

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Frank Crawford Martin K 8 Center



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	22
Positive Culture & Environment	31
Budget to Support Goals	31

Frank Crawford Martin K 8 Center

14250 BOGGS DR, Miami, FL 33176

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

Demographics

Principal: Elianeys Basulto

Start Date for this Principal: 7/19/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	91%
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: A (65%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	22
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	31

Frank Crawford Martin K 8 Center

14250 BOGGS DR, Miami, FL 33176

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School PK-8</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>76%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>97%</p>

School Grades History

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

All stakeholders are committed to the advancement of students' academic, emotional, social and physical well being within a supportive, creative and flexible environment in which children learn to think globally and act compassionately.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Frank C. Martin International K-8 Center provides students with an internationally recognized curriculum. This challenging curriculum incorporates world-class standards that empower students to actively participate in the learning process and acquire and exhibit positive attitudes. Students strive to become model citizens of our diverse world.

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
Basulto, Elianeys	Principal	Oversee all aspects of the school curriculum. Guides the leadership team in curricular decisions and areas of focus. Leads school leader instructional walk throughs and identifies areas of need for the teachers and students. Leads data discussions and assist teachers develop strategies to address the needs of the learners.
Zaldua, Nicole	Assistant Principal	Supports the principal in all aspects of curriculum. Conducts walkthroughs with the leadership team to help identify areas of academic need. Assists the principal develop strategies to address learner needs and provide guidance to teachers.
Capodiferro, Katheryn	Magnet Coordinator	Supports the administrative team with all aspects of the International Baccalaureate Curriculum. Works with the leadership team in supporting teachers with instructional strategies and the development of cross curricular IB Unit Planners.
Hasboun-Dupuy, Alexandra	School Counselor	Supports the administrative team with the MTSS process and all Social and Emotional Learning of the students.
Hoel, Robert	Assistant Principal	Supports the principal in all aspects of curriculum. Conducts walkthroughs with the leadership team to help identify areas of academic need. Assists the principal develop strategies to address learner needs and provide guidance to teachers.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/19/2021, Elianeys Basulto

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.*

24

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.*

54

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

54

Total number of students enrolled at the school

798

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

8

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

2

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	53	67	89	91	81	101	91	95	112	0	0	0	0	780
Attendance below 90 percent	10	5	8	5	7	6	5	14	9	0	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	1	8	5	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	2	8	6	2	3	15	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	3	0	0	0	0	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	4	6	24	21	23	14	25	41	29	0	0	0	0	187

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	5	1	1	1	8	7	2	9	8	0	0	0	0	42

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	8	2	0	0	7	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	23
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	53	67	89	91	81	101	91	95	112	0	0	0	0	780
Attendance below 90 percent	10	5	8	5	7	6	5	14	9	0	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	1	8	5	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	2	8	6	2	3	15	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	3	0	0	0	0	19

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	5	1	1	1	8	7	2	9	8	0	0	0	0	42

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	8	2	0	0	7	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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				75%	63%	61%	77%	62%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				58%	61%	59%	64%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	57%	54%	56%	57%	52%
Math Achievement				71%	67%	62%	72%	65%	61%
Math Learning Gains				60%	63%	59%	62%	61%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	56%	52%	54%	55%	52%
Science Achievement				68%	56%	56%	64%	57%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				79%	80%	78%	83%	79%	77%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	79%	60%	19%	58%	21%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	81%	64%	17%	58%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
05	2021					
	2019	85%	60%	25%	56%	29%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
06	2021					
	2019	67%	58%	9%	54%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				
07	2021					
	2019	68%	56%	12%	52%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
08	2021					
	2019	72%	60%	12%	56%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	76%	67%	9%	62%	14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	80%	69%	11%	64%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2021					
	2019	90%	65%	25%	60%	30%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
06	2021					
	2019	44%	58%	-14%	55%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-90%				
07	2021					
	2019	55%	53%	2%	54%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
08	2021					
	2019	33%	40%	-7%	46%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	75%	53%	22%	53%	22%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	46%	43%	3%	48%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	93%	68%	25%	67%	26%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	79%	73%	6%	71%	8%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	96%	63%	33%	61%	35%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	89%	54%	35%	57%	32%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Grade K-8 will participate in the iReady Diagnostic assessment 3 times per year. Grade 5 & 8 students will participate in Baseline and Mid-Year Science assessments during August and January. Grade 7 students will participate in Civics Mid-Year Assessments in January.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	50.0	60.2	70.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	51.6	60.3	71.9
	Students With Disabilities	na	na	na
	English Language Learners	na	na	na
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	36.1	43.4	48.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	33.3	41.3	45.3
	Students With Disabilities	na	na	na
	English Language Learners	na	na	na

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	52.4	61.9	76.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	46.9	57.8	73.4
	Students With Disabilities	na	na	na
	English Language Learners	na	na	na
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	27.4	53.6	60.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	26.6	53.1	57.8
	Students With Disabilities	na	na	na
	English Language Learners	na	na	na
	Grade 3			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	50.0%	51.8%	66.3%
	Economically Disadvantaged	43.1%	43.7%	61.1%
	Students With Disabilities	na	na	na
	English Language Learners	na	na	na
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	20.5	34.9	46.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	18.8	29.2	38.9
	Students With Disabilities	na	na	na
	English Language Learners	na	na	na

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	44.6	58.7	61.9
	Economically Disadvantaged	37.7	51.4	59.0
	Students With Disabilities	16.7	33.3	33.3
	English Language Learners	na	na	na
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	29.7	52.0	57.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	23.5	45.7	52.5
	Students With Disabilities	16.7	16.7	16.7
	English Language Learners	na	na	na
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	50.5	55.3	47.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	43.5	51.5	45.9
	Students With Disabilities	na	na	na
	English Language Learners	na	na	na
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	31.6	52.2	52.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	27.5	42.4	49.2
	Students With Disabilities	na	na	na
	English Language Learners	na	na	na
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	na	24	na
	Economically Disadvantaged	na	24	na
	Students With Disabilities	na	na	na
	English Language Learners	na	na	na
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	56.8	54.4	50.0
	Economically Disadvantaged	55.8	53.7	42.5
	Students With Disabilities	22.2	33.3	50.0
	English Language Learners	na	na	na
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	46.5	51.1	46.0
	Economically Disadvantaged	44.2	48.1	41.2
	Students With Disabilities	42.9	44.4	33.3
	English Language Learners	na	na	na
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	59.8	58.7	61.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	56.7	54.3	59.2
	Students With Disabilities	na	na	na
	English Language Learners	na	na	na
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	42.	45.7	47.9
	Economically Disadvantaged	36.9	4.3	43.5
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	na	55	na
	Economically Disadvantaged	na	51	na
	Students With Disabilities	na	na	na
	English Language Learners	na	na	na
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	45.6	54.0	50.0
	Economically Disadvantaged	43.5	47.7	49.4
	Students With Disabilities	na	na	na
	English Language Learners	na	na	na
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	34.9	43.2	45.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	31.0	37.9	44.3
	Students With Disabilities	na	na	na
	English Language Learners	na	na	na
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	na	30.0	na
	Economically Disadvantaged	na	29.0	na
	Students With Disabilities	na	na	na
	English Language Learners	na	na	na
	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	27	41	42	22	12	20					
ELL	45	54	50	45	18		38	30			
ASN	87	67		73	42						
BLK	58	53	42	40	28	28	40	60	70		
HSP	65	53	37	49	20	9	52	68	66		
MUL	60	40		53	20						
WHT	83	52		91	45		82				
FRL	55	50	38	39	24	21	39	59	64		
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	42	41	30	58	71						
ELL	77	64	60	71	68		54				

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
ASN	100	74		86	63						
BLK	70	52	39	65	56	49	61	66	75		
HSP	81	64	53	76	64	63	75	94	96		
MUL	71	59		63	57						
WHT	95	66		95	72		91	91	100		
FRL	70	55	40	66	57	54	61	72	83		

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	61	56	40	57	67	50					
ELL	65	75		85	88						
ASN	89	76		96	60		75				
BLK	71	63	50	66	59	53	57	77	68		
HSP	81	67	69	78	69	55	72	89	86		
MUL	85	57		67	35						
WHT	93	56		88	61		91		100		
FRL	72	63	54	68	62	54	58	80	74		

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	83
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	518
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
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	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	67
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	43
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	71
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	47
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

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

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

2019 data findings:

According to the 2019 ELA FSA , all reported grade levels scored above the district averages. The greatest concern was the Bottom Quartile students with only a 43% learning gain across all grade levels. According to the 2019 Math FSA Grades 3-5 and grade 7 grade levels performed above the district average in achievement level 3-5. 6th grade math students performed 14 percentage points below the district average with 44% scoring Level 3 and above and 8th Grade scored 7 percentage points below the District average with 33% scoring Level 3 and above.

2021 data findings:

Data Across in ELA and Math dropped across the board. According to the 2021 ELA FSA, 62% of the students in Grades 3-8 earned a level 3 and above as compared to 75% in 2019, a decrease of 13%. Students earning a learning gain dropped from 58% in 2019 to 53% in 2021. The bottom quartile students also decreased in learning gains from 43% in 2019 to 39% in 2021. According to the 2021 Math FSA , students scoring Level 3 and above decreased in all tested grade levels. The 8th grade students who started with a 44 percent pass rate on the 2019 FSA earned a 28 percent pass rate on the 8th grade math assessment. The 5th Grade cohort that scored an 80% pas rate on the 2019 FSA Math Assessment, had a 46% pass rate on the 2021 FSA Math. Assessment.

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

2019 data findings:

The data indicates that middle school math, in particular, 6th grade math, needs addressed. Only 44% of the students passed the 6th grade math assessment which is 14 percentage points below the district average. The 8th grade math indicates a 33% achievement rate and 7 percentage points below the district average. The progress monitoring data indicated a slight drop of proficient students in the 6th grade from 46.5% to 46.0%

2021 data findings:

According to the progress monitoring that occurred during the 2020-2021 school year, Grade 6 students proficiency rates in indicated 46.5% in the Fall and then 46% in the spring, a .5% decrease from the beginning of the school year to the end. This data indicates that students progressed very little from the beginning of the school year.

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:

During teacher data chats, students in need were identified and a general strategy to address the needs of the learners through bell ringers or reteach opportunities during the instructional block. We

will need to develop more individualized instructions utilizing the district resources that scaffold concepts to meet grade level standards.

2021 data findings:

The decline in math scores across all grade levels data support the need for greater need for differentiated instruction and strategic use of programmatic resources. Teachers need to consistently monitor student data and adjust the instruction accordingly.

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

2019 data findings:

In comparing the 2018 FSA Math data to 2019 Math FSA data, the overall Math scores dropped by 1% from 2018 to 2019. However, a closer look reveals that Grade 3 had a 76% proficiency rate, 4th Grade has an 80% proficiency rate, and 5th Grade had a 90% proficiency rate.

2021 data findings:

According to growth monitoring data, Grades 3, 4 and 5 continued to demonstrate growth from AP1 to AP3. Grade 3 reported a 26% increase, Grade 4 reported a 27.4% increase, and Grade 5 reported a 20.5% increase in overall math proficiency.

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

2019 data findings:

Grades 3-5 schedules includes a common planning time for all members of the grade level. The common planning times allow teachers to develop solutions to curricular issues and assist the team members to develop strategies to address student needs. Grade 3-5 teachers schedule contains intervention time in addition to the regular class time for differentiated instruction. Administrators will develop a consistent time for Grade 6-8 students to receive differentiated instruction.

2021 Data Findings:

Grade 3-5 teachers utilized the iReady platform for home learning assignments as well as to assigned specific lessons to students. Any student that received intervention also participated in the growth monitoring assessments to track progress toward goals.

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

A greater emphasis will be place on Data Driven Instruction and Differentiated Instruction for all grade levels. The instructional staff members will utilize all district provided resources including District created topic assessments, District Mid-Year Assessments, and iReady Diagnostic Assessments to make instructional decisions for their students.

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

Teachers assigned as subject area liaisons will participate in monthly district meetings, then provide teachers with information either through email distribution or live during a faculty meeting. Support for iReady will be provided to teachers new to Miami Dade County Public schools through professional developments offered through iReady.

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

Regular meeting schedules will be placed on a calendar to develop consistent routines for reviewing student data and developing strategies to address the needs of the learners.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: According to the 2021 School Climate survey, there was a 17% decrease in teachers agreeing with the statement, "adequate disciplinary measures are being used at my school. Lack of support may lead to a decline in teacher morale, thereby affecting the overall learning environment. A positive learning environment remains an essential component in increasing student achievement.

Measurable Outcome: If we successfully implement a Positive Behavior Support Plan, then at least 85% of the surveyed faculty will agree with the statement "adequate disciplinary measures are used at my school" on the 2022 School Climate Survey.

Monitoring: A disciplinary committee will develop a school wide behavior continuum to address both positive and undesired behaviors with the emphasis on incentivizing positive targeted behaviors. Monthly scheduled meetings will occur to ensure the implementation of the plan with fidelity. A quarterly survey will be conducted to monitor the implementation of the plan and determine if changes are needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Elianeys Basulto (pr3101@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The disciplinary committee will develop a Positive Behavior Support (PBS) which is a schoolwide systems of support that include proactive strategies for defining, teaching, and supporting appropriate student behaviors to create positive school environments. Quarterly surveys by staff and students will gather information on the effectiveness of the PBS system.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Positive Behavior Support focuses on desired behaviors and rewards students for adhering to procedures and guidelines set forth by the school wide discipline committee. The emphasis on the positive behavior support will allow for students to reestablish the desired behavior while decrease student anxiety as they return to the physical learning environment.

Action Steps to Implement

Survey faculty members to determine who is interested in serving on disciplinary committee (August 18)

Person Responsible Elianeys Basulto (pr3101@dadeschools.net)

Disciplinary committee will develop a school wide Positive Behavior support plan (September 16)

Person Responsible Elianeys Basulto (pr3101@dadeschools.net)

Present and train the faculty on the PBS plan. (Oct 5)

Person Responsible Elianeys Basulto (pr3101@dadeschools.net)

Develop initial survey to determine schoolwide feedback. (Oct 11)

Person Responsible Elianeys Basulto (pr3101@dadeschools.net)

MYP students meeting predesignated criteria will participate in a field day on Tuesday, November 23, 2021.

Person Responsible Robert Hoel (rhoel1@dadeschools.net)

MYP students meeting predesignated criteria will participate in a recess period on Friday, December 17, 2021

Person Responsible Robert Hoel (rhoel1@dadeschools.net)

MYP students meeting preidentified criteria, will participate in First Friday's Recess period at the end of the day. Teachers will be provided links to identify students unable to participate due to conduct or attendance infractions.

Person Responsible Robert Hoel (rhoel1@dadeschools.net)

PYP students will be offered incentives throughout the third nine weeks for positive behavioral and academic challenges.

Person Responsible Elianeys Basulto (pr3101@dadeschools.net)

#2. Leadership specifically relating to Walkthroughs

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: This area was identified as an area of need due to teacher responses in the District School Improvement Plan Survey. 24% of the surveyed faculty indicated that an administrator walked through their classroom either 1 or 0 times during the 2020-2021 school year. Walkthroughs remain an important tool to monitor district and school initiatives as well as provide teachers with instructional feedback.

Measurable Outcome: If we successfully implement a walkthrough schedule with feedback, one hundred percent of the teachers surveyed on the 2022 SIP survey will indicate that administration conducted a minimum of one walkthrough during each quarter.

Monitoring: The school leadership team will create a walkthrough log using MS Forms to collect evidence of classroom visits dates, times, and noticing's. A system will also be developed to provide instructional staff with feedback after formal observations focusing on providing teachers with support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Elianeys Basulto (pr3101@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence based strategy implemented will be Consistent, Developmental Feedback. Classroom walkthroughs allow school leaders to gather information and calibrate the instructional focus to improve student learning. This occurs by providing teachers with positive instructional feedback that will enhance the instructional routines of the classroom.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This strategy ties directly to professional growth of each staff member. When teachers receive positive and constructive feedback, the instruction in the classroom becomes more effective, thereby increasing student achievement. Both formal and informal walkthroughs should always include some type of teacher feedback to assist teacher and student growth in the classroom.

Action Steps to Implement

Develop a walkthrough schedule and log for the school leadership team. (September 16)

Person Responsible Elianeys Basulto (pr3101@dadeschools.net)

Develop a MS Form to record the evidence of the walkthrough. (September 16)

Person Responsible Nicole Zaldua (nvzaldua@dadeschools.net)

Implement the walkthrough schedule with fidelity. (September 20 - October 11)

Person Responsible Elianeys Basulto (pr3101@dadeschools.net)

Debrief after each walkthrough to discuss findings and assist with strategy development. (September 20-October 11)

Person Responsible Elianeys Basulto (pr3101@dadeschools.net)

The leadership team will develop a walkthrough schedule for the 2nd nine weeks to follow up on identified needs during initial walkthroughs.(December 17)

Person Responsible Elianeys Basulto (pr3101@dadeschools.net)

The leadership team will provide targeted feedback to teachers after walkthroughs.

Person Responsible Elianeys Basulto (pr3101@dadeschools.net)

The administrative team will conduct formal observations with specific feedback during the third nine weeks.

Person Responsible Robert Hoel (rhoel1@dadeschools.net)

The principal will conduct targeted walkthroughs to monitor intervention progress and identify areas of support for early career faculty members.

Person Responsible Elianeys Basulto (pr3101@dadeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: This area was identified as an area of need due to the low percentage of students earning a Learning Gain in ELA Reading and Math across all grade levels. According to the 2021 FSA data in Reading, only 53% percent of tested students earned a learning gain in Reading and only 38% of the lowest quartile made a learning gain. In Mathematics, only 26% of students earned a learning gain, and only 23% of the bottom quartile earned a learning gain. Differentiation targets students where they need the most assistance and provides them the support they need to master the taught skills.

Measurable Outcome: After successfully implementing Differentiated Instruction across all grade levels, at least 55% of students will earn a learning gain on the 2022 ELA FSA and sixty percent of the students will earn a learning gain on the 2022 Math FSA.

Monitoring: Differentiated instruction will be monitored during the formal observation cycle with the teacher by reviewing lesson plans and intervention folders. The administration will also look for differentiated instruction during informal walkthroughs and discuss DI strategies with teachers during regular data chats.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Elianeys Basulto (pr3101@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Within the instructional practice of differentiation, Frank C. Martin K-8 center will focus on the evidence based strategy of Differentiated Instruction. Teachers will utilize current student data to determine the needs of the students and provide different avenues of instruction to assist students with the targeted standard. During intervention time, the students will maintain Differentiated Instruction folders to document strategies implemented with the students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students received various levels of support during the 2020-2021 school year as a result of attending school physically, attending school online, and technology challenges that existed at home. Each student arrived in school this year with their own set of needs. Differentiated Instruction takes into account student needs and learning style to assist with reaching their potential and mastering the grade level standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Develop a daily instructional framework to include Differentiated Instruction (DI). (September 16)

Person Responsible Nicole Zaldua (nvzaldua@dadeschools.net)

Review the daily instructional framework with the faculty. (September 20-24)

Person Responsible Nicole Zaldua (nvzaldua@dadeschools.net)

Schedule a professional develop covering implementation of DI strategies and sharing of best practices during faculty and grade level or subject area meetings.(September 27- October 1)

Person Responsible Elianeys Basulto (pr3101@dadeschools.net)

Create a model DI folder to model expectations with the faculty during the October faculty meeting. (October 5)

Person Responsible Elianeys Basulto (pr3101@dadeschools.net)

During the Nov 2 faculty meeting, identified teachers will share DI best practices with the faculty.

Person Responsible Nicole Zaldua (nvzaldua@dadeschools.net)

After the iReady Growth monitoring window, Nov 15-19, administration will conduct data chats with teachers.

Person Responsible Nicole Zaldua (nvzaldua@dadeschools.net)

Based upon the iReady AP2 data, teachers will identify new students in need of intervention and add them to their intervention groups.

Person Responsible Robert Hoel (rhoel1@dadeschools.net)

Based upon iReady AP2 data, the Principal will identify students in need of after school tutoring and provide letters to parents inviting them to tutoring.

Person Responsible Elianeys Basulto (pr3101@dadeschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

This area was identified as an area of need due to the low percentage of students mastering the ELA Standards as indicated on the 2021 ELA FSA. 62% of the students in Grades 3-5 earned a level 3 and above as compared to 75% in 2019, a decrease of 13%. In Grade 3, only 46% of the students who participated in 2021 ELA FSA Scored a Level 3 and above. Students in Grades 3-8 earning a learning gain dropped from 58% in 2019 to 53% in 2021. The bottom quartile students also decreased in learning gains from 43% in 2019 to 39% in 2021. According to the 2021 iReady AP3 diagnostic, 16.4% of 1st graders, 43.7% of 2nd graders, and 45.7% of 3rd graders scored below proficiency. This data indicates a tremendous need to for Reading interventions and continually monitor student progress toward mastery of grade level standards.

Measurable Outcome:

If we successfully implement reading strategies across all grade levels then at least 75% of the students tested on the 2022 ELA FSA will score a level 3 or higher. Through successful interventions and checks for understanding, then at least 75% of Grade 3 students will score at least a Level 3 on the 2022 FSA.

Monitoring:

ELA Strategies will be monitored during both formal observations. During formal observations administration will look for highly effective reading strategies that assist students access the information in the text. Administration will also compare district pacing guides with teacher lesson plans to ensure teachers remain on track to cover all standards prior to the Spring testing.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robert Hoel (rhoel1@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Frank C. Martin K-8 center will focus on the evidence based strategy of Checks for Understanding. Teachers will monitor student progress toward standards mastery using both formal and informal data. The students will participate in formal data such as iReady diagnostic assessments and district topic assessments to track progress. Teachers will use strategies such as exit slips and white boards to informally assess data during lessons.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

In order to for teachers to know Checks for Understanding provide the teachers will real time data to make curricular decisions for students. They are ongoing and allow the teachers to modify their differentiated groups based upon student needs.

Action Steps to Implement

All students will participate in the iReady AP1 Diagnostic assessment. (September 13- Oct 8)

Person Responsible

Robert Hoel (rhoel1@dadeschools.net)

Teachers will participate in data chats with administration. (September 13-Oct 11)

Person Responsible

Elianeys Basulto (pr3101@dadeschools.net)

Administration will model a check for understanding strategy during a faculty meeting. (September 21, 2021)

Person Responsible

Robert Hoel (rhoel1@dadeschools.net)

Administration will conduct walkthroughs looking specifically for checks for understanding during lessons. (September 27 - October 11)

Person Responsible Robert Hoel (rhoel1@dadeschools.net)

Teachers in Grade 4-8 will administer the District Writing Assessment during the designated window. (Nov1 - Nov 12)

Person Responsible Robert Hoel (rhoel1@dadeschools.net)

After the administration of the data chats, administration will conduct data chats with teachers to develop an action plan to address student needs. (Nov 29-December 3)

Person Responsible Elianeys Basulto (pr3101@dadeschools.net)

Administration will conduct data chats with select teachers in order to identify students that would benefit from after school tutoring prior to the administration of the Reading FSA.

Person Responsible Elianeys Basulto (pr3101@dadeschools.net)

Teachers will use the iReady platform to assign targeted Reading lessons for students.

Person Responsible Robert Hoel (rhoel1@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.

According to the state report our school incident report is very low at 0.2 incidents per every 100 students when compared to other combination schools statewide. The primary concern during the reported school year was bullying. The school will work on bullying related incidents through bullying education provided by the student services staff and administrative investigation of any bullying allegations. The secondary area of concern indicated was physical attack. The administration and student service team will provide students information on conflict resolution and maintain an open door policy for students to discuss their concerns prior to escalating issues with their peers.

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.

Frank C. Martin K-8 Center creates a positive school culture by providing a variety of activities to celebrate and recognize students socially and academically. Throughout the school year, the school recognizes Hispanic Heritage and African American Heritage through school site programs involving both parents and members of the community. Students are also provided an opportunity to share their own cultural heritage by dressing in traditional clothing in lieu of Halloween costumes in October. Each Wednesday during the morning announcements, teachers and students may receive shout out's for being positive roll models. The nominations are tied to the Miami Dade County Values Matter program and may be submitted by any teacher or student. Frank C. Martin K-8 Center will also begin the Student of the Month program during the 2021-2022 school year. Teachers will submit nominations of students going above and beyond in the classroom and demonstrate the learner profiles core to the International Baccalaureate program. Introduced this school year, the Positive Behavior Support plan will incentivize positive actions among the students thereby creating a better school climate among the students. The principal will build community partnerships through monthly EESAC meetings and quarterly Principal coffee meetings as well as leading volunteer opportunities on campus. Monthly calendars, backpack mailers, and social media post will help stakeholders stay connected to school events. To maintain the positive relationships with faculty members, the administration will maintain an open door policy with the teachers and value feedback and ideas. Information will be collected via surveys and hallway conversations.

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

The administration will develop an inclusive environment by maintaining positive relationships with all stakeholders by participating in all school wide events and maintaining a constant presence in the hallways during the school day.

The teachers will build a positive school culture by providing the students with meaningful experiences and recognizing those students contributing to the school community.

The student services team will assist teachers with recognizing student achievements and responding to the needs of the students.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Walkthroughs	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00