

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Golden Glades Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	27
Budget to Support Goals	28

Golden Glades Elementary School

16520 NW 28TH AVE, Opa Locka, FL 33054

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

Demographics

Principal: Jeff Rateau

Start Date for this Principal: 7/19/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: C (52%) 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	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	28

Golden Glades Elementary School

16520 NW 28TH AVE, Opa Locka, FL 33054

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	96%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	100%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to provide an environment where all students can learn, achieve, and develop confidence to meet the challenges of a changing and complex society. It is our goal to prepare students to succeed in a global society by providing a personalized and rigorous curriculum through excellence in teaching.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Golden Glades Elementary is dedicated to providing a rigorous educational experience to a diverse community where all students are expected to succeed as innovative thinkers. Our vision, as a community, is to cultivate character and foster life-long learning through a challenging educational experience in a safe environment.

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
Rateau, Jeff	Principal	The Principal oversees the day to day Operation of the school and monitor curriculum and instruction.
	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal assist the principal with the day to day operations of the school, as well as oversees curriculum and instruction.
Braye, Lisa	Math Coach	The Math Coach serves as instructional Support for classroom teachers. She is tasked with assisting teachers with planning lessons, modeling, conducting trainings centered around curriculum, and using data to drive teachers' instruction.
Cherelus, Theodora	Reading Coach	The Literacy Coach serves as instructional Support for classroom teachers in the area of English Language Arts in the intermediate grades. She is tasked with assisting teachers with planning lessons, modeling, conducting trainings centered around ELA curriculum, and using data to drive teachers' instruction.
Jackson, LaVenia	Reading Coach	The Literacy Coach serves as instructional Support for classroom teachers in the area of English Language Arts in the primary grades. She is tasked with assisting teachers with planning lessons, modeling, conducting trainings centered around ELA curriculum, and using data to drive teachers' instruction.
Elliott, Vivienne	Science Coach	This individual serves as the Science Instructional Liaison to Teachers. She is only tasked with pushing out and turnkeying pertinent information regarding Science.
Glass, Akim	Teacher, ESE	This individual is our SPED Facilitator and is tasked with making sure we are in compliance and provide the best possible services to our SPED population. Additionally, She oversees all SPED and Gifted Cases.
Hagans-Watkins, Shirley	Teacher, PreK	This Educator serves as our VPK liaison. She is tasked with turnkeying information relating to our Voluntary Pre- Kindergarten program.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/19/2018, Jeff Rateau

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.*

1

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

14

Total number of students enrolled at the school

143

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.

3

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	12	34	27	25	21	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145
Attendance below 90 percent	3	15	12	9	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	2	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	4	13	12	4	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	2	2	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/30/2021

2020-21 - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Number of students enrolled		
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

2020-21 - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	38	29	27	27	28	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	178
Attendance below 90 percent	18	12	9	12	13	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	2	0	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	2	1	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	1	4	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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

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				45%	62%	57%	39%	62%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				43%	62%	58%	61%	62%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	58%	53%	88%	59%	48%
Math Achievement				65%	69%	63%	53%	69%	62%
Math Learning Gains				77%	66%	62%	53%	64%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				76%	55%	51%	38%	55%	47%
Science Achievement				44%	55%	53%	34%	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	49%	60%	-11%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	50%	64%	-14%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2021					
	2019	19%	60%	-41%	56%	-37%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	59%	67%	-8%	62%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	69%	69%	0%	64%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	65%	-13%	60%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

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

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tool used to compile the below data, was 2019-2020 i-ready AP3 Data.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15.4	19.2	50.0
	Economically Disadvantaged	15.4	19.2	50.0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30.8	15.4	57.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	30.8	15.4	57.7
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	27.3	40.9	57.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	27.3	40.9	57.1
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13.6	27.3	66.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	13.6	27.3	66.7
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	33.3	45.8	75.0
	Economically Disadvantaged	33.3	45.8	75.0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4.2	16.7	58.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	4.2	16.7	58.3
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	17.4	8.3	20.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	17.4	8.3	20.8
	Students With Disabilities	11.1	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4.2	4.2	29.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	4.2	4.2	29.2
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	10.0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30.8	30.8	38.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	28.0	28.0	36.0
	Students With Disabilities	11.1	11.1	11.1
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	26.9	26.9	46.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	24.0	24.0	44.0
	Students With Disabilities	22.2	11.1	33.3
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	0	26.0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	28.0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	11.0	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	23	62		14	23						
BLK	38	67		37	25		36				
FRL	37	62		36	27		36				
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	30	22		35	56						
BLK	44	42	40	64	79	76	41				
FRL	45	43	40	65	77	76	44				
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	18	67	92	16	35	36					
BLK	37	60	87	52	50	33	34				
FRL	39	60	88	52	54	38	34				

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	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	201
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	41
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	40
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?

According to the 2019 FSA State Assessment, the Leadership Team identified the overall proficiency in Reading at 45%, 65% in Math and 44% proficiency in Science as compared to 2020-2021 FSA State Assessment where Reading proficiency was 38%, a 7 percentage point decrease, Math proficiency was 36%, a 29 percentage point decrease and Science proficiency at 38%, a 6 percentage point decrease. This Leadership Team has identified a downward trend across all core content areas.

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

After analyzing the results of the 2019 FSA State Assessment data, the greatest need for improvement is ELA as evidenced by 45% of students in grades 3-5 in ELA were proficient as compared to 38% proficient on the FSA ELA in 2020-2021. Our current 5th grade students were only 32% proficient in ELA as evidenced by AP3 data. Additionally, this grade level houses the greatest number in our lowest quartile.

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

Some contributing factors that lead to the need for improvement were the need for in depth core instruction, reconstructing Differentiated lessons that addresses individualized needs of learners, and student attendance (tardies and early pick ups). As a result of these contributing factors, low Bi-weekly and OPM test scores were evident.

The new actions that would need to be taken in order to address this need for improvement is focusing on Tier I instruction by strengthening core instruction delivery; Ongoing Progress Monitoring; Modeling the course material; RTI; scaffolding instruction; completing Differentiation Instruction with fidelity; use of planning cards and question stems; item specs/infographics

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

According to 2019 state assessment, the most improvement shown was in the area of Math as evidenced by 65% of 3rd- 5th grade students showing proficient. Additionally, There was a percentage increase across all grade levels in Math from AP1 to AP3 in 2020.

AP1 AP3 % Increase

K - 17% 84% 67%

1st - 17% 69% 52%

2nd - 19% 74% 55%

3rd - 0% 36% 36%
 4th - 30% 44% 14%
 5th - 29% 60% 31%

Overall Proficiency by Tier

T-1 / 60%

T-2 / 28%

T-3 / 12%

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

The contributing factors to this improvement was implementing Common planning sessions with fidelity, intentional coaching support, weekly incentives, consistent monitoring of instruction and data, an incentive store (The Eagle Mart) was opened so that students can utilize their "Eagle Bucks" earned throughout the weeks and Administration consistently sending comparative data to teachers via email.

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

In order to accelerate learning, closely monitoring L25 students, re-igniting the mentoring of L25 students by the Leadership Team, monitoring and tracking data with fidelity; increasing rigor in instruction, increasing student engagement and enrichment strategies, provide more opportunities for project based learning, and increase the level of complexity in questioning for Tier 2 (bubble students).

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.

A clear focus will be on Data. Using Data to drive what happens in our school and in the classrooms. Additionally, offering Professional Development that focuses on the Response To Intervention(RTI) process and procedures, implementing strategies to meet the needs of ESE/ELL students, implementing effective reading/writing strategies, integrating technology into the classroom with the hierarchy of SAMR and addressing different learning styles.

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

Additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond would be that of Ongoing Professional Development and trainings, collaborative planning, and completing OPMs with fidelity. Moreover, extended learning opportunities will be offered to students in 3rd- 5th grade; before school and on Saturdays.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the Data review, our school will implement standards-aligned instruction as a need for review. We selected this area of focus based on our findings that demonstrated 38% proficiency in ELA for grades 3-5 on the 2021 FSA. We compared the current 2021 ELA FSA data of 38% proficiency to the 2019 FSA ELA proficiency of 45%. Over the last two years, proficiency dropped 7 percentage points. Tier 1 instruction, in both planning and delivery, did not result in an increase in proficient students. The 2021 AP3 Reading Diagnostic scores showed significant decrease in proficiency for students in grades K-2 (k-21%, 1st- 50%, 2nd- 53%). Therefore, we will strategically develop, explicitly deliver, and systematically monitor ELA tier 1 instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	According to the i-Ready AP1 diagnostic, 67% of students in reading and math will score on or above grade level based on the i-Ready AP3 diagnostic.
Monitoring:	The leadership team will monitor progress through weekly walkthroughs, electronic data trackers, collaborative planning and data chats, and sending comparative reports to teachers via email.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Yashyawa Teague (yteague@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) On a weekly basis, the administrative team and instructional coaches will monitor progress through walkthroughs, and electronic trackers which will be followed by debriefing during collaborative planning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	After analyzing the previous school year's data, continuous monitoring of learner progress and aligned instruction will contribute to the overall school improvement and will be evident through an increase in student proficiency on assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

Ongoing focused and strategic ELA/Mathematics weekly Collaborative Planning 8/23/2021

Person Responsible Yashyawa Teague (yteague@dadeschools.net)

Standards aligned instruction during Differentiated Instruction 8/23/2021

Person Responsible Lisa Braye (208010@dadeschools.net)

-Coaching Support 8/23/2021

Person Responsible Theodora Cherelus (tcherelus@dadeschools.net)

-Provide Professional Growth opportunities for teachers to become familiar with the utilization of resources and materials. 8/23/2021(ongoing throughout the year)

Person Responsible LaVenja Jackson (lmjackson@dadeschools.net)

Coaches will provide ongoing modeling support for teachers. 8/23/2021

Person Responsible Theodora Cherelus (tcherelus@dadeschools.net)

Teachers will create end product questions/problems that check for understanding.

Person Responsible LaVenja Jackson (lmjackson@dadeschools.net)

Conduct scheduled product reviews of student work samples in order to diagnose teacher instruction and student understanding.

Person Responsible Yashyawa Teague (yteague@dadeschools.net)

The reading and math CSS will provide ongoing support to the Instructional Coaches.

Person Responsible Yashyawa Teague (yteague@dadeschools.net)

Transformation Coaches will assist with providing standards aligned resources to maximize effective Instructional Delivery. 11/1-12/21/21

Person Responsible Lisa Braye (208010@dadeschools.net)

Ensure that through standards based planning, the Gradual Release Model is implemented with fidelity. 11/1-12/21/21.

Person Responsible Yashyawa Teague (yteague@dadeschools.net)

During collaborative planning sessions, the coaches and teachers will plan student generated work samples that aligns to the standards being taught. 1/31- 4/29/22

Person Responsible Theodora Cherelus (tcherelus@dadeschools.net)

Teachers will bring resources and materials to collaborative planning for review to ensure that the alignment to the standard is present 1/31- 4/29/22

Person Responsible LaVenja Jackson (lmjackson@dadeschools.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to the School Culture Data Map, 57% of students in grades 3-5 agreed with the statement that, "my school counselor helps me with school and personal problems." The School Leadership Team identified Social and Emotional Learning as an area in need of review. This school site has an outside agency that provides services that addresses Social and Emotional Learning. The goal is to increase Social and Emotional services provided to the students through the School's Student Services department.
Measurable Outcome:	According to the student's school climate survey, 57% of students agreed with the statement that, "my school counselor helps me with school and personal problems." With many of our families continuing to face hardships due to the pandemic, students will benefit from in class Social and Emotional Learning lessons. The school's guidance counselor, in collaboration with Citrus Health staff, will provide additional social and emotional services at least twice a week.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored on a weekly basis through the Guidance Counselor's in-class presentation walk-throughs/observations and submission of their weekly calendar.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Yashyawa Teague (yteague@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Evidence-based Strategy being implemented for this area of focus is Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) This School Site benefits from an outside agency called Citrus Health, as well as, a School Guidance Counselor.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	After careful review of the student portion of the School Climate Survey, Only 57% of students Agreed with the statement that "my school counselor helps me with school and personal problems." Many of our families continue to face hardships due to the pandemic and can benefit from various services inclusive of Social and Emotional learning. In addition to Citrus Health providing opportunities for Social & Emotional Learning, this school site will focus on the school's guidance counselor providing Social & Emotional Learning presentations for students.

Action Steps to Implement

-A schedule will be made for social emotional learning 8/23/2021

Person Responsible Jeff Rateau (pr2161@dadeschools.net)

-Create a checklist to monitor in classroom walkthroughs 8/23/2021

Person Responsible Yashyawa Teague (yteague@dadeschools.net)

-Lesson plans on what will be addressed during classroom presentations 8/23/2021

Person Responsible Yashyawa Teague (yteague@dadeschools.net)

On-going Collaboration between School Guidance Counselor, Mental Health Coordinator, and Citrus Health Prevention Counselor on students in need of one on one or group counseling sessions relative to social and emotional needs. 11/1- 12/21/21

Person Responsible Yashyawa Teague (yteague@dadeschools.net)

School Guidance Counselor will refer families in need of social and emotional assistance to the school's Mental Health Coordinator and/or Citrus Health Counselor (Healthy Me) program for further family aid. 11/1- 12/21/21

Person Responsible Yashyawa Teague (yteague@dadeschools.net)

School Counselor will meet on a Bi-weekly basis with students of the L25, SWD, and ESOL for small group counseling sessions offering support with academics, behavior, and home life. 1/31- 4/29/22

Person Responsible Yashyawa Teague (yteague@dadeschools.net)

Based on teacher and parent referrals, School Counselor will counsel students in need of assistance behaviorally and collaborate with all stakeholders such as SPED Facilitator, Mental Health Coordinators, Outside Agency (Citrus Health), and Parents. 1/31- 4/29/22

Person Responsible Yashyawa Teague (yteague@dadeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the Data review, our school will implement Differentiated Instruction as a need for review. We selected this area of focus based on our findings that demonstrated 0% proficiency in ELA for grades 3-5 students in the lowest quartile on the 2021 FSA. We compared the current 2021 ELA FSA data of 0% of L25 students in grades 3-5 making proficiency to the 2019 FSA ELA proficiency of L25 students at 40%. Over the last two years, proficiency of L25 students dropped 40 percentage points. The 2021 AP3 Reading Diagnostic scores showed significant decrease in proficiency for students in grades K-2 (k-21%, 1st- 50%, 2nd- 53%). Therefore, we will create and review primary standards for our tier 3 students during D.I.
Measurable Outcome:	Based on data maps, and statewide assessment findings, 70% of Tier 2 students will demonstrate mastery as evidenced by the results on the biweekly and topic assessments.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through weekly on-going progress monitoring that remediates the weakest standard.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Yashyawa Teague (yteague@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Data driven decision making will be implemented during collaborative planning to determine the secondary standard. Weekly check for understandings will occur through on-going progress monitoring to monitor the effectiveness of the strategies that were implemented.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Data-Driven Decision making was a strategy selected because our Coaching team and teachers will rely heavily on data to inform instruction in the classroom; this will be evident through an increase in student proficiency on District and school-wide assessments. The School leadership Team.....

Action Steps to Implement

-Monitor student success through the use of electronic data trackers 9/7/2021

Person Responsible Yashyawa Teague (yteague@dadeschools.net)

-Discuss student performance during collaborative planning and data chat sessions 8/23/2021- weekly

Person Responsible Theodora Cherelus (tcherelus@dadeschools.net)

-Teachers will provide explicit instruction during the TLC to assist with remediating the secondary standard. 8/23/2021

Person Responsible LaVenja Jackson (lmjackson@dadeschools.net)

Ensure that the systems for providing effective DI are in place in order to meet the specific learning needs based on the data.

Person Responsible Yashyawa Teague (yteague@dadeschools.net)

Conduct scheduled product reviews of student work samples in order to diagnose teacher instruction and student understanding.

Person Responsible Yashyawa Teague (yteague@dadeschools.net)

Develop Weekly/Bi-weekly Differentiated Instruction Lesson Plans based on student assessment data.

Person Responsible LaVenía Jackson (lmjackson@dadeschools.net)

Assist teachers with using the pacing guide to plan and to retrieve the necessary resources that are needed during D.I. based on the student's Tier or individualized level. 11/1- 12/21/21

Person Responsible LaVenía Jackson (lmjackson@dadeschools.net)

Conduct on-going Mini-PDs during collaborative planning on how to organize D.I. and how to shift the resources being utilized after an assessment in order to provide additional opportunities for mastery of standards. 11/1- 12/21/21

Person Responsible LaVenía Jackson (lmjackson@dadeschools.net)

Progress Monitoring Data will be utilized to make individualized and informed instructional decisions to remediate weakest standards during small group instruction. 1/31- 4/29/22

Person Responsible LaVenía Jackson (lmjackson@dadeschools.net)

Administration and Coaches will continue conducting product reviews of the resources that are being used to ensure that they are standards-aligned. The resources used will mirror their upcoming assessments in order to reflect mastery or understanding of various standards. 1/31- 4/29/22

Person Responsible LaVenía Jackson (lmjackson@dadeschools.net)

#4. Leadership specifically relating to Managing Accountability Systems**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Based on the Data review, our school will implement Managing Accountability Systems. We selected this area of focus based on our FSA Assessment findings that demonstrated 38% proficiency in ELA and 36% proficiency in Math for grades 3-5 on the 2021 FSA. We compared the current 2021 ELA FSA data of 38% proficiency and Math FSA data of 36% proficiency to the 2019 FSA ELA proficiency of 45% and FSA Math proficiency of 65%. Over the last two years, proficiency dropped 7 percentage points in ELA and 29 percentage points in Math. The lack of managing accountability systems with fidelity did not yield us favorable results in the content area. Therefore, we will monitor with fidelity all accountability systems set forth for the school year; Reading bi-weekly, D.I. and Intervention progress monitoring, Math and Science Topic Assessments, and i-Ready Diagnostics.

Measurable Outcome:

The leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs, and conduct quarterly action steps from the School Improvement Plan via missions based on our school's Mission Possible theme.

Monitoring:

The leadership team will monitor the desired area of focus through a walkthrough checklist, and a mission board displaying the missions over time.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Yashyawa Teague (yteague@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this area is that of Managing Data Systems and processes. Managing accountability of systems by way of weekly walkthroughs and observations, will contribute to sustained practices, improved teacher effectiveness and ultimately an increase in Bi-weekly, OPM, and Topic assessments data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

In the past, As a school we've had many academic systems in place that would yield much improvement academically and culturally. However, the lack of managing the systems with fidelity lead to our demise.

Action Steps to Implement

Close Monitoring of Systems in place on a weekly/bi-weekly
- Tracking Bi-Weekly, OPM, and Topic Assessment Data 9/3/2021

Person Responsible

Yashyawa Teague (yteague@dadeschools.net)

- Mentoring of L25 students 9/13/2021

Person Responsible

Yashyawa Teague (yteague@dadeschools.net)

- Monitoring Differentiated Instruction with fidelity 8/23/2021

Person Responsible

LaVenja Jackson (lmjackson@dadeschools.net)

- Monitoring Intervention with fidelity 8/23/2021

Person Responsible Theodora Cherelus (tcherelus@dadeschools.net)

- Monitoring/ tracking Attendance (Staff/Student) 8/23/2021

Person Responsible Lisa Braye (208010@dadeschools.net)

Principal and Assistant Principal will sit in on weekly Collaborative Planning sessions for Math and Reading 11/1- 12/21/21

Person Responsible Yashyawa Teague (yteague@dadeschools.net)

Administration will take a deeper look into Lesson plans with regards to Standards, Daily Learning Targets, instructional delivery, and Assessments. 11/1- 12/21/21

Person Responsible Yashyawa Teague (yteague@dadeschools.net)

Focused walkthroughs with the Leadership Team will occur with a checklist to provide a closer look at the targeted area. 1/31- 4/29/22

Person Responsible Yashyawa Teague (yteague@dadeschools.net)

Teacher led data chat presentations will occur during collaborative planning with a focus on identifying the weakest standard for DI support, standards aligned Di resources, OPM progress data and their action plan to ensure that students make the improvement leading to proficiency. 1/31- 4/29/22

Person Responsible Lisa Braye (208010@dadeschools.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the Data review, our school will implement the target element of ELA. We selected the overarching area of ELA based on our findings that demonstrated 38% proficiency in ELA for grades 3-5 on the 2021 FSA. We compared the current 2021 ELA FSA data of 38% proficiency to the 2019 FSA ELA proficiency of 45%. Over the last two years, proficiency dropped 7 percentage points. Tier 1 instruction, in both planning and delivery, did not result in an increase in proficient students. The 2021 AP3 Reading Diagnostic scores showed significant decrease in proficiency for students in grades K-2 (k-21%, 1st- 50%, 2nd- 53%). Therefore, we will strategically develop, explicitly deliver, and systematically monitor tier 1 instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	If we successfully develop, deliver, and monitor Tier 1/Core instruction, then our ELA Proficient students will increase by a minimum of 10 percentage points as evidenced by the 2022 State Assessments.
Monitoring:	The Leadership team will participate in weekly collaborative planning, following up with targeted walk-throughs that monitor the alignment of planning to instructional delivery. Explicit feedback will be provided weekly and instructional shifts in planning will occur, based on feedback. Transformation coaches will collaboratively plan with teachers, utilizing instructional resources that define the expectation of the standards. Collection of observational data and explicit feedback will be utilized to adjust planning and instruction. Data analysis of bi-weekly progress monitoring assessments, as well as the review of products, will be utilized to track progress and determine the effectiveness of instructional delivery and planning.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Yashyawa Teague (yteague@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Within the Targeted Element of ELA, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of: Check for understanding. Check for understanding assures that students have grasped the content being taught and are able to apply it. Ultimately, this will result in improved scores on i-ready lessons and progress monitoring assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Check for Understanding (CFU) will ensure students understand the content that was taught and can apply the actual skills learned. Continuous Data Chats with instructional coaches and teachers, viewing and analyzing data, and observing student work samples.

Action Steps to Implement

8/31- 10/11 Teachers will Participate in weekly Collaborative Planning sessions with a focus on CFU's.

Person Responsible Theodora Cherelus (tcherelus@dadeschools.net)

8/31- 10/11 Product reviews, bi-weekly, will be conducted by Administration and Coaches for the purpose of identifying is students are understanding what is being taught.

Person Responsible Yashyawa Teague (yteague@dadeschools.net)

8/31- 10/11 On a bi-weekly, Data analysis of progress monitoring assessments during collaborative planning will be conducted in order to determine mastery/ understanding of the skills assessed.

Person Responsible LaVenja Jackson (lmjackson@dadeschools.net)

11/1 - 12/21 During collaborative planning, teachers will create end product questions and plan activities that aligns to the standard(s) being taught in order to check for student mastery prior to the administration of the progress monitoring and topic assessments.

Person Responsible LaVenja Jackson (lmjackson@dadeschools.net)

11/1 - 12/21 Teachers will provide timely explicit and corrective feedback on student work.

Person Responsible Theodora Cherelus (tcherelus@dadeschools.net)

Teachers will scaffold assignments to meet the needs of various learners 1/31- 4/29/22

Person Responsible LaVenja Jackson (lmjackson@dadeschools.net)

Coaches will continue to provide support and modeling of explicit instruction for teachers 1/31- 4/29/22

Person Responsible Theodora Cherelus (tcherelus@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.

Incidents for this school site has declined tremendously as evidenced by Safe School for Alex report. An area of concern for this site is how far back this data goes back....2014. During the 2021-2022 school year, the Administrative team will continue to monitor and make necessary adjustments to our school-wide discipline plan. Additionally, the number of classroom incidents and referrals will be closely monitored by the student services team.

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.

The School Leadership Team of Golden Glades Elementary addresses building a positive school culture and environment by simply being an example to both staff, students, and the community. Daily, the vision,

mission and Eagle's Call is read on the P.A. Teachers are challenged with the mission of making sure students learn and commit the Eagles' Call to memory. Additionally, positive affirmations are posted around the building to encourage and instill an "I can" spirit among all. Moreover, Stakeholders and Community-Based Partners are asked to make donations of incentives to teachers and students for our "Eagles' Mart" that promotes academic achievement, model behavior, and "Spotting Success" among all.

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

Administrators, teachers, counselors, instructional coaches, parents, and the community are all stakeholders. They will promote a positive and professional culture and environment in the school by fostering positive interactions among stakeholders.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Managing Accountability Systems	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00