Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Morningside K 8 Academy



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 | 21 |
| | |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 29 |
| | |
| Budget to Support Goals | 30 |
| | |

Morningside K 8 Academy

6620 NE 5TH AVE, Miami, FL 33138

http://morningside.dadeschools.net/

Demographics

Principal: Leonardo Mourino

Start Date for this Principal: 7/20/2019

| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Combination School PK-8 |
| 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 (60%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: C (53%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info | ormation* |
| 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. F | or more information, <u>click here</u> . |

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:

- 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 | 21 |
| Γitle I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 30 |

Last Modified: 5/5/2024 https://www.floridacims.org Page 4 of 30

Morningside K 8 Academy

6620 NE 5TH AVE, Miami, FL 33138

http://morningside.dadeschools.net/

School Demographics

| School Type and Gi (per MSID | | 2020-21 Title I Schoo | l Disadvan | l Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3) | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------|-----------------------|------------|--------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Combination S PK-8 | School | Yes | | 87% | | | | | |
| Primary Servio (per MSID I | | Charter School | (Reporte | Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2) | | | | | |
| K-12 General E | ducation | No | | 96% | | | | | |
| School Grades History | | | | | | | | | |
| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | | | | | |
| Grade | | В | В | | | | | | |

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 Morningside K-8 Academy is to achieve academic excellence in a caring, safe, and healthy environment. The stakeholders deem that all students benefit from a program in which Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, Reading, Speaking and Writing in the English Language are stressed and incorporated with a strong technology component. In the language magnet program, students are given a choice of French, Spanish, or Haitian Creole. The curriculum also includes Art, Music and Physical Education. We emphasize self-worth by valuing our students as individuals and by respecting their different cultures. As part of our curriculum, we provide a differentiated approach to instruction and a focus on literacy that promotes high achievement. We recognize that children have various learning styles, and we are committed to multiple teaching methods to ensure their academic success. Through an integration of the Florida State Standards and the use of best instructional practices, an arena is created that stimulates, challenges and guides students to their goals. We strive to unite with parents and community members to form a strong fellowship that will help us achieve success. We endeavor to provide a quality education for each student in a school that adapts to the changing environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Morningside K-8 Academy community has high expectations for excellence. Teachers, staff, parents, students, and the community will work together to foster an environment where students are excited about learning and work at the peak of their abilities. We believe that learning is a lifelong process, one in which all the stakeholders are fully committed. We will provide an environment that is child-centered, maintaining a balance between the cognitive and affective domains seeking to develop the whole child. As a community rich in diversity, we take pride in and celebrate our uniqueness. We expect students to take responsibility for their actions, respect one another, and make ethical choices. We challenge our children to become critical and creative thinkers and problem-solvers who can work both independently and collaboratively using their failures as learning tools as they prepare to become productive citizens.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mourino, Leonardo | Principal | School Operations, School Based Budget, Curriculum, Internal Funds, Educational Leadership, Educational Excellence School Advisory Committee (EESAC), Dade Partners |
| Dorvily, Nicole | Assistant Principal | School Operations, Curriculum, Test Chairperson, Master Schedule, Exceptional Student Education, English Language Learners, LEA, Student Services. |
| Rose, Dianna | Magnet Coordinator | Magnet Lead Teacher, Registration & Selection, PTSA Liaison, PD Liaison, EESAC, Tutor, UTD Steward. |
| Blot, Rose | Teacher, K-12 | First Grade Chairperson, EESAC, After School Teacher, PLST Member, African American Advocate. |
| McKinley, Laura | Teacher, K-12 | Kindergarten Chairperson, EESAC Member, PLST Member, Teacher leadership Academy (TLA), After School Tutor. |
| Mariano- Rosete, Marice | Teacher, K-12 | 3rd Grade Chairperson, Math Liaison, EESAC Member (Secretary) |
| Marks, Kevin | Teacher, K-12 | Upper Academy Chairperson, Social Studies Liaison, EESAC Member |
| Olivier, Ann | Teacher, K-12 | Grade 2 Chairperson, Gifted Program Liaison |
| Rivero, Mercedes | Teacher, PreK | Pre K Chairperson |
| Asencio, Monica | Teacher, K-12 | Grade 5 Chairperson, ELA Liaison, O, Miami Liaison |
| Carrington, Juliet | Teacher, K-12 | Grade 4 Chairperson, KAPOW Program Liaison, Sunshine Committee, PTSA President. |
| Abou- Assali, Mona | Teacher, PreK | PRE-K Synergy Member |
| Forero, Veronica | Teacher, K-12 | Kindergarten Teacher |
| Ritchie, Shaketha | Teacher, K-12 | EESAC Member (Chairperson), First Grade Teacher |
| Southwood- smith, Tammy | Instructional Technology | Algebra 1 Teacher, Teacher Leader, Technology Liaison. Intramural Sports. |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| Landa, Lisette | Teacher, ESE | VE Teacher, ESE Program Chairperson |
| Woodley, Yulanda | Teacher, ESE | ESE Teacher, ELL Program Chairperson |
| Okany, Obiageli | School Counselor | Elementary School Counselor, Student Services Liaison |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/20/2019, Leonardo Mourino

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.

35

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

Total number of students enrolled at the school

427

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

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

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 | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|----|-------|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| Number of students enrolled | 42 | 43 | 47 | 65 | 52 | 49 | 27 | 34 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 389 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 4 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 12 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 3 | 16 | 12 | 25 | 13 | 13 | 4 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 |

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

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAT |
| Students with two or more indicators | 2 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 6 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/19/2021

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 | | | | | C | 3rad | le Le | evel | | | | | | Total |
|-----------------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|------|-------|------|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 46 | 60 | 68 | 66 | 54 | 54 | 43 | 43 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 466 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 7 | 13 | 11 | 14 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 6 | 7 | 10 | 1 | 11 | 9 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 14 | 12 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |

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

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-------|
| inuicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | rotai |
| Students with two or more indicators | | 8 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 10 | 10 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|-------|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 6 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

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 Grade Component | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 62% | 63% | 61% | 60% | 62% | 60% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 62% | 61% | 59% | 64% | 61% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 54% | 57% | 54% | 64% | 57% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 55% | 67% | 62% | 55% | 65% | 61% |

| School Grade Component | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| School Grade Component | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 46% | 63% | 59% | 54% | 61% | 58% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 40% | 56% | 52% | 43% | 55% | 52% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 61% | 56% | 56% | 44% | 57% | 57% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 100% | 80% | 78% | 89% | 79% | 77% |

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 | 60% | 60% | 0% | 58% | 2% |
| Cohort Com | nparison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 57% | 64% | -7% | 58% | -1% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -60% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 64% | 60% | 4% | 56% | 8% |
| Cohort Com | nparison | -57% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 51% | 58% | -7% | 54% | -3% |
| Cohort Com | nparison | -64% | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 69% | 56% | 13% | 52% | 17% |
| Cohort Com | nparison | -51% | | | | |
| 80 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 63% | 60% | 3% | 56% | 7% |
| Cohort Com | nparison | -69% | | | • | |

| | | | MATH | 1 | | |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 68% | 67% | 1% | 62% | 6% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 41% | 69% | -28% | 64% | -23% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -68% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 55% | 65% | -10% | 60% | -5% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -41% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 44% | 58% | -14% | 55% | -11% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -55% | | | | |

| | | | MATH | ł | | |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 61% | 53% | 8% | 54% | 7% |
| Cohort Com | nparison | -44% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 33% | 40% | -7% | 46% | -13% |
| Cohort Com | nparison | -61% | | | | |

| | SCIENCE | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison | | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 46% | 53% | -7% | 53% | -7% | | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | | | | | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 87% | 43% | 44% | 48% | 39% | | | | | |
| Cohort Com | nparison | -46% | | | | | | | | | |

| | | BIOLO | GY EOC | | |
|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| | | CIVIC | S EOC | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 100% | 73% | 27% | 71% | 29% |
| | | HISTO | RY EOC | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| | | ALGEE | BRA EOC | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 80% | 63% | 17% | 61% | 19% |

| | GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | | | | | |
|------|--------------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State | | | | | |
| 2021 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Power BI, iReady, Topic Assessments, FSA, SAT.

| | | Grade 1 | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 47.8 | 50 | 73.3 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 45.2 | 47.6 | 70.7 |
| , | Students With Disabilities | 28.6 | 57.1 | 57.1 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 22.7 | 28.3 | 71.4 |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 22.5 | 23.8 | 68.4 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 28.6 | 57.1 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | | Grade 2 | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring | | | | |
| | All Students | 38.3 | 52.5 | 62.3 | | | | |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 34 | 46.3 | 57.4 | | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 25.0 | 11.1 | 33.3 | | | | |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring | | | | |
| | All Students | 37.3 | 31.7 | 41 | | | | |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 32.7 | 24.5 | 35.2 | | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 33.3 | 33.3 | 22.2 | | | | |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Grade 3 | | | | | | | | |
| | | Grade 3 | | | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Grade 3 Fall | Winter | Spring | | | | |
| | Proficiency All Students | | Winter 62.1 | Spring 71.9 | | | | |
| English Language Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall | | | | | | |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | Fall 57.9 | 62.1 | 71.9 | | | | |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | Fall 57.9 56.6 | 62.1 59.3 | 71.9 69.8 | | | | |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency | Fall 57.9 56.6 16.7 0 Fall | 62.1 59.3 0 0 Winter | 71.9 69.8 0 0 Spring | | | | |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students | Fall 57.9 56.6 16.7 | 62.1 59.3 0 0 | 71.9 69.8 0 | | | | |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall 57.9 56.6 16.7 0 Fall | 62.1 59.3 0 0 Winter | 71.9 69.8 0 0 Spring | | | | |
| Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically | Fall 57.9 56.6 16.7 0 Fall 12.7 | 62.1 59.3 0 0 Winter 29.8 | 71.9 69.8 0 0 Spring 40 | | | | |

| Grade 4 | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|--|--|--|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring | | | |
| | All Students | 39.6 | 42.6 | 57.4 | | | |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 37.8 | 40.9 | 54.5 | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 18.2 | 10 | 30 | | | |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring | | | |
| | All Students | 35.4 | 58.3 | 78.7 | | | |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 33.3 | 57.8 | 77.3 | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 18.2 | 9.1 | 40 | | | |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| | | Grade 5 | | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring | | | |
| | All Students | 40.5 | 55.6 | 52.4 | | | |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 41 | 57.1 | 53.8 | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 12.5 | 40 | 14.3 | | | |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring | | | |
| | All Students | 24.4 | 42.2 | 53.5 | | | |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 23.8 | 42.9 | 55 | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 10 | 20 | 0 | | | |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring | | | |
| | All Students | 0 | 18 | 0 | | | |
| Science | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 17 | 0 | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |

| | | Grade 6 | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 33.3 | 50.0 | 53.8 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 30.6 | 50.0 | 51.4 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 16.7 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 25.6 | 32.5 | 41 |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 25.7 | 33.3 | 41.7 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Grade 7 | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 39.5 | 50.0 | 55.3 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 37.1 | 48.7 | 51.4 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 40 | 40 |
| | English Language Learners | 14.3 | 11.1 | 11.1 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 22 | 38.1 | 45 |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 18.4 | 35.9 | 43.2 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 11.1 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 0 | 93 | 0 |
| Civics | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 92 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 100 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 67 | 0 |

| | | Grade 8 | | |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 55.2 | 62.1 | 76.9 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 57.7 | 65.4 | 78.3 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 41.4 | 67.9 | 67.9 |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 46.2 | 68 | 68 |
| | Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 0 | 31 | 0 |
| Science | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 31 | 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 | 31 | 37 | | 17 | 19 | 25 | 14 | | | | |
| ELL | 49 | 61 | 57 | 29 | 33 | 29 | 48 | 64 | | | |
| BLK | 49 | 49 | 59 | 34 | 29 | 26 | 35 | 83 | | | |
| HSP | 60 | 60 | | 45 | 38 | | 70 | 93 | | | |
| FRL | 51 | 50 | 51 | 35 | 29 | 31 | 39 | 87 | | | |
| | | 2019 | SCHO | OL GRAD | E COMF | PONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 42 | 46 | 39 | 34 | 39 | 21 | 50 | | | | |
| ELL | 55 | 63 | 61 | 39 | 52 | 54 | 71 | | | | |
| BLK | 60 | 62 | 52 | 49 | 45 | 42 | 56 | 100 | 52 | | |
| HSP | 64 | 60 | 58 | 67 | 49 | 33 | 71 | | | | |
| FRL | 61 | 62 | 54 | 54 | 47 | 40 | 58 | 100 | 56 | | |

| | 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 | 25 | 52 | 63 | 16 | 45 | 38 | 15 | | | | | |
| ELL | 34 | 59 | 57 | 26 | 46 | 44 | 29 | 77 | | | | |
| BLK | 60 | 62 | 56 | 54 | 52 | 36 | 46 | 90 | | | | |
| HSP | 58 | 62 | 80 | 53 | 56 | 64 | 41 | 92 | · | | | |
| FRL | 60 | 63 | 63 | 53 | 54 | 44 | 44 | 89 | 73 | | | |

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 | 51 |
| 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 | 509 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Students With Disabilities Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 29 |
| | 29 YES |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% English Language Learners | YES |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% English Language Learners Federal Index - English Language Learners | YES 47 |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? 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? | YES 47 |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? 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? Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | YES 47 |

Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%

| A sion Chudonte | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 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% | <u></u> | | | | | | |
| Black/African American Students | | | | | | | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 46 | | | | | | |
| 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 | 60 | | | | | | |
| 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 | 47 | | | | | | |
| 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:

ELA proficiency was greater than Math proficiency at 62% compared to 55%.

ELA learning gains was greater than Math learning gains at 62% compared to 46%.

2021 data findings:

Overall ELA proficiency decreased by 9 percentage points from 62% to 53% from 2019 to 2021.

ELA learning gains also decreased by 9 percentage points from 62% to 53% from 2019 to 2021.

ELA proficiency was greater than Math proficiency at 53% compared to 39%.

ELA learning gains was greater than Math learning gains at 53% compared to 31%.

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

Except for grades 4 and 8, iReady AP3 Reading scores decreased considerably from 2020 to 2021. We experienced a double digit drop in five grade levels except for grades 3 and 6 which only decreased by four and three points respectively.

Except for grade 4 Math, the need for improvement in Mathematics has been consistent across the board.

There is also a consistent need for improvement in 5th grade Science where the proficiency level was only 30% in 2021.

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

The lack of basic scientific knowledge exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic and online school contributed to the low performance in science. Rigorous Tier 1 instruction supplemented by Saturday Academy for students who are working below grade level will help reverse this trend.

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

Student performance in 4th grade Math has consistently been 60% or higher.

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

The implementation of rigorous Tier 1 instruction and consistent differentiated instruction for students in need of remediation contributed to better performance in 4th grade Mathematics.

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

We will need to consistently analyze schoolwide data in order to provide differentiated instruction across the board. Differentiated instruction in Mathematics will have to be implemented with fidelity. Math intervention will also be provided to all Tier 2 and 3 students.

Extended learning opportunities offered through before and after school tutoring, Saturday Academy, and the MTSS process will also be used to help students improve their performance.

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.

Teachers will be trained on data analysis to drive instruction and the development of instructional focus calendars to address deficiencies within content areas. Mathematics teachers and interventionists will participate in common planning with the math coach to identify and gather resources for small group instruction. Administrator/teacher data chats as well as student/teacher data chats will be conducted on a regular basis to analyze student performance. Teachers will use topic assessment data to adjust their intervention groups. Ongoing progress monitoring will be conducted throughout the school year.

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

Administration will conduct regular classroom walkthroughs to ensure the action steps discussed above are being implemented with fidelity. The leadership team will assist with the implementation of schoolwide strategies that will help us meet our school goals.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Data-Driven Instruction will ensure that teachers are using relevant, recent, and aligned data to plan lessons that are customized to student needs. Teachers will continually make adjustments to their instruction, lesson plans, and instructional delivery as new data becomes available. Based on the data review, our school will implement the targeted element of differentiated instruction (DI). Differentiated instruction was selected as the overarching area of instruction based on our findings that demonstrated overall low proficiency levels in math.

Measurable Outcome:

Through the successful implementation of data driven and differentiated instruction, our overall proficiency in Mathematics will increase by a minimum of 10 percentage points to 49%, as evidenced by the 2022 results of the statewide assessments.

To ensure the effectiveness of differentiated instruction, weekly meetings will be held with the math coach and selected staff members. This will enable adequate lesson planning for

Monitoring:

DI to take place and provide necessary support and resources to teachers. Student performance will be consistently monitored using a variety of formal and informal assessment data.

Person responsible

for monitoring outcome:

Tammy Southwood-smith (tsouthwood@dadeschools.net)

Evidencebased Strategy: Morningside K-8 Academy will focus on data-driven decision making which is a process embedded in the culture of the school. Morningside will use data at every level to make informed decisions on what is best for students. This includes goal setting, interventions, teacher placement, course work, differentiating instruction, etc.

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy:

To remedy learning loss caused by the pandemic and online learning, Morningside K-8 Academy will closely monitor the implementation of differentiated instruction and interventions. This will assist teachers in developing targeted student centered lessons intended to improve student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

8/30/21-10/11/21

During grade-level common planning, teachers and interventionists will be given the opportunity to plan for rigorous differentiated instruction. Tier 1/2 students will be identified, and resources will be selected for differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible

Tammy Southwood-smith (tsouthwood@dadeschools.net)

8/30/21-10/11/21

Working with the math coach, lesson plans will be developed for small group differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible

Tammy Southwood-smith (tsouthwood@dadeschools.net)

8/30/21-10/11/21

After participating in grade level and/or subject area planning meetings, teachers will provide students with targeted lessons within the Florida Standards and deliver ongoing rigorous Mathematics instruction with fidelity.

Person Responsible

Tammy Southwood-smith (tsouthwood@dadeschools.net)

8/30/21-10/11/21

We will continue to implement the effective use of data to create flexible student groups and plan for differentiated instruction (DI) as discussed during grade level planning meetings.

Person Responsible

Tammy Southwood-smith (tsouthwood@dadeschools.net)

11/1/21 to 12/17/21

Based on the findings of the Impact Review (IR) conducted on 10/12/21, we identified a Master Teacher who is willing to serve as a model for exemplary differentiated instruction (DI). We have also identified teachers who will benefit from observing these best practices. As a result, teachers who visit this classroom will enhance their DI skills.

Person Responsible

Tammy Southwood-smith (tsouthwood@dadeschools.net)

11/1/21 to 12/17/21

As we target students' deficiencies in Mathematics, the IXL program will be used to bridge the learning gap in grades 4-8.

Person

Responsible

Becky Vickers (vickers.becky@oppaga.fl.gov)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2021 FSA results, 61% of our 3rd grade students and 52% of 5th grade scored a level 2 or below in English Language Arts. Also, according to our 2019 iReady AP3 data as compared to the 2021 results, we experienced a double digit drop in performance in five grade levels except for grades 3 and 6 which only decreased by four and three points respectively. For this reason, we will implement data driven instruction to ensure that teachers are using relevant, recent, and aligned data to plan lessons that are customized to student needs.

Measurable Outcome:

By May 31, 2022, across grade levels, we will increase the percentage of students scoring a level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment by a minimum of 3 percentage points.

Monitoring:

Administration will conduct quarterly grade level data chats with teachers to make sure student performance is aligned with expectations. Modifications will be made consistently to address student deficiencies through intervention, the rti process, differentiated instruction (DI), reteaching, remediation, and before/after school tutoring.

Person responsible

for Monica Asencio (233716@dadeschools.net)

monitoring outcome:

Evidence- Intervention, rti, differentiated instruction (DI), informal classroom observations and standards-based tier 1 instruction are the strategies that will be used to accelerate and improve student learning.

Rationale

Evidence- basedStandards-based Instruction will ensure that teachers are using relevant, recent, and aligned standards to plan lessons that are customized to student needs.

based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

8/30/21-10/11/21

We will provide opportunities for teachers to review and use the district pacing guides aligned to the Florida Standards to develop their lessons for whole group and small group instruction. Within grade levels, teachers will collaborate to identify initial tier groups for intervention.

Person Responsible

Monica Asencio (233716@dadeschools.net)

8/30/21-10/11/21

Teachers will create student groups for intervention and small group differentiated instruction based on multiple data sources such as FSA, iReady, and topic assessment data. Data charts will be available for each group as we monitor student performance.

Person Responsible

Monica Asencio (233716@dadeschools.net)

8/30/21-10/11/21

Teachers will conduct monthly reviews of Tier2 and Tier 3 student Reading data. Members of the leadership team will monitor the intervention program and provide feedback to the grade level chairs during leadership team meetings.

Person Responsible

Monica Asencio (233716@dadeschools.net)

8/30/21-10/11/21

Teachers will progress monitor their students and collect data to adjust instruction.

Person Responsible

Monica Asencio (233716@dadeschools.net)

11/1/21 to 12/17/21

Based on the findings of the Impact Review (IR) conducted on 10/12/21, it was evident that specific students need additional practice and will be assigned iReady lessons that target their specific learning deficiencies.

Person

Responsible

Monica Asencio (233716@dadeschools.net)

11/1/21 to 12/17/21

Research shows that reading 20 minutes a day at home helps improve student achievement. To that end, Morningside K-8 Academy is helping to create student home libraries through the Birthday Book Club and the After School Book Club. Donations secured from Donors Choose, First Book, and the Education Fund make it possible for each child to receive at least two brand new titles each year which will in turn help bridge the learning gap.

Person

Responsible

Dianna Rose (drose@dadeschools.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus
Description
and
Rationale:

Increased student attendance will result in students receiving quality instruction that will contribute to improved student outcomes. Attendance will be monitored at the end of every quarter. Student incentives will be used to help attain our goal.

Measurable Outcome:

By May 31, 2022, total school attendance will increase by 5 percentage points or more,

as evidenced by the District Attendance Dashboard results of 2022.

Consistent and productive communication on student attendance will be maintained by the counselor, who will share with all stakeholders, including administrators, teachers, parents and students. Incentives will be provided to encourage students to come to

school daily.

Person responsible

Monitoring:

for Obiageli Okany (ookany@dadeschools.net)

monitoring outcome:

Evidence- basedStrategic Attendance Initiatives involve close monitoring and reporting of student absences, calls to parents, and more direct measures such as home visits, counseling, and referrals to outside agencies. Rewards will also be provided for perfect attendance.

Rationale for

Evidence- Excessive absences will increase the learning gap. Learning and improved performance take place when students attend school daily.

Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

8/31/21-10/11/21

The attendance bulletin will be monitored by teachers on a daily basis. Teachers will report all discrepancies to the attendance clerk.

Person Responsible

Obiageli Okany (ookany@dadeschools.net)

8/31/21-10/11/21

Administration will discuss rewards/incentives and provide students with daily pep talks to increase their interest in being in school.

Person Responsible

Obiageli Okany (ookany@dadeschools.net)

8/31/21-10/11/21

Will maintain ongoing communication with parents of students who accrue excessive absences to discuss the importance of being in school. The Counselor will help parents understand the need for their children to be in school.

Person Responsible

Obiageli Okany (ookany@dadeschools.net)

8/31/21-10/11/21

Develop incentives and/or recognitions for classrooms and individual students who achieve perfect attendance.

Person Responsible

Obiageli Okany (ookany@dadeschools.net)

11/1/21 to 12/17/21

To improve student attendance, the importance of being in school daily will be discussed with parents during 2nd Cup of Coffee meetings. Every quarter, a special 2nd Cup of Coffee meeting will be held to honor parents whose children have perfect attendance.

Person Responsible

Obiageli Okany (ookany@dadeschools.net)

11/1/21 to 12/17/21

At the end of each marking period, students with perfect attendance will be given a Certificate of Perfect Attendance and recognized through the PA system.

Person

Responsible

Obiageli Okany (ookany@dadeschools.net)

Last Modified: 5/5/2024

#4. Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

The Leadership Team will identify staff members who are experts in specific areas to serve as leaders with new initiatives and development. By involving teachers, we hope to create an environment of shared leadership. This initiative will be evident by teacher leaders providing support and development to their colleagues in various areas. To ensure we are on the right track, teachers who receive support will share the knowledge they have gained during faculty meetings.

Measurable Outcome:

By May 31, 2022, 100% of the teacher leaders identified will collaborate, support, and mentor fellow teachers to help them improve their teaching practice. As a result, overall student performance will increase by a minimum of 15 percentage points as evidenced by the 2021-2022 assessment results.

Opportunities for ongoing collaboration between teacher leaders and their colleagues will Monitoring: afford emergent leaders opportunities to share learned knowledge at faculty meetings.

Person responsible

Dianna Rose (drose@dadeschools.net) for

monitoring outcome:

Evidence-Research-based professional learning opportunities, including Teacher's Choice, will based improve teaching practices across the board.

Strategy: Rationale

for Professional development opportunities based on deliberate growth targets will help

develop stronger and more informed instructional leaders.

Evidencebased

Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

8/30/21 -10/11/21

The leadership team will identify potential teacher leaders, who will be paired-up with a rookie teacher. The leadership team will develop a needs assessment or individual growth target for each teacher.

Person Responsible

Leonardo Mourino (pr3501@dadeschools.net)

8/30/21 -10/11/21

Identify school leaders and mentors. Pair mentors and mentees based on individual strengths and interests.

Person Responsible

Leonardo Mourino (pr3501@dadeschools.net)

8/30/21 -10/11/21

On-going collaborative meetings will take place between mentors and mentees to discuss best practices and help mentees hone their craft.

Person

Leonardo Mourino (pr3501@dadeschools.net) Responsible

8/30/21 -10/11/21

Provide opportunities for mentees to shadow their mentors and discuss the implementation of observed strategies.

Person

Leonardo Mourino (pr3501@dadeschools.net)

Responsible

11/1/21-12/17/21

The PD Liaison will conduct a needs assessment in order to promote Teachers Choice Pathway 3 professional learning activities. This includes PLCs, teacher driven observations, and/or lesson studies.

Person Responsible

Dianna Rose (drose@dadeschools.net)

11/1/21-12/17/21

Administration will maintain on-going mentor/mentee conversations to follow-up on the progress of the mentor/mentee relationship.

Person

Responsible

Leonardo Mourino (pr3501@dadeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, 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.

Based on the School Safety Dashboard, during the 2020-2021 school year, Morningside K-8 Academy ranked 231 out of 313 combination schools statewide and ranked 62 out 66 combination schools in the country, of violent incidents per 100 students. We will continue to implement student services and behavioral interventions and supports in order to reduce the possibility of such incidents occurring during the 2021-2022 school year. We will develop and implement appropriate action steps to mitigate any situations that may arise.

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.

At Morningside K-8 Academy, we maintain constant communication with all stakeholders through a monthly calendar of activities, School Messenger, the school marquee, ClassDojo, e-mails, Remind, the school website, and social media. Student attendance is monitored closely to make sure students are in school and learning. We provide a safe, healthy, and clean environment that supports teaching and learning. Support personnel are available and accessible for students through either a push-in or pull-out model and

for intervention. Our guidance counselor works with the students on a daily basis to promote inclusivity, build tolerance, and reduce bullying. Inclusivity, Tolerance, and Anti-Bullying curricula establish an environment where students and staff feel safe from physical harm, teasing, gossiping, and exclusion in school and/or social media. Our leadership team takes part in all important decisions related to the school's organization, operation, and academics. Students and staff are recognized for their efforts, contribution, perfect attendance, and academic performance.

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

At Morningside K-8 Academy, we strive to develop leadership capacity among all members of the school community by setting high expectations for students and staff to help build a culture of trust, responsibility and excellence. Objectives are clearly defined to ensure that faculty and staff understand the school's priorities and how they align to the school's mission and goals. The school leadership team provides ongoing support to staff, teachers, and students to help build capacity and ascertain that all stakeholders experience success during the course of the school year. Leadership roles are created for students with the sole purpose of providing opportunities to students to develop and demonstrate leadership skills.

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: Leadership Development | \$0.00 |
| | | Total: | \$0.00 |