



---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>30</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>31</b> |

## Gertrude K. Edelman/Sabal Palm

17101 NE 7TH AVE, North Miami Beach, FL 33162

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

### Demographics

**Principal: Emrice Guerra**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/20/2021

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2020-21 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: A (63%)<br>2017-18: A (68%)<br>2016-17: B (60%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   |  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |  |

### School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>31</b> |

## Gertrude K. Edelman/Sabal Palm

17101 NE 7TH AVE, North Miami Beach, FL 33162

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

### School Demographics

|   |                               |   |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File) | <b>2020-21 Title I School</b> | <b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                               | Yes                           | 89%   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)          | <b>Charter School</b>         | <b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                                  | No                            | 99%   |

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a 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.**

It is our belief that a child-centered program creates an atmosphere in which children can develop academically, physically, socially, morally and emotionally to their fullest potential, in order to become contributing members of a technological and global society. Our primary needs continue to be academic and purpose-centered in nature.

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

Gertrude K. Edelman Sabal Palm Elementary school's vision is to empower students to become 21st century global learners and citizens. As a school of learners, we will: provide a safe environment conducive to learning, promote cultural respect as well as diversity and engagement in meaningful activities.

### 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  |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| Guerra, Emirce    | Principal           | The school principal is responsible for the overall academic success of all students, fiscal management of the school site, and the safety of all stakeholders. The principal shares the school's common vision with stakeholders, develops the school's improvement plan (SIP), and aligns the SIP with the legal financial and organizational structure of the school system. Furthermore, the principal ensures a positive school climate and school morale and encourages healthy and inclusive relationships among all stakeholders.  |
| Breedlove, Elaine | Assistant Principal | The assistant principal assists the principal by engaging the faculty in data analysis with a particular emphasis on academic progression to support the need for remediation and intervention. Together with the principal, the assistant principal collaborates and problem solves with the school leadership team to set goals for student learning. Additionally, the assistant principal helps to foster and create a positive learning environment for all stakeholders.   |
| Foreman, Susan    | Teacher, K-12       | As the Educational Excellence School Advisory Council (EESAC) chairperson, Ms. Forman works with the school principal to prepare the meeting agenda, is responsible for making sure that each meeting is planned appropriately and conducted by the constitution and bylaws of the EESAC. In performing the duties outlined above, Ms. Forman actively contributes to fair and open discussions of matters aligned to the school's common vision as outlined by the principal and leadership team so that decisions are made collaboratively with all stakeholders.  |
| Piper, Kareem     | Teacher, K-12       | As the school site data coach and learning management system (LMS) manager, Mr. Piper is responsible for working with the school site mathematics coach, reading coach, administrators, and teachers to assist them in aggregating, analyzing, and interpreting student data from I-Ready software and performance matters software to best inform student learning. Further, Mr. Piper is responsible for providing monthly data training to faculty and staff and presenting reports to school site administrators on various student data trends. Finally, Mr. Piper manages school-wide LMS "Schoolology" and provides faculty and staff with training on using LMS effectively. |
| Beltz, David      | Teacher, K-12       | As a teacher representative on the school's leadership team, Mr. Rolle is responsible for communicating the school's common vision as outlined by the school principal and the leadership to all grade-level teachers. Further, as a teacher representative, Mr. Rolle is responsible for communicating any grade level teacher issues hindering student learning to the leadership team.  |
| Manuel, Nicole    | Instructional Coach | Ms. Siegler assists with the coordination and implementation of the K–12 Comprehensive Research-based Reading Plan and Reading Intervention. Additionally, she attends training and disseminates the information with  |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|------|----------------|--|
|      |                | reading teachers through grade level common planning sessions, monitors I-Ready and unit test data points which result in data chats with teachers about students' academic progress. Furthermore, she shares information with parents and other stakeholders during a variety of meetings (EESAC, SST, Title 1, Parent, etc). |

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Tuesday 7/20/2021, Emrice Guerra

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

9

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

20

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

35

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

440

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

7

**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          | 65 | 80 | 68 | 72 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 440   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 8           | 7  | 19 | 13 | 11 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 75    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0  | 8  | 10 | 7  | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 31    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0  | 1  | 10 | 6  | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 34    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4     |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 2           | 4  | 31 | 27 | 24 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 119   |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 4 | 8 | 5 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 31    |

**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     | 1           | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |

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

Wednesday 6/30/2021

**2020-21 - As Reported**

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

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

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Students with two or more indicators |             |       |

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

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

**2020-21 - Updated**

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

| Indicator                                     | Grade Level |    |    |    |     |    |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |     |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|-----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-----|
|   | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4   | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12  |
| Number of students enrolled                   | 75          | 89 | 74 | 92 | 106 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 509 |
| Attendance below 90 percent                   | 7           | 19 | 12 | 14 | 15  | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 72  |
| One or more suspensions                       | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     |     |
| Course failure in ELA                         | 0           | 7  | 9  | 16 | 6   | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 42  |
| Course failure in Math                        | 0           | 1  | 9  | 11 | 17  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 42  |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7   | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 14  |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4   | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 16  |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |    |    |   |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |    |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|----|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12 |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 4 | 7 | 10 | 13 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 43 |

**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     | 1           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 2  |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 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 | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement            |        |          |       | 59%    | 62%      | 57%   | 60%    | 62%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 56%    | 62%      | 58%   | 64%    | 62%      | 55%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 48%    | 58%      | 53%   | 60%    | 59%      | 48%   |
| Math Achievement           |        |          |       | 73%    | 69%      | 63%   | 79%    | 69%      | 62%   |

| School Grade Component      | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       | 2018   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 77%    | 66%      | 62%   | 78%    | 64%      | 59%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 72%    | 55%      | 51%   | 80%    | 55%      | 47%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 58%    | 55%      | 53%   | 54%    | 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 | 45%    | 60%      | -15%                       | 58%   | -13%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 59%    | 64%      | -5%                        | 58%   | 1%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -45%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 58%    | 60%      | -2%                        | 56%   | 2%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -59%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 49%    | 67%      | -18%                       | 62%   | -13%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 73%    | 69%      | 4%                         | 64%   | 9%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -49%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 79%    | 65%      | 14%                        | 60%   | 19%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -73%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 55%    | 53%      | 2%                         | 53%   | 2%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

### Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

English Language Arts and Mathematics Progress Monitoring information is based on I-Ready AP 1, AP2, and AP3 information as documented on Power BI. 5th Grade Science progress monitoring is based on the Winter 2021 Mid-Year assessments as indicated on Power BI.

| <b>Grade 1</b>        |                            |       |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 42.5  | 52.98  | 62.83  |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 43.23 | 52.3   | 61.6   |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 15.65 | 13.5   | 25.23  |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 16.7  | 33.3   | 20     |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 35.31 | 36.68  | 53.3   |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 36.33 | 32.3   | 36.86  |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 12.3  | 9.7    | 23.33  |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 16.7  | 20     | 0      |
| <b>Grade 2</b>        |                            |       |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 27    | 50     | 60.9   |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 25.9  | 47.3   | 56.4   |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 0     | 0      | 0      |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0     | 0      | 0      |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 19.7  | 28.6   | 44.4   |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 21.2  | 25.9   | 37     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 0     | 0      | 0      |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0     | 0      | 0      |

| <b>Grade 3</b>        |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 40.7 | 50.0   | 61.0   |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 40.3 | 47.9   | 60.3   |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 22.2 | 10     | 30     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0    | 0      | 0      |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 15.4 | 25.9   | 36.4   |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 15.9 | 26.4   | 32.4   |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 11.1 | 10     | 20     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0    | 0      | 0      |

| <b>Grade 4</b>        |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 37.9 | 44.8   | 51.7   |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 37.5 | 43.8   | 48.8   |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 9.1  | 9.1    | 10     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0    | 0      | 0      |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 26.7 | 37.6   | 45.8   |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 39.2 | 46.1   | 37.7   |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 18.2 | 9.1    | 10     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0    | 0      | 0      |

| Grade 5               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 38.0 | 38.0   | 50     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 39.4 | 39.4   | 49.2   |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 0    | 21.4   | 35.7   |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0    | 0      | 0      |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 34.8 | 25.4   | 53.3   |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 37.7 | 27.4   | 56.1   |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 7.7  | 10     | 40     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0    | 0      | 0      |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science               | All Students               | 0    | 9.0    | 0      |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 0    | 10.0   | 0      |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 0    | 8.0    | 0      |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0    | 0      | 0      |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |

**Subgroup Data Review**

| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD                                       | 17       | 27     |             | 23        | 19      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 41       | 45     |             | 29        | 25      |              | 16       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 37       | 40     | 33          | 24        | 25      | 23           | 20       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 40       |        |             | 41        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 37       | 39     | 38          | 28        | 30      | 27           | 19       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD                                       | 29       | 55     | 55          | 48        | 70      | 58           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 56       | 55     | 43          | 73        | 73      | 63           | 51       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 85       | 64     |             | 92        | 82      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 54       | 54     | 49          | 70        | 75      | 74           | 53       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 70       | 59     |             | 81        | 84      | 70           | 75       |         |           |                   |                     |

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| FRL                                       | 59       | 57     | 49          | 73        | 78      | 73           | 58       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 53       | 80     |             | 74        | 80      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 60       | 72     | 70          | 71        | 76      | 76           | 38       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 69       | 64     |             | 92        | 82      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 59       | 65     | 62          | 78        | 80      | 83           | 56       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 61       | 58     |             | 78        | 70      |              | 44       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 60       | 64     | 60          | 79        | 78      | 80           | 54       |         |           |                   |                     |

### 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  | 33  |
| 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 | 55  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 263 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8   |
| Percent Tested  | 90% |
| Subgroup Data   |     |
| Students With Disabilities  |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 17  |
| 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                                       | 35  |
| 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   |     |
|--|-----|
| 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                                    | 32  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?            | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%     |     |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 44  |
| 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                                | 34  |
| 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 data findings:

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

All ELA Subgroups Achievement decreased by 2 percentage points.

All ELA Subgroups learning Gains decreased.

All ELA Subgroups learning Gains L25 decreased.

All Math Subgroups overall Learning Gains and Learning Gains L25 decreased across all grade levels.

Science Subgroups Achievement levels decreased.

2021 data findings:

The school grade components show a decrease in the Achievement Gap for both Math and ELA.

Math learning gains decreased from 77% in 2019 to 28% in 2021, and ELA learning gains decreased from 56% in 2019 to 37% in 2021.

Both ELAL25 and MathL25 decreased from 2019 to 2021. ELAL25 decreased from 48% in 2019 to 33% in 2021, and MathL25 decreased from 77% in 2019 to 24% in 2021.

Science also showed a decrease from 58% in 2019 to 18% in 2021.

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

2019 data findings:

The majority of ELA Subgroups Learning Gains decreased. Students who were English Language Learners (ELL) were the lowest with 38 percentage points.

2021 data findings:

Based on the comparative data in the School Grade Components Report, Math Learning Gains decreased by 49% percentage points from 2019 to 2021. By comparison to the other indicators in the School Grade Components Report, Math Learning Gains displayed the most significant decrease and thus had the greatest need for improvement.

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

2019 data findings:

For the last 3 years, we have been focusing on implementing standards-based instruction in all classrooms. The leadership team has focused on collaborative planning, data driven instruction and differentiated instruction across all grade levels. We will continue to incorporate new development opportunities per grade level and content area to unwrap the standards and align appropriate resources and instructional activities. In addition, collaborative planning will support these efforts and will incorporate a greater focus on the standards and standards based resources provided by the district.

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

2019 data findings:

Science learning Gains increased by 4 percentage points from 2018 to 2019.

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

2019 data findings:

We created a collaborative planning schedule that allowed time to plan for DI. Adminsitrators will now attend weekly collaborative planning sessions and contribute to conversations with individual grade levels to carefully align resources.

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

2019 data findings:

Data-driven instruction, Differentiated Instruction, Extended Learning Opportunities, Standards-Based Collaborative Planning, Interventions-RTI.

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

The professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders are professional development sessions that focus on mitigating learning loss based on Spring 2021 FSA Math/SAT-10 data results. Furthermore, the PLST will develop whole group sessions and job embedded sessions using data to drive instruction (September/21), Aligning resources to small group instruction (October/21) employing OPM data (November and December/ 21), making adjustments to groups as data becomes available (2/21) and continuous data chats with individual feedback and next steps (ongoing).

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

Collaborative Planning will be scheduled weekly and a member of the leadership team will attend to ensure fidelity to the strategies being implemented school wide that are aligned to the goals. Extended learning opportunities will be provided before and after school tutoring as well as Saturday academies.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** GKE Sabal Palm will focus on monitoring and analyzing Early Warning Systems. Upon review of the 2021 School Climate Survey, only 12 percent of the faculty responded that students come to school prepared to learn. Specifically, the area of Digital Citizenship was discussed as it relates to student access and use of technology within the classroom and at home.

**Measurable Outcome:** By May of 2022, faculty will engage in a minimum of 8 team activities, presented during monthly faculty meetings, designed to promote student readiness to learn. The positive impact on student achievement, from these team building activities, will be measured by monitoring student usage and passing rate in the i-Ready program. We expect 70 percent of students to complete a minimum of 45 minutes per week in both reading and math, while maintaining a passing rate of at least 75 percent.

**Monitoring:** This area of focus will be consistently monitored by accessing specific i-Ready reports. Each week the usage and passing rate reports, for both reading and math, will be reviewed and shared with staff.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Kareem Piper (320504@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Digital Citizenship refers to having the knowledge and skills to effectively use digital technologies to communicate with others, participate in society and create and consume digital content. Providing the parameters of digital citizenship helps teachers, leaders, and parents understand what students should know about technology appropriately. Digital Citizenship is a way to prepare students to think critically, behave safely, and participate responsibly in our digital world.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** By giving instruction in Digital Citizenship, we will be empowering our students to be successful in their utilization of technology. This will help prepare them for further educational endeavors and the world of work. Digital Citizenship will provide them with skills needed to augment student learning, problem-solving skills, and working cooperatively with others as 21st-century learners.

**Action Steps to Implement**

The action steps that will be taken to monitor Digital Citizenship will be as follows:

9/13 - 10/11 1. Run usage and passing reports for reading and math each Monday (after completion of the Diagnostic)

9/13 - 10/11 2. Report information to faculty digitally

9/14 - 10/8 3. Teachers will conduct data chats with students

9/9 - 10/6 4. Provide appropriate faculty training on technology usage

**Person Responsible** Elaine Breedlove (elaine@dadeschools.net)

10/26 - 10/28 5. The Leadership Team will conduct data chats with each grade level, for both reading and math. During these chats, the team will provide an overview the data for each grade level. After that, teachers will be charged with the responsibility of discussing their data and completing a debriefing protocol. This will ensure teachers have an awareness of their students' strengths, as well as their needs.

**Person Responsible** Elaine Breedlove (elaine@dadeschools.net)

11/1 - 12/17 6. Teachers will develop and implement a plan of action that addresses their students' needs based on the information discussed during the data chats. While typically the focus is on struggling

students, teachers will also provide enrichment activities for students who are performing at or above grade level.

**Person Responsible** Elaine Breedlove (elaine@dadeschools.net)

1/31-4/29

7. Develop a plan to provide incentives to students, achieving the necessary passing and usage rates, more frequently. Some students need gratification and validation for their efforts more often than others. Hopefully, all students will be encouraged to meet their weekly i-Ready goals.

**Person Responsible** Elaine Breedlove (elaine@dadeschools.net)

1/31 - 4/29

8. Conduct weekly data chats with those students not meeting their goals. This will assist us in understanding any barriers students are facing with meeting the requirements.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Manuel (nmanuel@dadeschools.net)

## #2. Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Based on the School Climate Survey results, we plan to target "Promoting the Morale and Performance of the Team". Many staff members indicated feeling frequently overwhelmed and that staff morale was low. We want to continue working on team building activities, as well as providing incentives and positive reinforcement, so that teachers feel supported and valued. Team building activities may also be used to build positive classroom culture, which will have a positive impact on student performance.

**Measurable Outcome:** If we successfully strengthen our staff's ability to work as a team, with a concentrated focus on student achievement, we will reduce the percentage of staff members who feel overwhelmed from 35% to 25% or less during the 2021-2022 school year.

**Monitoring:** The Leadership Team will identify staff members with specialized knowledge (such as: technology, classroom management, data analysis) to pair up with teachers who could benefit from assistance in a particular area. These teacher leaders will provide support and professional development to their colleagues. These teacher leader/colleague teams will share the knowledge they have gained during faculty meetings. We will also continue the practice of incorporating team building activities, during these meetings. The teacher leaders will keep a record of the support provided and submit this report to the Leadership Team each month

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Nicole Manuel (nmanuel@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** We will focus on the evidence-based strategy of Providing Personal Instruction. The identified teacher leaders will provide assistance to colleagues, based on their area of need. The goal being for leaders to model behaviors and strategies in their areas of expertise, so that their colleagues will be empowered to implement their newly acquired skills when instructing their students.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Encouraging staff members to share their expertise and work together as a team, will increase our effectiveness as we implement the school's vision and mission. Working together as a cohesive unit will improve our ability to celebrate our successes and work through our problems and challenges.

### Action Steps to Implement

- 9/8 1. Survey teacher professional development needs during faculty meeting
- 9/11 2. Identify teacher leaders who can meet these needs during Leadership Team meeting
- 9/13 3. Pair up teacher leaders with colleagues requesting assistance
- 9/30 4. Teacher leaders will submit documentation regarding assistance to administrators

**Person Responsible** Elaine Breedlove (elaine@dadeschools.net)

11/1 - 12/17 5. During common planning sessions with instructional coaches, teachers will share their experiences with giving and/or receiving assistance from colleagues. The intent is to encourage teachers to seek out assistance with areas they would like to improve, without them having feelings of inadequacies. This practice will also develop leadership qualities in those teachers who are mentoring colleagues.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Manuel (nmanuel@dadeschools.net)

11/1 - 12/17 6. During common planning sessions with instructional coaches, teachers will have an opportunity to discuss Schoology components. There have been so many challenges recently (i.e. COVID-19, technology, new programs, etc), so teachers need support as they grapple with Schoology and the fact that it will be mandatory next school year.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Manuel (nmanuel@dadeschools.net)

1/31 - 4/29

7. Common planning sessions will serve as one venue whereby teachers can share their expertise and resources with colleagues.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Manuel (nmanuel@dadeschools.net)

1/31 - 4/29

8. Administrators will recognize teachers who use the opportunity to glean knowledge from their colleagues, as well as those who share their expertise and resources.

**Person Responsible** Elaine Breedlove (elaine@dadeschools.net)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Based on the review of our school data, we will implement the practice Differentiated Instruction to ensure the instructional needs of all students are addressed. We selected this area since 59% of students in 4th grade achieved proficiency on the 2019 FSA ELA, as compared to 34% in 2021, which was a decrease of 25 percentage points. Similarly, 58% of 5th grade students achieved proficiency in 2019, as compared to 34% in 2021, which was a decrease of 24 percentage points.

In order to address the needs of all learners, data must be reviewed and analyzed monthly. This will improve our ability to determine specific needs that should be addressed during differentiated instruction. By focusing our attention on specific student needs, we will provide the instruction needed to have a higher percentage of students make learning gains and move towards achieving levels of proficiency

**Measurable Outcome:**

If we are successful in our implementation of Differentiated Instruction, then the number of 4th and 5th grade students achieving proficiency on the 2022 FSA ELA will increase by at least 8 percentage points.

**Monitoring:**

Administrators will conduct quarterly data chats with teachers. Based on these discussions, teachers will adjust their student groups and determine areas that need to be focused on during reading/language arts instruction. Formative assessments will be reviewed monthly to determine levels of progress. Administrators will review lesson plans bi-weekly for evidence of the skills being instructed during differentiated instruction. Students not demonstrating adequate progress will be provided with extended learning opportunities. After each reading assessment, teachers will debrief the questions with students in small groups. Focus will be on questions that proved to be the most challenging for students. Teachers will also conduct monthly data chats with their students to apprise them of their levels of progress. Teachers and students will maintain data trackers to guide their data chats and assist them in instructional planning. This information will also be shared with the Reading Coach during grade level common planning meetings.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Nicole Manuel (nmanuel@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Within the targeted element of Differentiated Instruction, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of Reciprocal Teaching. This strategy combines components of the Gradual Release Model (teacher modeling, guided practice, independent practice) with the highly effective comprehension strategies of predicting, questioning, clarifying and summarizing. In addition to these being skills students need to become efficient at comprehending complex text, they give students the opportunity to be actively engaged in learning.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Throughout several research studies, reciprocal teaching has proven to be a highly effective strategy for improving reading comprehension, particularly with struggling readers. Students participating in reciprocal teaching techniques made greater gains in reading comprehension, than those using more traditional approaches. By combining the use of reciprocal teaching strategies with frequent analysis of assessment data, teachers may make adjustments to their student groups, lesson plans and instructional techniques. This attention to new data points, will ensure that teachers are addressing individual student needs

## Action Steps to Implement

8/31 - 10/11 - During grade level common planning sessions for ELA teachers, data from multiple data sources such as FSA ELA, i-Ready and Performance Matters will be revisited to determine specific areas where students need more intensive small group instruction. Teachers will develop classroom procedures that are conducive to small group instruction, such as rotation charts, student folders, and adequate spacing. In addition, the Reading Coach will disseminate information pertaining to reciprocal teaching techniques.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Manuel (nmanuel@dadeschools.net)

8/31 -10/11 - Teachers will show evidence of differentiated instruction within their lesson plans. The plans will indicate appropriate resources and activities for providing meaningful differentiated instruction.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Manuel (nmanuel@dadeschools.net)

8/31 - 10/11 - Bi-weekly collaborative planning meetings, with instructional coaches, will enable teachers to collaborate, brainstorm challenges, analyze data and share best practices. Teachers will lead these discussions by sharing examples of reciprocal teaching, modeling instructional strategies and utilizing data to improve student achievement.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Manuel (nmanuel@dadeschools.net)

8/31 - 10/11 - Teachers will use data trackers to monitor student progress on a variety of assessments. This will assist them in making adjustments for small group instruction.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Manuel (nmanuel@dadeschools.net)

11/1 - 12/17 - The Reading Coach, who is also the school's "Dyslexpert" will use part of the common planning session to disseminate information gleaned from the District's Dyslexia Summit. During to learning loss sparked by pivoting from online to physical learning, many students, although not dyslexic, are struggling with reading. Strategies that are designed to assist dyslexic students, incorporate multiple modalities, and can also be used successfully with other students. Sharing information will increase the instructional strategies available to teachers, thus leading to improved student performance on reading assessments and tasks.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Manuel (nmanuel@dadeschools.net)

11/1 - 12/17 - Teachers who attend grade level ICAD sessions for reading will have an opportunity to share pertinent content with their colleagues and the coach. Not only will this practice provide all teachers with essential reading information, it will empower the teachers attending ICAD sessions to become more comfortable in leadership roles.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Manuel (nmanuel@dadeschools.net)

1/31 - 4/29

Increase the frequency of common planning with the reading coach from bi-weekly to weekly. This will assist with focusing on the most current student data.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Manuel (nmanuel@dadeschools.net)

1/31 - 4/29

The Leadership Team will conduct learning walks to gain further insight into instructional strategies being used, as well as student engagement.



**Person Responsible** Elaine Breedlove (elaine@dadeschools.net)

1/31 - 4/29

Teachers will bring student work samples, as well as current data, to these meetings. Reviewing student work samples from different classrooms will provide the opportunity to spot trends and discuss strategies.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Manuel (nmanuel@dadeschools.net)

**#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** After reviewing the data from last year's FSA Math Assessment, we will implement Instructional Support/Coaching. We selected this area since our results indicated that the percentage of 4th grade students attaining proficiency levels on the FSA Math was 73% in 2019, compared to 27% in 2021, which was a decrease of 46 percentage points. Similarly, 79% of 5th grade students achieved proficiency in 2019, while only 37% did in 2021, which was a decrease of 42 percentage points. As a result, we were allocated a Math Coach position. The Math Coach will assist the teachers in developing measurable goals, while increasing the achievement and engagement levels of students. The Coach will provide both student-centered and teacher-centered strategies to assist teachers in making instructional decisions. We will provide the instruction needed to have a higher percentage of students make learning gains and move towards achieving levels of proficiency in math.

**Measurable Outcome:** If we are successful in our implementation of Instructional Support/Coaching, then our 4th and 5th grade students will show an increase of at least 10 percentage points on their performance on the 2022 FSA Math Assessment.

**Monitoring:** The Math Coach will conduct bi-weekly planning sessions with math teachers. The Coach will provide resources and strategies to be use during math instruction. There will also be time allotted for teachers to share their challenges and best practices. Data will be gathered from a variety of sources, including topic assessments, classroom quizzes, chapter tests, to determine student progress. Students who are not demonstrating adequate progress will be provided with extended learning opportunities.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Elaine Breedlove (elaine@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Within the targeted element of Instructional Support/Coaching, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM). This strategy will provide a systematic approach to gathering data points to ascertain students' needs. Teachers will conduct monthly data chats with their students to apprise them of their levels of progress. Teachers and students will maintain trackers to guide their data chats and assist them in instructional planning.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** By consistently gathering, reviewing, and analyzing data, teachers will continually make adjustments to their student groups, lesson plans and instructional techniques. This attention to new data points, will ensure that teachers are addressing individual student needs

**Action Steps to Implement**

8/31 - 10/11 - During grade level common planning sessions for math teachers, data from FSA Math will be revisited to determine specific areas where students need more intensive instruction. The Math Coach will create and share an Instructional Focus Calendar for Math.

**Person Responsible** Elaine Breedlove (elaine@dadeschools.net)

8/31 -10/11 - Teachers will show evidence of concepts on the Instructional Focus Calendar within their lesson plans. The plans will indicate appropriate resources and activities for providing meaningful differentiated instruction.

**Person Responsible** Elaine Breedlove (elaine@dadeschools.net)

8/31 - 10/11 - Bi-weekly collaborative planning meetings, with instructional coaches, will enable teachers to collaborate, brainstorm challenges, and share best practices. Teachers will take turns leading these discussions and modeling strategies.

**Person Responsible** Elaine Breedlove (elaine@dadeschools.net)

8/31 - 10/11 - Teachers will use data trackers to monitor student progress on a variety of assessments. This will assist them in making adjustments for both whole class and small group instruction.

**Person Responsible** Elaine Breedlove (elaine@dadeschools.net)

11/1 - 12/17 - During common planning sessions, the Math Coach will assist teachers in identifying and analyzing math data from a variety of sources (i.e. i-Ready, IXL, Performance Matters, etc.), to identify skills that need to be targeted. The deeper understanding and ownership that teachers have regarding their data, the better equipped they will be to plan and deliver instruction that will address student needs.

**Person Responsible** Elaine Breedlove (elaine@dadeschools.net)

11/1 - 12/17 - Math teachers and the Instructional Coach will continue to research and implement additional instructional strategies to enhance students' academic performance. Being familiar with a wide variety of instructional approaches will assist teachers in delivering a highly effective level of instruction through multiple modalities.

**Person Responsible** Elaine Breedlove (elaine@dadeschools.net)

1/31 - 4/29

The Math Coach will meet with teachers each week for common planning, as opposed to bi-weekly. This will enable her to determine if instructional pacing is on target.

**Person Responsible** Elaine Breedlove (elaine@dadeschools.net)

1/31 - 4/29

Every Wednesday will be set aside as Data Driven Instruction Day for math teachers. Teachers will conduct small group instruction to focus on areas requiring additional practice.

**Person Responsible** Elaine Breedlove (elaine@dadeschools.net)

**#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Based on the review of our school data, we will also implement the use of multi-modal strategies to improve students' reading comprehension. We selected this area since 59% of students in 4th grade achieved proficiency on the 2019 FSA ELA, as compared to 34% in 2021, which was a decrease of 25 percentage points. Similarly, 58% of 5th grade students achieved proficiency in 2019, as compared to 34% in 2021, which was a decrease of 24 percentage points. By providing the instructional staff with information and techniques to address students who are struggling readers, we expect to see more students make learning gains.

**Measurable Outcome:**

By incorporating multi-modal strategies in our reading instruction we expect to see the number of 4th and 5th grade students achieving proficiency on the 2022 FSA ELA will increase by at least 8 percentage points.

**Monitoring:**

During the bi-weekly common planning sessions, the Reading Coach will share strategies that incorporate a variety of modalities. Opportunities will be given for teachers to practice these strategies with the Coach and their colleagues. Teachers will then be expected to use these strategies with students and share their experiences during subsequent planning sessions.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Nicole Manuel (nmanuel@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

The use of strategies that address various learning modalities is beneficial to all students, but is essential for those struggling readers, some of whom may be displaying symptoms of dyslexia. These strategies help improve students' ability to make associations between the spoken and printed word. The stronger the connections are between oral and written language, the better fluency. All these components are crucial to developing effective reading comprehension. In addition to these being skills students need to become efficient at comprehending complex text, they give students the opportunity to be actively engaged in learning.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Throughout several research studies, instruction targeting multiple modalities has proven to be a highly effective strategy for improving reading comprehension, particularly with struggling readers. Students participating in multi-modal techniques make stronger connections between spoken and printed language than students instructed with lectures. By incorporating multi-modal strategies with frequent analysis of informal and formal data, teachers should expect to see improvement in students' reading fluency and comprehension.

**Action Steps to Implement**

8/31 - 10/11 - During grade level common planning sessions for ELA teachers, the Reading Coach will share instructional strategies that focus on maintaining student engagement. Teachers will then be expected to select specific strategies, based on their students' needs, to implement in the classroom.

**Person Responsible**

Nicole Manuel (nmanuel@dadeschools.net)

8/31 -10/11 - During class walk-throughs, administrators will observe student levels of engagement during reading instruction.

**Person Responsible**

Elaine Breedlove (elaine@dadeschools.net)

8/31 - 10/11 - Bi-weekly collaborative planning meetings, will shift focus by having the teachers lead the discussion, while coaches facilitate. These discussions will include: successes, challenges, and new ideas to promote improvement of students' academic progress in reading fluency and comprehension.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Manuel (nmanuel@dadeschools.net)

8/31 - 10/11 - Students in grades 2-5 will be responsible for maintaining individual data trackers, while teachers and leadership team will monitor class and school data. Teachers will conduct monthly data chats with students to ensure they are on track.

**Person Responsible** Elaine Breedlove (elaine@dadeschools.net)

11/1 - 12/17 - The Reading Coach will share information on multi-modal strategies during common planning sessions. Teachers will have a risk-free setting whereby they may practice using new strategies with colleagues prior to implementing them with students. The use of these strategies, combined with reciprocal teaching, is expected to lead to improving students' performance in reading fluency, as well as comprehension.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Manuel (nmanuel@dadeschools.net)

11/1 - 12/17 - The administrators will observe teachers' use of multi-modal techniques by conducting weekly classroom walk-throughs, as well as formal observations. Additionally, quarterly data chats will be conducted with each grade level, to monitor student progress.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Manuel (nmanuel@dadeschools.net)

1/31 - 4/29

During bi-weekly learning walks, conducted by the Leadership Team, evidence of the incorporation of multi-modal strategies will be observed. Multi-modal strategies are beneficial for all students, but essential for those with learning disabilities.

**Person Responsible** Elaine Breedlove (elaine@dadeschools.net)

1/31 - 4/29

The Reading Coach will use a portion of each common planning sessions to debrief the findings gathered from the aforementioned learning walks. This will ensure teachers are aware of findings and any adjustments that need to be made.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Manuel (nmanuel@dadeschools.net)

## Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**The social and emotional needs of students need to be addressed to help them achieve academic success. Students need to display understanding and empathy toward one another as they develop and maintain positive relationships. The Guidance Counselor will implement weekly and/or monthly Restorative Justice Practices and Mindfulness Activities to promote positive behavior within the school environment. She will also provide resources to classroom teachers that address Social and Emotional Learning. In addition, the Leadership Team will monitor the EWI Data provided in Powerbi to determine if the number of discipline referrals are decreasing as apart of this implementation plan. This will be an integral component toward improving school culture.**

#### **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.**

Ensuring that there is a consistent, open, and inclusive dialogue that engages feedback from all stakeholders to support the academic and social needs of the students, faculty, and staff within an inclusive and supportive environment. As the Superintendent stated, "We must start with the Heart". By addressing Social and Emotional Learning skills, all stakeholders can benefit from the ability to understand and manage emotions, set and achieve goals, feel empathy for others, make responsible decisions, and maintain positive relationships. Our school starts each day with a "Mindfulness Moment". This sets a positive tone for the day that guides us throughout our interactions with one another. The Guidance Counselor also provides staff with a variety of Restorative Justice Practices to implement with students. We realize that if we do not meet the social and emotional needs of students, it will be difficult for them to experience academic successes.

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

The Leadership Team plays a vital role in promoting a positive school culture and environment. The Principal monitors the implementation of school initiatives, as well as planning team building exercises and being our main cheerleader for morale. The Assistant Principal assists in disseminating pertinent information, particularly regarding students' academic and behavior needs, to all stakeholders in a timely manner. The Guidance Counselor is responsible for providing assistance with the implementation of

Restorative Justice Practices, Mindfulness, and other services regarding Social and Emotional Learning. Teacher Leaders and Instructional Coaches provide teachers with the support they need to ensure the needs of all students are addressed.

## Part V: Budget

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

|               |        |  |               |
|---------------|--------|--|---------------|
| 1             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems   | \$0.00        |
| 2             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Leadership: Leadership Development             | \$0.00        |
| 3             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA                    | \$0.00        |
| 4             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Instructional Coaching | \$0.00        |
| 5             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA                    | \$0.00        |
| <b>Total:</b> |        |  | <b>\$0.00</b> |