

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Myrtle Grove K 8 Center



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	26

Myrtle Grove K 8 Center

3125 NW 176TH ST, Opa Locka, FL 33056

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

Demographics

Principal: Jessica Fortich M

Start Date for this Principal: 7/6/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
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: B (57%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (46%)
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	9
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	26

Myrtle Grove K 8 Center

3125 NW 176TH ST, Opa Locka, FL 33056

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	Yes	97%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	99%

School Grades History

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

At Myrtle Grove K-8 Center, we strive to provide a comprehensive educational program that will foster a love for learning and develop the skills for success in all future endeavors. An integral part of student success is the ability to seize all educational and life opportunities daily. We will reach students at an individual learning platform. In doing this, we will ensure that all students make minor and major growth in learning and achievements.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to provide a learning environment in which education is purposeful to students, faculty, and staff. Through purposeful education, we will foster a love of learning and develop skills for success, seizing all opportunities to teach and learn as they present themselves.

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
Kirnes, Apryle	Principal	Oversee all functions of the school site.
Maldonado, Emperatriz	Assistant Principal	Assist principal oversee all functions of the school site.
Donaldson, Ashley	Instructional Coach	Assist Instructional staff with the ELA, Reading, and Social Studies implementation of the curriculum in an effective way.
Martin, Gina	Math Coach	Assist Instructional staff with the Mathematics and Science implementation of the curriculum in an effective way.
Townslly, Marshonda	School Counselor	Assist with the emotional support of all students

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/6/2015, Jessica Fortich M

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

6

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

15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

21

Total number of students enrolled at the school

320

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	21	40	33	34	25	48	37	47	44	0	0	0	0	329
Attendance below 90 percent	5	14	7	10	0	12	17	19	11	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	7	3	9	15	2	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	2	15	14	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	11	9	8	17	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	12	14	8	0	0	0	0	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	7	22	30	14	23	27	30	30	0	0	0	0	183

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	0	5	7	16	16	18	14	0	0	0	0	76

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	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/16/2021

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	41	33	41	29	57	40	51	53	46	0	0	0	0	391	
Attendance below 90 percent	14	7	10	0	12	17	19	14	16	0	0	0	0	109	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	7	7	3	9	16	2	0	0	0	0	0	44	
Course failure in Math	0	1	2	15	14	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	46	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	11	9	9	19	8	0	0	0	0	56	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	12	15	10	5	0	0	0	0	51	

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	5	7	16	16	19	15	7	0	0	0	0	85

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	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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				34%	62%	57%	37%	62%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				48%	62%	58%	48%	62%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	58%	53%	46%	59%	48%
Math Achievement				59%	69%	63%	61%	69%	62%
Math Learning Gains				70%	66%	62%	67%	64%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	55%	51%	48%	55%	47%
Science Achievement				20%	55%	53%	23%	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	22%	60%	-38%	58%	-36%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	50%	64%	-14%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-22%				
05	2021					
	2019	20%	60%	-40%	56%	-36%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
06	2021					
	2019	38%	58%	-20%	54%	-16%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-20%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	28%	67%	-39%	62%	-34%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	50%	69%	-19%	64%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				
05	2021					
	2019	55%	65%	-10%	60%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
06	2021					
	2019	65%	58%	7%	55%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	14%	53%	-39%	53%	-39%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tool used to compile the data below by grade level was the AP1, AP2, and AP3 Diagnostic Assessments from i-Ready.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	20.7	10.3	27.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	20.7	10.3	27.6
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	3.4	13.8	34.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	3.4	13.8	34.5
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	2.9	21.9	16.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	3.1	22.6	16.7
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8.8	25.0	21.9
	Economically Disadvantaged	9.4	25.8	22.6
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	16.0	37.5	44.0
	Economically Disadvantaged	12.5	34.8	41.7
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4.3	12.5	23.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	4.5	13.0	25.0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	16.3	22.7	14.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	16.3	22.7	14.6
	Students With Disabilities	0	14.3	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13.6	28.6	20.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	13.6	28.6	20.5
	Students With Disabilities	14.3	42.9	16.7
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12.9	21.9	19.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	12.9	21.9	19.4
	Students With Disabilities	14.3	14.3	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9.1	21.9	42.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	9.1	21.9	42.3
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	21.0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	21.0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23.8	35.1	36.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	23.8	35.1	36.8
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	20.0	0	20.0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20.9	25.0	35.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	20.9	25.0	25.0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	6	30	39	23	48	43	23				
ELL	29			43	40						
BLK	22	33	28	44	56	49	23	58	63		
HSP	40	47		60	50						
FRL	24	34	32	45	55	50	26	60	62		
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	14	25	21	26	59	64	7				
ELL	20	42			80						
BLK	35	48	56	57	68	56	23	86	90		
HSP	32	46	36	72	83		7				
FRL	35	48	51	59	69	58	20	83	90		
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	6	31	38	20	36	45					
ELL	9	18		18	36						
BLK	37	48	50	62	69	48	23	71	100		
HSP	38	52	30	53	55						
FRL	37	48	45	61	67	48	23	64	96		

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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	443
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	41
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	42
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
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	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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 data findings:

The school to district comparison shows an increase in the Achievement gap widening from 3rd to 5th grade in both ELA and Math.

All ELA Subgroups Achievement increased except for the Black, Hispanic, and FRL subgroups by 2 percentage points, 6 percentage points and 2 percentage points.

All ELA Subgroups Learning Gains increased except for the SWE subgroup by 6 percentage points.

All ELA Subgroups Learning Gains L25 increased in all subgroups.

All Math Subgroups overall Learning Gains and Learning Gains L25 increased in all grade levels.

Science Subgroups Achievement levels increased except in the FRL subgroup by 3 percentage points.

2020-2021 data findings:

The school to district comparison shows a decrease in the Achievement gap widening from 3rd to 5th grade in both ELA and Math.

ELA Learning Gains for the lowest 25% are 32 percentage points in comparison to the District's 36 percentage points.

Math Learning Gains for the lowest 25% are 50 percentage points in comparison to the District's 29 percentage points.

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

In 2019, 14% of students in Grade 5 met proficiency levels 3-5 in the FCAT Science. We decreased by 37 percentage points from the previous year. In 2019, District results where 51% of students in Grade 5 meeting proficiency levels of 3-5 in Science. We decreased by 37 percentage points. In 2019, 41% of students in Grade 8 met proficiency levels 3-5 in the ELA FSA. In 2019, 24% of students in Grade 3 met proficiency levels 3-5 in the ELA FSA. We decreased by 26 percentage points from the previous year.

In 2021, 21% of students in Grade 5 met proficiency levels 3-5 in the FCAT Science Assessment. We increased by 7 percentage points from the previous year.

In 2020-2021, 26% of all students in grades 5 and 8 met proficiency levels 3-5 in FCAT Science.
In 2020-2021, 49% of all students in the District met proficiency levels 3-5 in FCAT Science.

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

By developing a Literacy Team that will assist teachers in planning ELA tutoring sessions and interventions, differentiated instruction will be addressed. By implementing an Intensive Acceleration (IA) class to 3rd grade students will be provided with the intervention they need.

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

In 2019, 100% of students in Algebra met proficiency levels 3-5 in the 2019 FSA. We increased by 4 percentage points from the previous year. In 2019, over 20% of students in grades 6th-7th in Mathematics made learning gains. We have increased by over 20 percentage points from the previous year.

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

We have developed a schedule for collaborative planning and instructional coaching support for teachers so that they can continue to infuse best teaching practices and ensure Algebraic Proficiency levels and by continuing to infuse best teaching practices to ensure Mathematics Proficiency levels.

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

Strategies that will be implemented in order to accelerate learning include Data-driven Instruction, Differentiated Instruction, Extended Learning Opportunities, Standards-Based Collaborative Planning, Interventions- RTI

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 (September/21), Aligning resources to small group instruction (October/21), Tackling OPM data (November/December/21), making adjustments to groups as data becomes available (2/21) and continuous data chats with individualized feedback and next steps (ongoing). Coaching cycles will also be implemented individually with teachers to support specific needs (ongoing).

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

Extended Learning opportunities will be provided with before and after school tutoring and interventions as well as Saturday Academies, Spring Break Academy, and special camps and STEM-based clubs.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the data review, our school will implement the Targeted Element of Differentiation. We selected the overarching area of Differentiation based on our findings that students are performing below grade level and not making sufficient learning gains in the L25 subgroup. In 2020-2021, ELA Learning Gains for the L25 subgroup are 32 percentage points. In 2020-2021, Mathematics Learning Gains for the L25 are 50 percentage points.
Measurable Outcome:	If we successfully implement Differentiation, then our L25 will increase by a minimum of 12 percentage points as evidenced by the 2022 State Assessments.
Monitoring:	The Leadership Team will ensure common planning is evidenced by using agendas, sign-in sheets and common planning minutes indicating the differentiated instruction best practices shared.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Apryle Kirnes (akirnes@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Within the Targeted Element of Differentiation, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of: Data-Driven Instruction. Data-Driven instruction will assist in accelerating the learning gains of our L25s as it is a systematic approach of instruction to meet the students' needs. Data-Driven instruction will be monitored through the use of data trackers to drive instructional planning and data driven conversations to include OPMS.Differentiated Instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Data-Driven Instruction will ensure that students performing below grade level close the academic learning gap and students performing above grade level be challenged to increase learning achievement. In 2020-2021, data shows that ELA Learning Gains are 34 percentage points in comparison to the District's Learning Gains of 49 percentage points.

Action Steps to Implement

8/31-10/11- Teachers will analyze data on-going to identify student learning levels and develop lesson plans accordingly for small group instruction. As a result, students will receive appropriate intervention.

Person Responsible Emperatriz Maldonado (maldonadoe@dadeschools.net)

8/31-10/11- Administration will provide planning time for teachers and coaches. As a result, teachers will develop DI groups and plan accordingly.

Person Responsible Emperatriz Maldonado (maldonadoe@dadeschools.net)

8/31-10/11- Administration will monitor the implementation of Differentiated Instruction in classrooms. As a result, consistency will be ensured in the implementation of DI.

Person Responsible Apryle Kirnes (akirnes@dadeschools.net)

8/31- 10/11- Teachers will monitor data ongoing. As a result, the implementation of the plan will be evaluated.

Person Responsible Emperatriz Maldonado (maldonadoe@dadeschools.net)

11/1-12/17-Data Chats are scheduled for November 10, 2021 and November 12, 2021 to review the results of iReady AP1. As a result, action plans will be revisited.

Person Responsible Apryle Kirnes (akirnes@dadeschools.net)

11/1-12/17- Provide the intervention each student needs based on their Tier level. As a result, students will be reached at their learning level and grow from there.

Person Responsible Emperatriz Maldonado (maldonadoe@dadeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the data review, our school will implement the Targeted Element of ELA. In 2020-2021, ELA Learning Gains for the L25 was 32 percentage points in comparison to the District's 36 percentage points. By focusing on the instructional practice of ELA, the school should increase learning gains for the L25 by 10 percentage points in the 2021-2022 assessment.

Measurable Outcome: If we successfully implement Collaborative Planning, then our proficiency levels for students in grades 3-5 will increase by a minimum of 5 percentage points as evidenced by the 2022 State Assessments.

Monitoring: The Leadership Team will ensure that collaborative planning is evidenced by the use of agendas, sign-in sheets and collaborative planning minutes indicating the differentiated instruction best practices shared.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Emperatriz Maldonado (maldonadoe@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Within the Targeted Element of Collaborative Planning, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of: Data-Driven Instruction. Data-Driven instruction will assist in achieving proficiency levels as a systematic approach of instruction to meet the students' needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Data-Driven Instruction will ensure that teachers learn from one another and collaborate on projects that will lead to improvements in standards-aligned lesson quality. As evidenced in the 2020-2021 FSA Results, the achievement levels for all students in ELA and Mathematics are at 24 and 46 percentage points.

Action Steps to Implement

8/31-10/11- Facilitate weekly collaborative planning meetings to provide ELA teachers with an opportunity to collaborate and brainstorm challenges, needs, and shared best practices. As a result, teachers will attend collaborative planning and take turns taking the lead and modeling explicit instruction during small groups.

Person Responsible Emperatriz Maldonado (maldonadoe@dadeschools.net)

8/31-10/11- All stakeholders will participate in ELA collaborative planning meetings. As a result, the process will be consistent and productive.

Person Responsible Apryle Kirnes (akirnes@dadeschools.net)

8/31- 10/11- Utilize student data from ongoing ELA assessments to develop differentiated instruction lesson plans.

Person Responsible Emperatriz Maldonado (maldonadoe@dadeschools.net)

8/31-10/11- Develop a schedule for coaches to participate in ELA collaborative meetings. As a result, all teachers will receive support from the coaches.

Person Responsible Emperatriz Maldonado (maldonadoe@dadeschools.net)

11/01-12/21- Implement a Foundational Skills Tutoring Camp for students in different grade levels. As a result, students will be able to reach reading fluency.

Person Responsible Emperatriz Maldonado (maldonadoe@dadeschools.net)

11/01- 12/21- English Language Learners (ELL) will be identified and invited to attend the ELL tutoring program. As a result, ELL students will improve their English language skills.

Person Responsible Emperatriz Maldonado (maldonadoe@dadeschools.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance**Area of Focus
Description
and
Rationale:**

Based on the data review, our school will implement the Targeted Element of Student Attendance. Through our data review, we noticed the students who struggle with daily attendance are also the students not meeting expectations for learning gains and proficiency. Attendance initiatives will be implemented for both teachers and students. In order to Implement strategic attendance initiatives, close monitoring will need to take place. Accountable conversations will be scheduled for both teachers and parents. Support staff will be available to students for emotional and physical concern. Daily Shout outs will take place for teachers and parents regarding attendance.

Measurable Outcome:

If we successfully implement the Targeted Element of Student Attendance, our students will receive quality instruction that will contribute to improved student outcomes. With consistent student incentives, our attendance will increase 4 percentage points by June 2022.

Monitoring:

The Leadership Team will identify an increase in the student daily attendance rate that demonstrates this implementation step is successful as evidenced by the attendance bulletin.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Emperatriz Maldonado (maldonadoe@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Within the Targeted Element of Student Attendance, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of: Attendance Initiatives. Attendance Initiatives will assist in narrowing the absence gap amongst our students. Student absences will be monitored on a weekly basis to prevent a pattern of excessive absences and to promote good student attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

As evidenced in the EWS report, students with the lowest academic achievement have truancy documentation.

Action Steps to Implement

8/31-10/11-Establish an attendance committee that will meet monthly. As a result attendance policies, procedures and incentives initiatives will be monitored.

Person Responsible

Apryle Kirnes (akirnes@dadeschools.net)

8/31-10/11-Develop incentives programs for students to be recognized for good attendance. As a result, students will develop good attendance habits.

Person Responsible

Emperatriz Maldonado (maldonadoe@dadeschools.net)

8/31-10/11- Recognize students and staff members that have good attendance. As a result, students and staff members will strive to be recognized for their attendance efforts.

Person Responsible

Apryle Kirnes (akirnes@dadeschools.net)

8/31-10/11- Monitor the truancy referral process to ensure compliance. As a result, all efforts will be made to decrease the amount of referrals.

Person Responsible

Apryle Kirnes (akirnes@dadeschools.net)

11/1- 12/21 - Administrators and Counselors will start submitting iAttend information to the Attendance Department at the District. As a result, parents will be scheduled to meet with school staff regarding student absences.

Person Responsible Emperatriz Maldonado (maldonadoe@dadeschools.net)

11/1-12/21 - The Leadership Team will hold student assemblies for grades 3 through 8 to provide student attendance information. As a result, students will be aware of the differences between excused and unexcused and the importance of school attendance.

Person Responsible Emperatriz Maldonado (maldonadoe@dadeschools.net)

#4. Leadership specifically relating to Walkthroughs

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on qualitative data from the School Climate survey and the SIP survey and review of the Core Leadership Competencies, we want to use the Targeted Element of Walkthroughs. Teachers have expressed that immediate reflective feedback will enable them to enhance their instructional delivery.

Measurable Outcome: If we successfully implement the Targeted Element of Walkthroughs, our teachers will be provided the information needed to enhance their instructional skills. Professional growth conversations will take place consistently. The percentage of teachers receiving Highly Effective Ratings will increase by at least a 2% during the 2021-2022 school year.

Monitoring: Administration will monitor teacher walkthrough logs and meeting agendas to ensure communication is taking place among all stakeholders.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Apryle Kirnes (akirnes@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Within the Targeted Element of Walkthroughs, we will focus on the evidence-based strategy of: Providing teachers with reflective feedback. By providing teachers with information that will help them enhance best practices, we hope to increase the amount of teachers receive highly qualified ratings.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Involving Staff will assist by providing frequent feedback to teachers towards recognizing their weaknesses and strengths, and helping teachers learn how to work with these characteristics.

Action Steps to Implement

8/31-10/11- Administration will conduct weekly walkthroughs. As a result, teachers will be provided with immediate reflective feedback for teachers to utilize in their instructional practices.

Person Responsible Apryle Kirnes (akirnes@dadeschools.net)

8/31-10/11- Administration will provide teacher with timely feedback. As a result, teachers are able to make any needed adjustments after a walkthrough.

Person Responsible Apryle Kirnes (akirnes@dadeschools.net)

8/31-10/11- Administration will provide professional development opportunities. As a result, instructional staff may enhance their instructional planning and delivering skills.

Person Responsible Emperatriz Maldonado (maldonadoe@dadeschools.net)

8/31-10/11- Administration will provide instructional coaching support to all instructional staff. As a result, teachers will have an additional resource.

Person Responsible Emperatriz Maldonado (maldonadoe@dadeschools.net)

11/1-12/21- Administrators will have all teachers develop strategies to communicate the daily learning objective to their students. As a result, students will be able to be more accountable for their learning.

Person Responsible Apryle Kirnes (akirnes@dadeschools.net)

11/1-12/21- Administration will review specific IPEGS standards to provide information. As a result, teachers will be clear on what is expected to achieve specific ratings.

Person Responsible Emperatriz Maldonado (maldonadoe@dadeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

The primary area of concern is based on the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org. Myrtle Grove K-8 Center ranks 932 in comparison to the state 1,395 in violent incidents such as physical attacks and fighting. This area will be monitored through student referrals and mental health reports.

The secondary area of concern is Public Order Incidents. Myrtle Grove K-8 Center ranks 1,270 in comparison to the state 1,395 of trespassing incidents. This area will be monitored through school cameras and school resource officer.

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.

Myrtle Grove K-8 Center has a strong school culture in Relationships, Physical & Emotional Safety and Support. We continue to build our skill-set in ensuring our classrooms are highly engaging and foster the highest level of engagement and learning. Staff are provided opportunities to take part in Team-Building activities and social activities where we come together to share celebrations of success during informal meetings. We provide opportunities for both staff and students to provide ongoing feedback and suggestions to school leaders and we schedule informal conferences with staff and students to garner information about their educational/professional experience at our school.

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

The stakeholders involved in building a positive school culture and environment are the Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coaches, Teacher Leaders and Counselors (our School Leadership Team). The Principal's role is to monitor and oversee all the school's initiatives and respond to concerns with morale by planning Team-building and morale boosting activities. The Assistant Principals will monitor the mentorship programs and assist in ensuring all information is shared with stakeholders in a timely manner. Teacher leaders and instructional coaches assist in providing and responding to feedback from stakeholders. All stakeholders are responsible for making specific efforts to connect and build relationships with students, parents, and families.

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: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Walkthroughs	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00