

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# North Miami Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>26</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# North Miami Elementary School

655 NE 145TH ST, North Miami, FL 33161

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Solomon Homidas**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/21/2018

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2020-21 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%  |
| <b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (51%)<br>2017-18: B (55%)<br>2016-17: C (51%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   |   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |   |

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

# North Miami Elementary School

655 NE 145TH ST, North Miami, FL 33161

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

## School Demographics

|   |                               |   |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File) | <b>2020-21 Title I School</b> | <b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                               | Yes                           | 91%   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)          | <b>Charter School</b>         | <b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                                  | No                            | 97%   |

## School Grades History

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

## 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 mission of North Miami Elementary School is to improve academic skills, develop social maturity, and promote emotional growth of our Pre-K through fifth grade students. We, the parents, staff, and community promote the development of respect for self and others in a multicultural community. We accept the responsibility to provide a safe environment and to help our students develop skills necessary to become resourceful and productive citizens in our ever-changing world.

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

The vision at North Miami Elementary School is to prepare and stimulate our students for a rapidly shifting world by implanting in them critical thinking skills, a global perspective, and a respect for core values of honesty, loyalty, determination, and compassion. Students will have success for today and be prepared for tomorrow.

### 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   |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| Darbonne, Deborah  | Principal                   | Provide strategic direction in the school system, monitor the use of standardized curricula, assess teaching methods, monitor student achievement, encourage parent involvement, revise policies and procedures, administer the budget, hire and evaluate staff and oversee facilities.   |
| Navarro, Christine | Assistant Principal         | Assist the school principal in overall administration of instructional program and campus level operations. Coordinate assigned student activities and services.  |
|                    | Assistant Principal         | Deal with the issues of school management, student activities and services, community relations, personnel, and curriculum instruction. They coordinate with principals and staff members and parents to assist in defining and enforcing school policies and guidelines for students, staff, and faculty.  |
| Alberto, Angeline  | Curriculum Resource Teacher | Provide proactive outreach and academic coaching for teachers to help them address their individual learning needs in order to increase achievement and persistence, and work teachers collaboratively in the planning of intentional academic pathways.  |
| Telfort, Gislaine  | Teacher, K-12               | Prepare classroom for class activities. Provide a variety of learning materials and resources for use in educational activities. Observe, motivate, and evaluate student's performance and development. Assign and grade class work, homework, tests and assignments.   |
| Pierre, Yvianne    | Teacher, K-12               | Prepare classroom for class activities. Provide a variety of learning materials and resources for use in educational activities. Observe, motivate, and evaluate student's performance and development. Assign and grade class work, homework, tests and assignments.   |
| Morris, Giovanni   | School Counselor            | Assist individual student academic planning and goal setting, school counseling classroom lessons based on student success standards, provide short-term counseling to students, create referrals for long-term support, collaborate with families/teachers/ administrators/community for student success, advocate for students at individual education plan, conduct meetings and other student-focused meetings, participate in data analysis to identify student issues, needs and challenges, act as a systems change agent to improve equity and access, achievement and opportunities for all students |

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Tuesday 8/21/2018, Solomon Homidas

**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.*

9

**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.*

23

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

19

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

420

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

1

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

1

**Demographic Data**

**Early Warning Systems**

**2021-22**

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

| Indicator  | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |     |
|--|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-----|
|  | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12  |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 13          | 59 | 95 | 70 | 28 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 350 |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 3           | 19 | 33 | 31 | 6  | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 120 |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     |     |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0  | 25 | 13 | 0  | 9  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 47  |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0  | 21 | 10 | 0  | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 55  |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 8   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 5   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 24 | 60 | 41 | 7  | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 171 |
|  | 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 | 22 | 14 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 58 |



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

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

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

Wednesday 7/21/2021

**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                   | 70          | 108 | 77 | 83 | 91 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 515   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                   | 20          | 33  | 32 | 17 | 29 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 157   |
| One or more suspensions                       | 0           | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                         | 0           | 25  | 13 | 6  | 9  | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 79    |
| Course failure in Math                        | 0           | 21  | 10 | 6  | 24 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 93    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment  | 0           | 0   | 0  | 0  | 8  | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0           | 0   | 0  | 0  | 5  | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 18    |

**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           | 22 | 14 | 5 | 22 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 95    |

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

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 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             |        |          |       | 47%    | 62%      | 57%   | 51%    | 62%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 52%    | 62%      | 58%   | 57%    | 62%      | 55%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 45%    | 58%      | 53%   | 60%    | 59%      | 48%   |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 60%    | 69%      | 63%   | 64%    | 69%      | 62%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 63%    | 66%      | 62%   | 61%    | 64%      | 59%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 55%    | 55%      | 51%   | 48%    | 55%      | 47%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 38%    | 55%      | 53%   | 47%    | 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 | 41%    | 60%      | -19%                       | 58%   | -17%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 52%    | 64%      | -12%                       | 58%   | -6%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -41%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 37%    | 60%      | -23%                       | 56%   | -19%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -52%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 57%    | 67%      | -10%                       | 62%   | -5%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 58%    | 69%      | -11%                       | 64%   | -6%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -57%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 48%    | 65%      | -17%                       | 60%   | -12%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -58%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 34%    | 53%      | -19%                       | 53%   | -19%                    |
| 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 Diagnostic Data

| Grade 1               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 39.1 | 28.2   | 31.4   |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 38.5 | 27.3   | 33.8   |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 50   | 50     | 20     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0    | 20     | 20     |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 34.7 | 17.1   | 26.1   |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 36.4 | 18.5   | 26.6   |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 41.2 | 18.2   | 10.0   |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 60   | 20     | 40     |
| Grade 2               |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 18.2 | 29.4   | 40.8   |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 18.9 | 30.6   | 40.4   |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 18.8 | 25     | 41.7   |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0    | 0      | 0      |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 20   | 24.1   | 34.7   |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 20.8 | 25.0   | 34     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 25   | 13.3   | 50     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0    | 0      | 0      |

| Grade 3               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 25.4 | 40.7   | 48.2   |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 25.4 | 40.7   | 48.2   |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 16.7 | 20     | 33.3   |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0    | 0      | 0      |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 11.7 | 16.9   | 31.6   |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 11.7 | 16.9   | 31.6   |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 91.1 | 10     | 20     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0    | 0      | 0      |

| Grade 4               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 28.2 | 27.9   | 37.9   |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 29.4 | 29.8   | 40.7   |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 11.8 | 0      | 0      |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0    | 0      | 0      |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 14.1 | 45.2   | 52.4   |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 14.7 | 46.6   | 52.5   |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 6.7  | 28.6   | 42.9   |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0    | 0      | 0      |

| Grade 5               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 31.7 | 35     | 43.9   |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 32.3 | 33.9   | 42.9   |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 16.7 | 37.5   | 50     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0    | 0      | 0      |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 23.4 | 35     | 50     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 23.8 | 33.9   | 49.2   |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 15.4 | 37.5   | 57.1   |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0    | 0      | 0      |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science               | All Students               | 0    | 13     | 0      |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 0    | 13     | 0      |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 0    | 14     | 0      |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0    | 0      | 0      |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |

**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                                       | 55       | 56     |             | 57        | 19      |              | 57       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 35       | 35     | 40          | 36        | 35      | 36           | 19       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 35       | 32     | 47          | 37        | 25      | 28           | 24       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 50       | 40     |             | 45        | 30      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 38       | 34     | 44          | 39        | 28      | 26           | 28       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 8        |        |             | 23        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 45       | 47     | 43          | 58        | 70      | 61           | 28       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 45       | 49     | 43          | 58        | 61      | 57           | 34       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 60       | 90     |             | 75        | 80      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 47       | 52     | 45          | 59        | 62      | 55           | 37       |         |           |                   |                     |

| 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                                       | 8        |        |             | 33        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 38       | 45     | 54          | 54        | 58      | 50           | 25       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 52       | 58     | 58          | 62        | 59      | 47           | 52       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 53       | 43     |             | 83        | 73      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 51       | 57     | 60          | 64        | 61      | 48           | 47       |         |           |                   |                     |

### 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  | 36  |
| 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 | 49  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 286 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8   |
| Percent Tested  | 96% |
| Subgroup Data   |     |
| Students With Disabilities  |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 48  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       |     |
| English Language Learners   |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 36  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%        |     |
| Native American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Native American Students  |     |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%         |     |

| <b>Asian Students</b>  |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Asian Students   |     |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                      |     |
| <b>Black/African American Students</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                    | 35  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?            | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%     |     |
| <b>Hispanic Students</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 41  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%                   |     |
| <b>Multiracial Students</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   |     |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                       | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%                |     |
| <b>Pacific Islander Students</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                  | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%           |     |
| <b>White Students</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   |     |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      |     |
| <b>Economically Disadvantaged Students</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 36  |
| 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?**

2021 Data Findings:

Our ELA proficiency levels decreased by 9 percentage points when comparing the data from the 2020-2021 FSA ELA Assessment with the assessment in 2019. In 2020-2021 our ELA FSA proficiency was at 38%, while in 2019, our ELA proficiency was at 47%. A trend we noted was that our 3rd and our 4th grade students decreased in ELA proficiency on the 2020-2021 FSA Assessment. In 3rd grade, students decreased in proficiency by on the ELA FSA by 12 percentage points, decreasing from 39% on the 2019 FSA Assessment to 27% on the 2020-2021 ELA FSA Assessment. In 4th grade, students decreased in proficiency by on the ELA FSA by 15 percentage points, decreasing from 38% on the 2019 FSA Assessment to 23% on the 2020-2021 ELA FSA Assessment.

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

2021 Data Findings:

The greatest need for improvement is in 3rd and 4th grade ELA Proficiency.

**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 Data Findings:

Attendance was a large concern. 50% of our students have missed 11 or more days of school in the 2019-2020 school year, while 41% missed 11 or more days in the 2018-2019 school year. School taking place at home caused students to have many distractions. Unreliable data due to students testing at home in many cases. Having students attend physically would ensure that we could control the environmental distractions and resolve attendance issues. We will use attendance reports to assist us with contacting parents once students have 3 absences. Also, having students test in the building will assist us with having reliable data.

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

2019 Data Findings:

At this time we did not see the improvement we planned for. The area that declined the least was ELA in 5th Grade. ELA declined 14 percentage points when compared to the 2018-2019 of the students taking the FSA.

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

2019 Data Findings:

Teachers were already familiar with the curriculum. The curriculum was easy to pivot into the virtual school environment.

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

Differentiated instruction will be our focus. We will need to group our students based on their reading levels, and continuously stretch students to the next level up in D.I. Teachers will need a simple plan to follow so that they may concentrate on the implementation, due to the high number of students who scored below grade level.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

The PLST will develop whole group sessions and job-embedded sessions on using data to drive instruction. PD will be provided to teachers on how to use the new series and intervention program, how to respond quickly to data, and how to adjust instruction based on the latest data points we have.

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

The MTSS team will monitor ongoing progress monitoring to determine which classes, teachers, interventionists, and/or students who are not making progress as expected. The team will discuss our next steps during our MTSS meetings and the academic coaches will address and discuss during collaborative planning time.

### **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

#### **Areas of Focus:**

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our 2020-2021 proficiency levels were much lower than we expected. In ELA our students scored 38% on the 2020-2021 FSA, while 47% of our students scored levels 3-5 on the 2018-2019 FSA in ELA. Because 62% of our students in 3rd - 5th grades and 53% of our Kindergarten - 2nd grade students are below grade level in reading, we decided that Differentiated Instruction in ELA will be our primary Area of Focus.

**Measurable Outcome:** Our school plans to have 60% of our students in Kindergarten - 5th grades make a minimum of one year's worth of growth on the i-Ready AP1 Diagnostic to the i-Ready AP3 Diagnostic in the 2021-2022 school year in ELA. This goal would show that Differentiated Instruction in ELA was successful at our school.

**Monitoring:** This area of focus will be monitored using the results of each i-Ready Diagnostic assessment. By the 2nd i-Ready Diagnostic Assessment, 40% of our students will have reached their growth target. This will be monitored by the MTSS Team.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Christine Navarro (christinenavarro@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The school will use Collaborative Data Chats to ensure this Area of Focus is implemented with fidelity and monitored consistently.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** During Collaborative Data Chats, teachers, support staff, and administration will analyze student performance data and determine how this data will be used to drive future instruction. Together, we will discuss activities and strategies teachers used to remediate and/or enrich students on the assessed standards. Students who are in the Rtl process or who are identified as fragile will also be discussed. We will also use these data chats to discuss teacher needs as it relates to additional assistance needed in the classroom, and in what ways both administration and support staff can assist teachers with those needs.

**Action Steps to Implement**

8/30 - Create a schedule to conduct the i-Ready AP1 Diagnostic Assessment.

**Person Responsible** Angeline Alberto (aalberto@dadeschools.net)

9/13 - 9/24 - Conduct the i-Ready AP1 Diagnostic Assessment

**Person Responsible** Angeline Alberto (aalberto@dadeschools.net)

9/20 - 9/30 - Conduct collaborative data chats during planning time to identify student levels and possible differentiated instructional groups

**Person Responsible** Christine Navarro (christinenavarro@dadeschools.net)

9/20 - 9/30 - Identify suitable resources to use in differentiated instruction that will address the needs of each instructional group.

**Person Responsible** Christine Navarro (christinenavarro@dadeschools.net)

11/1-11/15 - Teachers will create a D.I. TLC binder that will contain student data, student trackers, teacher lesson plans for D.I., and resources to be used in the Teacher Learning Center (TLC) to serve as a planning and data center that will drive the decisions and shift the actions made at the TLC.

**Person Responsible** Christine Navarro (christinenavarro@dadeschools.net)

11/1 - 12/21 - The SLT will pull i-Ready reports weekly to meet, discuss, and identify next steps. The team will specifically look for usage and pass rates. We will share the findings during collaborative planning in both math and reading and have the teachers collaborate to determine the next steps for their students as well.

**Person Responsible** Angeline Alberto (aalberto@dadeschools.net)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Developing a Growth Mindset was selected as one of our Areas of Focus due to the low number of students who achieved one year's worth of growth on the AP3 i-Ready Diagnostic Assessment. 31% of our primary students (grades K-2) and 49% of our intermediate students (grade 3-5) reached their growth target in ELA on this assessment. In addition, 26% of our primary students and 40% of our intermediate students reached their growth target in math on the AP3 i-Ready Diagnostic Assessment. We believe if students and teachers understand how growth leads to success, and make growth a priority, students will achieve a minimum of one year's worth of growth.

**Measurable Outcome:** Our goal is to have 60% of our students reach their growth targets in both AP3 ELA and Math on the i-Ready Diagnostic Assessment.

**Monitoring:** This area of focus will be monitored using the results of each i-Ready Diagnostic assessment. By the 2nd i-Ready Diagnostic Assessment, 40% of our students will have reached their growth target.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Christine Navarro (christinenavarro@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** We will incorporate the evidenced-based strategy of Job-Embedded Professional Development. Job-Embedded Professional Development (JEPD) refers to teacher learning that is grounded in day-to-day teaching practice and is designed to enhance teachers' content-specific instructional practices with the intent of improving student learning. It is primarily school or classroom based and is integrated into the workday, consisting of teachers assessing and finding solutions for authentic and immediate problems of practice as part of a cycle of continuous improvement.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Job-Embedded Professional Development allows teachers to link learning to the immediate and real-life problems teachers and administrators face in the classroom. By incorporating this strategy in our collaborative planning times, our data chats, and faculty meetings, teachers and administrators will be able to discuss, provide feedback to each other, and respond to the challenges currently being faced by individual students as well as classes and how we will use growth mindset strategies to face and/or overcome those challenges.

**Action Steps to Implement**

8/30 - Provide an introductory PD to all faculty.

**Person Responsible** Deborah Darbonne (pr3941@dadeschools.net)

8/30 - Incorporate a Growth Mindset Workshop by The Chosen Path for all faculty.

**Person Responsible** Deborah Darbonne (pr3941@dadeschools.net)

9/5, and 9/21 - Present the Growth Mindset Action Plans created by the Growth Mindset Book Study Team to all of the faculty.

**Person Responsible** Deborah Darbonne (pr3941@dadeschools.net)

9/20 - 9/30 -Incorporate the Growth Mindset Goal-Setting Rubric into our data chats.

**Person Responsible** Christine Navarro (christinenavarro@dadeschools.net)

11/1 - 11/15 - Our Book Study team will create Growth Mindset Focus Calendars for the entire school year that will address lessons to teach, activities, and assembly topics.

**Person Responsible** Deborah Darbonne (pr3941@dadeschools.net)

11/1 - 12/21 - Book Study Teams will identify lessons and activities to distribute/teach to parents, students, and teachers based on each month's Growth Mindset Focus.

**Person Responsible** Christine Navarro (christinenavarro@dadeschools.net)

**#3. Leadership specifically relating to Teacher Recruitment and Retention**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** On our School Climate Survey 50% of the 40 respondents stated "All of the time" on this question "Following a professional development opportunity, I am provided with support/resources to implement the newly learned strategy." We would like more teachers to feel empowered to incorporate the newly learned strategy and speak up about any support and/or resources they may need in order to do so effectively.

**Measurable Outcome:** We would like to see 70% of our teachers respond positively to this same question on the 2021-2022 School Climate Survey.

**Monitoring:** During administrative walk-throughs, we will see tangible evidence regarding any PDs on our Areas of Focus, such as data trackers, individual student goal setting, posters with the strategy, and mini-lessons provided by the counselor. During collaborative planning, we will help teachers identify goals and celebrate those they have achieved. We will use our i-Ready Diagnostic growth data to determine if the teachers' practice has been more supported and thus, more effective in their implementation.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Christine Navarro (christinenavarro@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The evidenced-based strategy, Make Meetings Matter and Shared Leadership will be our focus. Making Meetings Matter involves ensuring the time is managed properly and used effectively. The purpose is to guarantee that meetings are effective (the time should be used for the exchange of information, problem solving, and reviewing progress). ensures that the learners have a clear understanding of the learning goal/target and a clear focus of what they will be able to accomplish or produce as a result of the lesson. Teachers invested in learning goals, both short term and long term, are more invested in learning outcomes. We will ensure that each PD presented at our school states a goal for the training as well as how to implement the strategy, what resources will be needed and who the "go to" person will be for additional support.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Our specific strategy is Shared Leadership. On our School Climate Survey 50% of the 40 respondents stated "All of the time" on this question "Following a professional development opportunity, I am provided with support/resources to implement the newly learned strategy." 50% of our teachers did not feel supported or had the resources to implement a newly learned strategy. Shared Leadership involves systems designed to develop leadership capacity among all members of the school community. All stakeholders will work together to create an engaging school climate that fosters student learning where best practices and professional development is shared and supported. This all starts by Making Meetings Matter and Shared Leadership with respecting everyone's time.

**Action Steps to Implement**

9/1 - 9/5 - Create a focused sample template to be used for in-house PDs that includes goal statement.

**Person Responsible** Christine Navarro (christinenavarro@dadeschools.net)

9/7 - Ongoing - After each in-house PD or meeting, review the goals stated at collaborative planning.

**Person Responsible** Angeline Alberto (aalberto@dadeschools.net)

9/7 - Ongoing - "Train the Trainer" Model - Have faculty share what they learned from a PD or meeting during collaborative planning and/or a faculty meeting.

**Person Responsible** Christine Navarro (christinenavarro@dadeschools.net)

9/7 - Ongoing - During a collaborative planning, have teachers share how they incorporated the newly learned strategy and/or share a student product of it. We will monitor the use of this PD through data after each assessment.

**Person Responsible** Christine Navarro (christinenavarro@dadeschools.net)

11/1 - 11/15 - Use the School's Assessment Goal tracker at the beginning of each collaborative planning strategy. Teachers will determine if the past week's strategies were successful, using the assessment scores and their class's goal and proficiency levels.

**Person Responsible** Christine Navarro (christinenavarro@dadeschools.net)

11/1 - 11/29 - Introduce and distribute "GOAL: Set & Met!" Bells at a faculty meeting. Ask teachers to work together to come up with how we will use the bells in the classroom to recognize students and classes, across the school, and to inform parents that students have met their goals.

**Person Responsible** Christine Navarro (christinenavarro@dadeschools.net)



**#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Although, only 26 respondents answered this question, 61% of our staff responded from neutral to strongly disagree to the statement, "Staff morale is high at our school." on the 2021-2022 School Climate Survey.

**Measurable Outcome:** We would like to see at least 50% of our staff believe staff morale is high at our school on the 2021-2022 School Climate Survey.

**Monitoring:** We will see an increase in engagement of our school-based committees and clubs. Last year, we had minimal participation from our staff. If our committees and newly formed club make an impact, people will feel more engaged in our school and morale will be higher.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Christine Navarro (christinenavarro@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Clubs and Extracurricular Programming are offerings aligned with the needs of students and staff that can help increase all stakeholders' valuing of school. Flexible scheduling and grouping strategies can help create space during the school day.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** If teachers and staff are more engaged in creating experiences for other teachers, staff, and students they will visibly see the effects of their involvement. This will positively affect the people in the committee as well as those who took part in the event or activity.

**Action Steps to Implement**

8/30 - Conduct a PD on School Climate and Shared Leadership

**Person Responsible** Christine Navarro (christinenavarro@dadeschools.net)

9/1 - 9/10 -Tie in the PD on School Climate and Shared Leadership to the Survey for School Committees.

**Person Responsible** Christine Navarro (christinenavarro@dadeschools.net)

9/6 - 9/20 - Use the feedback from the PD on School Climate and Shared Leadership to create posters to be placed in the teacher's lounge of the school.

**Person Responsible** Christine Navarro (christinenavarro@dadeschools.net)

9/21 - Share the feedback from the PD on School Climate and Shared Leadership at a faculty meeting and use as a springboard for future PD.

**Person Responsible** Christine Navarro (christinenavarro@dadeschools.net)

11/1 - 11/21 - Present the ideas generated from the Opening of Schools PD at a faculty meeting. Teachers will work together together to read the ideas generated and create a list of ways we can incorporates the shared leadership approach.

**Person Responsible** Christine Navarro (christinenavarro@dadeschools.net)

11/21 - 12/21 - Add the Shared Leadership events/activities to the Master Calendar to begin to implement.

**Person Responsible** Christine Navarro (christinenavarro@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.

**Our discipline data shows that we have a high property incident rate. This was due to a computer being stolen from an employee's car. We will track, and monitor our property quarterly.**

### 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 school is effective at managing our team. Our school shares information: agendas, time constraints and work tasks. We consistently share messages from the district. We provide clarity about unclear goals, roles, and directions.

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

We have three main groups that include all or most of our stakeholders.

\* EESAC - Principal, Dr. Deborah Darbonne; Assistant Principal, Christine Navarro; G. Morris, EESAC; Various Teachers; Ms. Chelsea Gomez, Parent; Student Representative This team communicates our Areas of Focus consistently, garners feedback from each person, and incorporates ideas into our implementation steps.

\* PLST -Christine Navarro, Assistant Principal; Yvianne Pierre, Teacher; Gislaine Telfort, Teacher; Angeline Alberto, Academic Coach. We work together to turnkey development and study effects of these PDs. This will empower our teachers to take a leadership role and also build relationships.

\* School Leadership Team - Principal, Dr. Deborah Darbonne; Assistant Principal, Christine Navarro; G. Morris, EESAC; Yvianne Pierre, Teacher; Gislaine Telfort, Teacher; Angeline Alberto, Academic Coach. We strategize to ensure that we are consistent with building relationships, that all stakeholders develop a Growth Mindset.