Eneida M. Hartner Elementary School

leadership
analysis
Florida
college and career
students
mission
school improvement
striving
achievement
ambitious
family and community involvement
teaching
relationships
needs assessment
success
resources
areas of focus
supportive environment
instruction
strategic planning
collaboration
vision
learning
growth

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Eneida M. Hartner Elementary School

401 NW 29TH ST, Miami, FL 33127

http://www.dade.k12.fl.us/hartner/

Demographics

Principal: Tangela Goa D   Start Date for this Principal: 7/18/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	98%
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 (59%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (47%)
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

Eneida M. Hartner Elementary School

401 NW 29TH ST, Miami, FL 33127

http://www.dade.k12.fl.us/hartner/

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	91%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	99%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	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 school celebrates individuality, diversity, and creativity. We focus on incorporating technology, and providing opportunities for students to collaborate, communicate, and think critically about real-world problems.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to educate global citizens for the 21st century.

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
Goa, Tangela	Principal	Leads teachers and staff in ensuring a quality educational environment is maintained while overseeing the daily activities and operations within the school. Main duties involve supervising staff and ensuring the school environment is safe for all students and staff members; overseeing the implementation of school policies; and, helping teachers maximize their teaching potential in order to maximize student learning.
Marban, Anailene	Assistant Principal	Assists the principal in leading teachers and staff in providing a quality educational environment while assisting with daily operations and activities within the school. Main duties involve supporting the implementation of school improvement initiatives; supporting and supervising teachers and staff; and, providing instructional leadership to improve teaching and learning outcomes.
Okab, Reem	Instructional Coach	Provides ongoing, embedded, non-evaluative, professional learning and support. Leads and implements instructional practices, content and instructional expertise to support teachers through professional learning.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/18/2021, Tangela Goa D

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.*
13

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

18

Total number of students enrolled at the school

350

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.

0

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	57	51	47	52	56	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	312
Attendance below 90 percent	13	19	13	13	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	5	4	19	13	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in Math	0	3	2	8	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	10	17	15	31	26	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114

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	11	11	2	10	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	18	12	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	65	67	60	68	53	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	370
Attendance below 90 percent	22	22	13	15	14	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	9	19	14	11	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Course failure in Math	0	5	7	12	13	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	11	13	9	13	12	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83

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	18	12	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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				46%	62%	57%	49%	62%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				60%	62%	58%	64%	62%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				71%	58%	53%	50%	59%	48%
Math Achievement				59%	69%	63%	49%	69%	62%
Math Learning Gains				56%	66%	62%	46%	64%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	55%	51%	35%	55%	47%
Science Achievement				65%	55%	53%	38%	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	29%	60%	-31%	58%	-29%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	54%	64%	-10%	58%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-29%				
05	2021					
	2019	45%	60%	-15%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	64%	67%	-3%	62%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	56%	69%	-13%	64%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2021					
	2019	43%	65%	-22%	60%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	58%	53%	5%	53%	5%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady will be the progress monitoring tool for Reading and Math. The district's baseline and mid-year assessment will be the progress monitoring tool for Science.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34.6	25.5	61.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	35.3	26	61.2
	Students With Disabilities	36.4	10	80
	English Language Learners			16.7
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	28.3	21.6	58
	Economically Disadvantaged	28.9	22	59.2
	Students With Disabilities	40	20	70
	English Language Learners			42.9

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	26.1	43.5	47.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	27.3	43.2	47.7
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	20.5	41.3	65.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	19	38.6	63.6
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	21.8	43.6	50.9
	Economically Disadvantaged	20.4	44.4	51.9
	Students With Disabilities	13.3	33.3	33.3
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5.5	25.5	58.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	5.6	25.9	59.3
	Students With Disabilities	6.7	26.7	46.7
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24.3	21.6	34.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	22.2	35.3
	Students With Disabilities			16.7
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15.8	37.8	55.9
	Economically Disadvantaged	16.2	36.1	54.5
	Students With Disabilities			33.3
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24.1	35.7	29.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	23.1	35.8	28.6
	Students With Disabilities	8.3	23.1	30.8
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20.4	30.4	45.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	19.6	30.2	43.8
	Students With Disabilities		30.8	46.2
	English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students		7	
	Economically Disadvantaged		7	
	Students With Disabilities		4	
	English Language Learners		8	

Subgroup Data Review

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
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	25	31		39	38		21				
ELL	34	38	18	46	43	50	21				
BLK	48	42		48	50		27				
HSP	34	37	21	41	28	38	17				
FRL	39	41	23	42	33	31	22				

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	32	57	67	41	68	60					
ELL	41	62	80	59	59	50	52				
BLK	53	55		60	55		58				
HSP	46	61	70	58	57	47	67				
FRL	46	59	70	58	56	50	64				

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
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	26	52	47	21	20	9	18				
ELL	41	68	58	49	45	43	18				
BLK	53	68		38	32		35				
HSP	49	62	53	53	51	40	38				
FRL	50	63	50	50	46	34	38				

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	35
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	279
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
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	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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	43
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	33
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	35
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

2019 Florida Standards Assessments ELA and Mathematics Data Findings:
The school to district comparison report showed that:
1. ELA proficiency was 41%, 20 percentage points below the district's average of 61%.
Math proficiency was 57%, 10 percentage points below the district's average of 67%.
2. ELA and Math Learning Gains were aligned with the district's average of 58%.
SWD was the lowest performing subgroup in both ELA and Math. 30% of SWD students scored at proficiency in ELA and 41% in Math.
3. Science proficiency was 65%, 12 percentage points above the district's average of 53%.1.

2021 Florida Standards Assessments ELA and Mathematics Data Findings:
The school to district comparison report showed that:
ELA proficiency was 38%, a 3 percentage points decrease since 2019, and 18 percentage points below the district's average of 56%.
1. Math proficiency was 53%, a 4 percentage points decrease since 2019, and 4 percentage points below the district's average of 49%.
2. Science proficiency was 19%, a 46 percentage points decrease since 2019, and 24 percentage points below the district's average of 43%.

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

2019 Florida Standards Assessments and Standard Achievement Test ELA and Mathematics Data Findings:
1. ELA proficiency was 41%, 26 percentage points below the district's average of 67%.
The Grade 1 SAT-10 median percentile was 21%, 46 percentage points below the district's median percentile of 67%.
2. The Grade 2 SAT-10 median percentile was 41%, 27 percentage points below the district's median percentile of 68%.
3. The Grade K SAT-10 median percentile was 63%, 17 percentage points below the district's median percentile of 80%.
4. SWD was the lowest performing subgroup in both ELA and Math.

2021 Florida Standards Assessments ELA, Mathematics, and Science Data Findings:
1. Science proficiency was at 19%, a 46 percentage point decrease since 2019, and 24 percentage points below the district's average of 43%.
2. ELA proficiency was 38%, a 3 percentage points decrease since 2019, and 18 percentage points below the district's average of 56%.
3. ELA learning gains was 39%, 21 percentage points decrease since 2019, from 39% to 21%.
4. ELA learning gains of the lowest 25% was 20%, a 51 percentage points decrease since 2019, from 71% to 20%.
5. Math learning gains was 37%, a 19 percentage point decrease since 2019, from 56% to 37%.
6. Math learning gains of the lowest 25% was 42%, an 11 percentage point decrease since 2019, from 53% to 42%.

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

In the past, academic improvement initiatives have predominantly targeted grades 3-5 with a focus on Tier 2-3 remedial instruction. Reading data has trended consistently low across grade levels, with steady declines commencing from kindergarten through grade 5. Progress monitoring data has shown less than a third of students are mastering the standards being taught with an increased number of students working below grade level in the intermediate grades. In order to close the achievement gap in Reading, Tier 1 instruction must be strengthened across all grade levels beginning in the primary grades. Students entering third grade should have the prerequisite reading skills needed to be able further develop their comprehension skills. Effective foundational skills instruction will better prepare students to develop and sustain on-grade level reading proficiency.

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

2019 Data Findings:
1. Science Achievement increased by 27 percentage points, from 38% in 2018 to 65% in 2019.
2. L25% Math Learning Gains increased by 18 percentage points, from 35% in 2018 to 65% in 2019.
3. L25% Reading Learning Gains increased by 21 percentage points, from 50% in 2018 to 71% in 2019.

2021 Data Findings:
1. Grade 3 ELA Achievement increased by 7 percentage points since 2019, from 29% to 36%.
2. The percent of students scoring at Stanines 7-9 on the Grade 2 SAT-10 Reading test increased by 8 percentage points since 2019, from 9% to 17%.

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

Contributing factors and actions that led to this improvement included weekly grade level collaborative planning, providing professional development opportunities for teachers, implementation of DI and interventions, and providing teachers with guidance and support from instructional coaches. New actions that led to improvements in Grade 2 Reading achievement included restructuring of grade level to include highly effective teachers in primary grade classrooms and increased focus on the incorporation and monitoring of foundational skills instruction.

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

The following strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning.
1. Monitoring of student data following formative assessments to determine if concept/skill has been mastered and/or if additional practice or a reteach of concept utilizing a alternate strategy is needed.

2. Maximize opportunities during collaborative planning for teachers to share and instructional strategies that are most effective in addressing learning goals of the week.
3. Provided extended learning opportunities for students to practice concepts/skills taught in class through extended day tutorials, in-school interventions, and targeted home learning assignments.

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

The PLST will develop the following professional development opportunities to accelerate learning:
August 2021: Reading and Math Instructional Framework
September 2021: School Improvement Initiatives / Reading Instruction Look-fors
October 2021: K-1 Foundations
November/December 2021: 2-5 Reading Comprehension Strategies
February 2022: Text-Based Writing
Ongoing: Data chats, individualized feedback, coaching cycles to support specific teacher needs

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 include weekly collaborative planning, instructional walkthroughs with feedback, on-going progress monitoring and data chats with both teachers and students, support from instructional coach, and weekly leadership team meetings.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Academic achievement across all grade levels and subject areas were negatively impacted due to the pandemic. 2021 school accountability data in Reading reveals that learning gains among the lowest 25% evidenced the most significant decrease, declining 51 percentage points from 71% in 2019 to 20% in 2021. Only 38% scored at FSA Achievement Level 3 or better in Reading, a decrease of 8 percentage points over the 2019 administration. 2021 school accountability in Math reveals that learning gains decreased by 23 percentage points, from 53% in 2019 to 33% in 2021. There was a 16 percentage point decrease in the percent of students scoring at FSA Achievement Level 3 or better in Math, from 59% t0 33% in 2021. Based on the data review, our school will implement the targeted element of Collaborative Planning. The overarching area of Collaborative Planning is based on our findings that student proficiency was below district norms in both Reading and Mathematics. Effective collaborative planning will enhance instructional delivery and accelerate learning in both subject areas.
Measurable Outcome:	If collaborative planning is successfully implemented, instructional delivery will be enhanced and student proficiency will increase by 10 percentage points as evidenced on 2022 state assessments.
Monitoring:	Collaborative planning will be conducted weekly as evidenced by agendas. Administration along with the leadership team will conduct walkthroughs to monitor implementation of planned activities and provide feedback.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Reem Okab (reem.okab@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Within the targeted element of collaborative planning, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of: Standards-Based Collaborative Planning. Standards-Based Collaborative Planning focuses on helping teachers identify instructional strategies and best practices to prepare lessons where instructional delivery promotes mastery of concepts and standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Establishing and implementing standards-based collaborative planning will bring teachers together to learn from one another and collaborate on projects that will lead to improvements in standards-aligned lesson quality, instructional effectiveness, and student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Establish group norms, expectations, engagement, and protocols for communication and time management during collaborative planning. The date range for this action step is 08/30/21-11/11/21.

Person Responsible	Tangela Goa (pr2351@dadeschools.net)

2. Embed data conversations into collaborative planning in order to plan for remediation/reteaching of non-mastered skills. The date range for this action step is 08/30/21-11/11/21.

Person Responsible	Anailene Marban (amarban@dadeschools.net)

3. Engage teachers in reflective collegial conversations about standards-driven instructional practices. The date range for this action step is 08/30/21-11/11/21.

Person Responsible   Reem Okab (reem.okab@dadeschools.net)

4. Provide opportunities for teachers to share strategies and resources that positively impact student learning.
The date range for this action step is 08/30/21-11/11/21.

Person Responsible   Anailene Marban (amarban@dadeschools.net)

5. Conduct data chats with teachers. The date range for this action step is 11/01/21-12/17/21.

Person Responsible   Tangela Goa (pr2351@dadeschools.net)

6. Incorporate analysis of student work samples into planning sessions. The date range for this action step is 11/01/21-12/17/21.

Person Responsible   Anailene Marban (amarban@dadeschools.net)

7. Identify appropriate tasks given to students to meet the learning target. The date range for this action step is 1/31/22-4/29/22.

Person Responsible   Reem Okab (reem.okab@dadeschools.net)

8. Utilize achievement level descriptors and sample response mechanisms from ELA planning cards to plan for instruction. The date range for this action step is 1/31/22-4/29/22.

Person Responsible   Reem Okab (reem.okab@dadeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the data review, our school will implement the targeted element of English Language Arts (ELA). ELA was identified based on our findings that 62% of students scored below a Level 3 on the 2021 ELA FSA and only 38% scored at proficiency (Level 3 or above). Learning gains among the lowest 25% in Reading evidenced the most significant decrease, declining 51 percentage points from 71% in 2019 to 20% in 2021. Additionally, i-Ready spring progress monitoring data reveals a decrease in the percent of students scoring at proficiency in grades K-2. 66% of students scored at proficiency in kindergarten; 61% scored at proficiency in grade 1; and, 47% scored at proficiency in grade 2. Improving instructional delivery in the targeted element of ELA will decrease the percent of students scoring below proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	If the ELA classroom is student-centered, then learning gains will increase by 10 percentage points as evidenced on the 2022 FSA ELA state assessment.
Monitoring:	Administration along with the leadership team will conduct walkthroughs to monitor instructional delivery and the learning environment of ELA classrooms and provide feedback.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tangela Goa (pr2351@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of Student-Centered Learning which refers to a wide variety of educational programs, learning experiences, instructional approaches, and academic-support strategies that are intended to address the distinct learning needs, interests, aspirations, or cultural backgrounds of individual students and groups of students .
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If students are to demonstrate learning gains and build proficiency, they have to be motivated to learn, focused during instruction, and passionate about learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Embed authentic learning experiences into their lessons to provide students with opportunities to explore and apply skills and concepts beyond the textbook. The date range for this action step is 08/30/21-11/11/21.

Person Responsible	Tangela Goa (pr2351@dadeschools.net)

2. Plan for the delivery of engaging lessons to increase students' interest and motivation to learn regardless of academic level and/or ability. The date range for this action step is 08/30/21-11/11/21.

Person Responsible	Reem Okab (reem.okab@dadeschools.net)

3. Implement goal-setting and goal-tracking to empower students to take control of their learning and understand learning as a process of growth over time. The date range for this action step is 08/30/21-11/11/21.

Person Responsible	Anailene Marban (amarban@dadeschools.net)

4. Tailor instruction of concepts/skills to make it relatable to student interests. The date range for this action step is 08/30/21-11/11/21.

Person Responsible   Reem Okab (reem.okab@dadeschools.net)

5. Increase opportunities for students to engage in the writing process. The date range for this action step is 11/01/21-12/17/21.

Person Responsible   Tangela Goa (pr2351@dadeschools.net)

6. Provide explicit instruction of close reading strategies during ELA block. The date range for this action step is 11/01/21-12/17/21.

Person Responsible   Anailene Marban (amarban@dadeschools.net)

7. Provide explicit instruction on the targeted comprehension focus skill and embed multiple opportunities for students to practice into lessons. The date range for this action step is 1/31/22-4/29/22.

Person Responsible   Anailene Marban (amarban@dadeschools.net)

8. Incorporate reading fluency practice into daily instruction. The date range for this action step is 1/31/22-4/29/22.

Person Responsible   Anailene Marban (amarban@dadeschools.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the data review, our school will implement the targeted element of Rewards & Incentives. This area was identified based on our findings that student incentives positively impact attendance, engagement, achievement, and motivation.
Measurable Outcome:	If rewards and incentives are implemented, then student attendance will improve as evidenced by a decrease of 10 percentage points in the percent of students with 15 or more absences, from 51% to 41% or below.
Monitoring:	Administration and leadership team will monitor initiatives to motivate students through rewards and incentives to support academics, attendance, and positive behavior.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Anailene Marban (amarban@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Within the targeted element of Early Warning Systems, our school will focus on Rewards/Incentives. Rewards/Incentives aims to promote and sustain students' motivation to put forth maximum effort throughout the learning process. Rewards include certificates, tangible incentives, and invitations to special activities and celebrations.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Rewards/incentives increase productivity, motivation, and boost morale.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide timely attendance interventions through the establishment of a schoolwide attendance tracking and accountability system. The date range for this action step is 08/30/21-11/11/21.

Person Responsible	Tangela Goa (pr2351@dadeschools.net)

2. Establish and implement classroom-based academic reward/incentives for students. The date range for this action step is 08/30/21-11/11/21.

Person Responsible	Reem Okab (reem.okab@dadeschools.net)

3. Track classroom progress towards learning goals to encourage healthy competition and reward those classrooms that meet set criteria. The date range for this action step is 08/30/21-11/11/21.

Person Responsible	Tangela Goa (pr2351@dadeschools.net)

4. Reward students with group activities to acknowledge their efforts and accomplishments. The date range for this action step is 08/30/21-11/11/21.

Person Responsible	Anailene Marban (amarban@dadeschools.net)

5. Provide schoolwide student recognition for academic and conduct honor rolls. The date range for this action step is 11/01/21-12/17/21.

Person Responsible	Tangela Goa (pr2351@dadeschools.net)

6. Highlight/promote student attendance on morning announcements. The date range for this action step is 11/01/21-12/17/21.

Person Responsible	Tangela Goa (pr2351@dadeschools.net)

7. Meet with parents to discuss grade level expectations and provide strategies to assist families with home learning. The date range for this action step is 1/31/22-4/29/22.

Person Responsible	Tangela Goa (pr2351@dadeschools.net)

8. Provide extended day tutorials to at-risk students in the lowest 25%. The date range for this action step is 1/31/22-4/29/22.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#4. Leadership specifically relating to Walkthroughs	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the data review, our school will implement the targeted element of Walkthroughs. This area was identified based on findings that a limited number of students are mastering standards taught and Tier 1 instruction needs to be strengthened.
Measurable Outcome:	If walkthroughs are successfully implemented, instructional delivery will be enhanced, and student proficiency will increase by10 percentage points as evidenced on 2022 state assessments.
Monitoring:	Within the targeted element of Leadership our school will focus on Walkthroughs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Anailene Marban (amarban@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Within the targeted element of Walkthroughs, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of: Set High Expectations for Students and Staff. Providing teachers with feedback following walkthroughs and data conversations, will lead to adjustments and improvements to instructional delivery and student achievement. Walkthroughs will enable the leadership team to informally gather evidence of standards-based instruction and desired student outcomes to identify areas of support needed by teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Walkthroughs will serve as a tool to monitor and guide teachers in achieving learning goals and objectives.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Conduct weekly walkthroughs and provide feedback that promotes reflection on current instructional practices, levels of student engagement, and student work being produced. The date range for this action step is 08/30/21-11/11/21.

Person Responsible	Tangela Goa (pr2351@dadeschools.net)

2. Hold weekly leadership team meetings to reflect on walkthroughs and plan for how best to meet the needs of students to increase achievement. The date range for this action step is 08/30/21-11/11/21.

Person Responsible	Tangela Goa (pr2351@dadeschools.net)

3. Monitor the implementation of instructional expectations. The date range for this action step is 08/30/21-11/11/21.

Person Responsible	Anailene Marban (amarban@dadeschools.net)

4. Share anecdotal feedback from walkthroughs with the faculty. The date range for this action step is 08/30/21-11/11/21.

Person Responsible	Reem Okab (reem.okab@dadeschools.net)

5. Solicit student work samples and reflect on feedback provided. The date range for this action step is 11/01/21-12/17/21.

Person Responsible	Tangela Goa (pr2351@dadeschools.net)

6. Continue to monitor functional literacy skills and student growth over time utilizing student writing samples. The date range for this action step is 11/01/21-12/17/21.

Person Responsible	Tangela Goa (pr2351@dadeschools.net)

7. Promote teacher reflection during walkthrough debriefs by having respond to the following: "What did you want students to learn from the lesson? and "How do you know they learned it?" The date range for this action step is 1/31/22-4/29/22.

Person Responsible	Anailene Marban (amarban@dadeschools.net)

8. Individualize note-taking for observation visits. The date range for this action step is 1/31/22-4/29/22.

Person Responsible	Anailene Marban (amarban@dadeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The leadership team will carefully monitor Early Warning Systems data during the upcoming school year to provide interventions to identified at-risk students. The Student Services department, our Hero Attendance Interventionist, and the administrative team will monitor EWS attendance data and contact families, conduct home visits, and provide referrals to support/ address needs of families that are impacting student attendance.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

Our strengths within school culture are in Resources and Support Systems. Students are supported through academic engagement, interventions and student services. We provide opportunities to motivate and actively engage students in learning. Activities such as Math Absorption where students partake in mathematics explorations outdoors, through hands-on physically activities, promote a joy for learning. Additionally, we support and build teacher capacity through professional development, weekly planning sessions, and guidance from an instructional coach. We encourage both teachers and students to analyze and reflect upon their practices, while acknowledging their efforts and celebrating their successes.

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

The stakeholders involved in promoting a positive school culture and environment are the leadership team comprised of the Principal, Assistant Principal, Instructional Coach, and Counselor. The Principal and Assistant Principal oversee and support schoolwide initiatives in an ongoing effort to better support the school community by building relationships with students, parents, and faculty. The Instructional Coach and Counselor assist in facilitating efforts that welcome and unite the school community. All school stakeholders take part in building relationships with the school community which includes students, parents, and families. Team building activities are incorporated into meetings and events to foster a positive school culture and environment.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning				$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$2,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			2351 - Eneida M. Hartner Elem. School	Other		$2,000.00
			Notes: Student Rewards & Incentives: The school will provide rewards and incentives for students to promote engagement.			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems				$1,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			2351 - Eneida M. Hartner Elem. School			$1,000.00
			Notes: Student Agendas: To support home learning and parental involvement, agendas will be purchased for students to note their homework assignments and for teachers to communicate with parents.			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Walkthroughs				$0.00
					Total:	$3,000.00