Person Responsible Gianni Ramon (gramon@dadeschools.net)

Students, teachers, coaches, and administrators will have data binders to track progress and update trackers and data monitoring charts as results become available.

Person Responsible TaShimba Andrews (pr3041@dadeschools.net)

Through administrative walk-throughs, monitor the implementation of instructional leadership through school-wide data tracking.

Person Responsible TaShimba Andrews (pr3041@dadeschools.net)

By the week of November 22, a uniform data chat protocol for monthly student data chats will be developed and implemented to ensure teachers have data conversations with students and focus on setting attainable progress-monitoring goals.

Person Responsible LaGloria Diaz (mrs.diaz@dadeschools.net)

Beginning the week of December 6, schedule and execute data chats that will focus on developing goals for upcoming topic assessments, 2nd diagnostic of iReady, as well as make necessary adjustments for students in the lowest quartile. Teachers and coaches will also have data chats with the administration to progress monitor academic achievement towards school-wide goals.

Person Responsible TaShimba Andrews (pr3041@dadeschools.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

ELA proficiency was identified as an area of critical need after reviewing 3-year trend data. Students' proficiency decreased from 60% in 2018 to 49% in 2019, a difference of 11 percentage points. While students did not test in 2020, students' proficiency decreased again from 49% in 2019 to 31% in 2021, a difference of 18 percentage points. The proficiency decreased by 11 percentage points from 2018 to 2019 and more than doubled to 18 percentage points from 2019 to 2021. Similarly, learning gains overall decreased from 75% in 2018 to 21% in 2021, a difference of 54 percentage points, and learning gains for the lowest quartile decreased from 69% in 2018 to 0% in 2021, a difference of 69 percentage points. Tier I instruction and intervention planning and instructional delivery did not result in an increase in proficient students nor learning gains for struggling learners. Therefore, we will strategically develop, explicitly deliver, and systematically monitor the ELA instruction of all learners.

Measurable Outcome:

If we successfully develop, deliver, and monitor Tier 1 instruction through a variety of ELA evidenced-based strategies then our ELA Proficient students will increase performance during OPM, district topic assessments, and by a minimum of 5 percentage points as evidenced by the 2022 Florida Standards Assessments.

Monitoring:

ELA monitoring will occur through transformation coaches collaboratively planning with teachers and by 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. Administrators will conduct targeted walk-throughs that monitor the alignment of planning and execution of instructional delivery. Explicit feedback will be provided and instructional shifts in planning will occur, based on the feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

TaShimba Andrews (pr3041@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Within the targeted element of ELA, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategies of Standards-Aligned Instruction and Differentiated Instruction in literacy. Teachers will provide instruction based on the standard, concept, theme, or skill rather than "the book" or "the chapter". This will afford students the opportunity to analyze text to explore big ideas and expand their knowledge of key concepts. The goal will be to deliver lessons that provide students with a range of opportunities to gain the knowledge, skills, and abilities required by the standards. This process is to ensure that students are exposed to the depth and assessment limits of the standard. This instruction will result in improved lesson quality, instructional effectiveness, and student achievement. Standards-aligned instruction will be monitored by observation of developed instruction, product reviews, and progress monitoring performance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Using Standard-aligned Instruction and Differentiated Instruction requires teachers to plan rigorously aligned lessons that translate into a deep understanding of literacy. 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

Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning, with a focus on standards-aligned instruction and Differentiated Instruction, resulting in an explicit lesson plan that scaffolds instruction for struggling learners and provides enrichment for on-level learners.

Person Responsible Aquilah Malik (315447@dadeschools.net)

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

Person Responsible Aquilah Malik (315447@dadeschools.net)

Product reviews, bi-weekly, will be conducted in collaborative planning for the purpose of assessing the impact of the instructional delivery.

Person Responsible Gianni Ramon (gramon@dadeschools.net)

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

Person Responsible Gianni Ramon (gramon@dadeschools.net)

Beginning the week of November 8, 2021, plans will be developed that include the Gradual Release Model - (I Do, We Do, They Do, You Do) for explicit instruction of standards using the strategy "Planning with The End in Mind".

Person Responsible Gianni Ramon (gramon@dadeschools.net)

Beginning the week of November 8, 2021, during collaborative planning, develop Daily Learning Targets (DLTs) and Daily End Products (DEPs) that align to the Florida Standards in grades 3-5.

Person Responsible Aquilah Malik (315447@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.

According to the 2021-2022 District/School Disciplinary comparison data from PowerBI. As per this data, Lorah Park had 3% of students with 1 referral throughout the school year, which is exactly the same percentage of the district as a whole of student receiving one referral. Students in grades 1 and 5 accumulated the most referrals, with 6 percent in each grade accumulating 1 referral. Our primary area of concern will be in second grade as these are the students that are currently in our building. We will monitor behavior and implementation of our school wide implementation. Quarterly, the school leadership team (inclusive of the school counselor) will review accumulation of referrals in order to monitor behavior and discipline.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

Our strength at Lorah Park Elementary is building relationships with all stakeholders. In specifically, teachers, and administration at Lorah Park Elementary, strive to build positive relationships with students and parents. We truly believe a partnership is crucial in order to achieve academically and socially. As a school community, we work together to build a relationship that will benefit the whole child. We ensure clear communication and are open to discussion as it would benefit our students.

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

The stakeholders involved in promoting a positive school culture and ensuring a safe learning environment are our Assistant Principal, Ms. Gianni Ramon, and Ms. Lecia Moorer, our school counselor. All our teachers are also involved in promoting a positive school culture, but our two leaders guide the culture and promote relationship building throughout the school year.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00