Marjory Stoneman Douglas Elem

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Marjory Stoneman Douglas Elem

11901 SW 2ND ST, Miami, FL 33184

http://msdouglas.dadeschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Moraima Almeida Perez

Start Date for this Principal: 7/19/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
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 Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (73%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: A (71%)
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

Marjory Stoneman Douglas Elem

11901 SW 2ND ST, Miami, FL 33184

http://msdouglas.dadeschools.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	77%

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

School Grades History

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

Our mission at Marjory Stoneman Douglas Elementary is to bilingually foster student achievement with respect for historical, cultural, and individual diversities with an emphasis on the preservation of our environment and an appreciation for the arts.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We at Marjory Stoneman Douglas Elementary share the vision, feel the pride, and experience the commitment to excellence every day. This vision is reflected in a school where all children will learn to be biliterate and bilingual critical thinkers as a result of the dual language program.

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
Almeida-Perez, Moraima	Principal	Moraima Almeida-Perez (Principal) provides the vision and instructional leadership strategies to improve data-driven school performance and decision making. She ensures that procedures are in place to ensure the well-being of all stakeholders, as well as, ensuring a safe learning environment for students and staff.
Vega, Tania	Assistant Principal	Tania Vega (Assistant Principal) assists the Principal in promoting initiatives that enhance the educational experience for staff and students to ensure that instructional practices prepare students for successful careers .
Cruz-Lopez, Patricia	Teacher, K-12	Patricia Cruz-Lopez is a fourth grade teacher and grade level chairperson, as well as, the Educational Excellence School Advisory Committee (EESAC) Chairperson. Her responsibilities include disseminating information to all stakeholders, maintaining cohesion within the grade level, and implementing relevant and rigorous academics in an innovative manner while promoting a sense of belonging in an inclusive environment.
Estevez, Melissa	Teacher, PreK	Melissa Estevez is a Pre-K teacher, as well as, the grade level chairperson. Her responsibilities include providing an educational setting whereby students receive high-quality instruction that prepares them to succeed in Kindergarten and beyond.
Diez-Rodriguez, Beatriz	Teacher, K-12	Beatriz Diez-Rodriguez is a third grade teacher and content liaison. Her responsibilities include disseminating information to all stakeholders and implementing relevant and rigorous academics in an innovative manner while promoting a sense of belonging in an inclusive environment.
Hernandez, Veronica	Teacher, K-12	Veronica Hernandez is a first grade teacher and grade level chairperson. Her responsibilities include disseminating information to all stakeholders and implementing relevant and rigorous academics in an innovative manner while promoting a sense of belonging in an inclusive environment.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/19/2014, Moraima Almeida Perez

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.*
30

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
47

Total number of students enrolled at the school
585

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
0

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	79	82	89	88	121	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	582
Attendance below 90 percent	4	8	7	6	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	7	4	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	3	10	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	7	21	32	25	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116

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	1	0	2	4	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	1	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	100	94	92	131	130	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	685
Attendance below 90 percent	8	6	5	12	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	6	2	12	17	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Course failure in Math	0	1	2	12	20	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	1	1	11	15	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

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	1	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				70%	62%	57%	68%	62%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				70%	62%	58%	65%	62%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				68%	58%	53%	66%	59%	48%
Math Achievement				85%	69%	63%	79%	69%	62%
Math Learning Gains				83%	66%	62%	69%	64%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				80%	55%	51%	50%	55%	47%
Science Achievement				56%	55%	53%	78%	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	62%	60%	2%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	71%	64%	7%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2021					
	2019	65%	60%	5%	56%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	78%	67%	11%	62%	16%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	87%	69%	18%	64%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
05	2021					
	2019	82%	65%	17%	60%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	52%	53%	-1%	53%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

I-Ready was the primary tool used by each grade level for progress monitoring.

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

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	54.2	69.4	78.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	45.2	64.9	75.0
	Students With Disabilities	15.4	58.8	30.8
	English Language Learners	0	33.3	51.3
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	28.1	45.5	68.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	20.2	38.3	63.8
	Students With Disabilities	15.4	38.5	38.5
	English Language Learners	0	18	46.2

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	53.7	61.5	62
	Economically Disadvantaged	47.1	55.4	56
	Students With Disabilities	8.3	16.7	21.7
	English Language Learners	22.6	25.8	22.6
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	34.4	53.7	66.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	30.7	47	59.8
	Students With Disabilities	12.5	20.8	33.3
	English Language Learners	0	22.6	38.7

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	37.1	48.4	52.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	34.7	47	49.5
	Students With Disabilities	7.7	7.7	7.7
	English Language Learners	16.7	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	38.1	55.6	65.9
	Economically Disadvantaged	34	53	65
	Students With Disabilities	0	15.4	23.1
	English Language Learners	0	25.7	16.7
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	0	20	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	16	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	8	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Subgroup Data Review

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	25	37	43	33	32	42	17				
ELL	65	66	55	63	63	35	58				
HSP	68	65	60	63	58	43	58				
FRL	62	59	61	58	55	46	54				

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	39	54	60	72	88	89	20				
ELL	69	70	72	87	85	84	51				
HSP	69	70	68	85	83	80	56				
FRL	67	68	68	83	82	79	55				

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	39	59	67	66	66	63	23				
ELL	57	61	70	72	62	51	58				
HSP	68	65	66	79	69	49	77				
FRL	66	63	66	76	69	48	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	59
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	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	471
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

Students With Disabilities	
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	58
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	
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	59
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	57
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:
The school to District comparison shows an overall increase in ELA and Mathematics assessments. The English Language Learners (ELL) subgroup average growth in ELA was commensurate to the school's data. The students with disabilities (SWD) subgroup data was significantly lower in both ELA and Mathematics. The stronger academic area for SWD students was Mathematics.

2021 Data Findings:
Overall, the school's average in ELA, Mathematics, and Science was above that of the District. Upon closer analysis, the school went from 70% proficiency in ELA in 2019 to 68% proficiency in ELA in 2021. This represents a drop of 2 percentage points. However, in Mathematics, the school went from 85% proficiency in 2019 to 63% proficiency in 2021. This represents a drop of 22 percentage points and calls for further investigation. In Science, the school went from 56% proficiency in 2019 to 58% proficiency in 2021. This increase of 2 percentage points indicates a needed upward trend.

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

2019 Data Findings:
ELL learners had 38% proficiency in ELA and 73% proficiency in Mathematics. Both of these are below the school's ELA proficiency of 66% and 82% in Mathematics.
SWD had 38% proficiency in ELA and 72% proficiency in Mathematics. Both of these are below the school's ELA proficiency of 66% and 82% in Mathematics.
Economically Disadvantaged learners had 67% proficiency in ELA and 84% proficiency in Mathematics. Both of these are above the school's ELA proficiency of 66% and 82% in Mathematics.

2021 Data Findings:
The 2021 FSA data shows a large decline across all grade levels in Mathematics which needs to be addressed. Additionally, 4th and 5th grade students showed a decline in ELA as well.

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:
We have a large population of ELL students for whom English is their second language. Language acquisition and vocabulary development are necessary to advance academically in all subject areas.

2021 Data Findings:
The biggest contributing factor for the decline in Mathematics was that teachers were suddenly charged with the task of delivering instruction via the computer. The use of manipulatives and small group was difficult as some students were learning remotely. However, through ongoing collaboration, teachers learned how to use new platforms and websites that enabled them to better meet the needs of their students. It took time to create these resources and many will be used and perfected this year as we are still exercising physical distancing. One particular strategy will be differentiation which can be done efficiently through computer-based learning and/or small group instruction.

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

2019 Data Findings:
Mathematics data showed the most improvement schoolwide, increasing 6 percentage points from 76% to 82%.

2021 Data Findings:
Third grade ELA data showed the most improvement, increasing 4 percentage points from 63% to 67%.

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

2019 Data Findings:
Collaborative planning, differentiated instructional practices, and weekly student i-Ready monitoring were contributing factors to the improvement.

2021 Data Findings:
The majority of the 3rd grade classes were physically present as opposed to on-line/distance learning.

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

1. Data-driven instructional practices
2. Differentiated instruction
3. Collaborative data chats
4. Social-emotional learning
5. Technology integration

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

The PLST will develop professional development opportunities to promote technology integration, data driven instructional practices, and differentiated instructional practices schoolwide. On Professional Development days, teacher leaders will share resources that are on significant benefit to them, as well as instruction of how to use the new resources received this year.

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 to ensure all teachers are implementing rigorous curriculum to ensure improvement. Interventions for L25 students will be implemented daily for 30 minutes. Title I and Title III Tutoring will take place weekly.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The school's average in ELA, Mathematics, and Science was above that of the District. Upon closer analysis, the school went from 70% proficiency in ELA in 2019 to 68% proficiency in ELA in 2021. This represents a drop of 2 percentage points. However, in Mathematics, the school went from 85% proficiency in 2019 to 63% proficiency in 2021. This represents a drop of 22 percentage points and calls for further investigation. In Science, the school went from 56% proficiency in 2019 to 58% proficiency in 2021. This increase of 2 percentage points indicates a needed upward trend.Based on the data review, our school will implement the Targeted Element of Collaborative Planning. Due to the unique situation of the pandemic where teachers can have minimal contact with students and must maintain physical distance, teachers need to create new resources to meet the needs of all learners. By having a common planning time, teachers can work together to learn from one another and share ideas in order to deliver differentiated instruction in a physically distant manner so that students make learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	If we successfully implement Collaborative Planning, then our students will increase by a minimum of 8 percentage points as evidenced by the 2022 FSA.
Monitoring:	The area of focus will be monitored by administrative walkthroughs. During these walkthroughs, administration will see uniformity in the lessons being taught while at the same time see how teachers individualize and tailor the lesson delivery to the needs of the students. The uniformity and individualization will be a reflection of teachers assisting each other during collaborative planning.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Moraima Almeida-Perez (pr1371@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of Collaborative Planning. Teachers will assist each other in creating standards-based lessons, learn how to better use the platforms introduced last year, and gather materials and resources necessary to differentiate instruction to increase the learning gains of our students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows that nations that out perform the United States on international assessments, build time into the school workday for ongoing, sustained teacher development, collaboration, and planning. By providing Collaborative Planning time, teachers will have the necessary time to develop and implement plans to integrate the new B.E.S.T. standards and updated reading series in the classroom and yield better results for the students in the 2022 FSA.

Action Steps to Implement

Build common planning time in the teachers' schedules by grade level so that they can plan together.

Person Responsible	Tania Vega (tcvega@dadeschools.net)

Cultivate trust. Be open and honest. Observe the dynamics of teacher to students, student to student, and teacher to teacher.

Person Responsible	Moraima Almeida-Perez (pr1371@dadeschools.net)

When working together, encourage all collaborators to generate as many ideas as possible. Discuss best practices to think about different ways that a learning goal can be executed.

Person Responsible	Tania Vega (tcvega@dadeschools.net)

Monitor the progress of implementation using feedback and adapt the strategy, as needed.

Person Responsible Moraima Almeida-Perez (pr1371@dadeschools.net)

Facilitate Leadership Team meeting to review implementation of Collaborative Planning and identify necessary adjustments necessary to improve process from November 1, 2021 through December 21, 2021.

Person Responsible Moraima Almeida-Perez (pr1371@dadeschools.net)

Instructional focus standards and resources available in the Pacing Guides will be discussed during PLCs which are conducted during common planning time. After reviewing and discussing student data, teachers will plan data-driven lessons in the classroom including targeted differentiated instruction from November 1, 2021 through December 21, 2021.

Person Responsible Tania Vega (tcvega@dadeschools.net)

During collaborative planning, teachers will join i-Ready professional development to assist in gathering data and ways to encourage student growth and passing rates from January 31, 2022 through April 29, 2022.

Person Responsible Moraima Almeida-Perez (pr1371@dadeschools.net)

To get ready for SAT-10 and FSA, teachers will collaborate to create crunch time planners from January 31, 2022 through April 29, 2022 to facilitate in getting the students ready for testing.

Person Responsible Tania Vega (tcvega@dadeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The school's average in ELA, Mathematics, and Science was above that of the District. Upon closer analysis, the school went from 70% proficiency in ELA in 2019 to 68% proficiency in ELA in 2021. This represents a drop of 2 percentage points. However, in Mathematics, the school went from 85% proficiency in 2019 to 63% proficiency in 2021. This represents a drop of 22 percentage points and calls for further investigation. In Science, the school went from 56% proficiency in 2019 to 58% proficiency in 2021. This increase of 2 percentage points indicates a needed upward trend. The data analyzed revealed that students continued to need differentiated instruction to better address the learning loss as a result of the Covid slide. Differentiated instruction offers teachers the opportunity to provide individualized instruction tailored to the needs of students who may have learning gaps or learning loss.
Measurable Outcome:	If we successfully implement differentiated instruction, then our students will increase by a minimum of 8 percentage points as evidenced by the 2022 FSA.
Monitoring:	The leadership team will conduct data chats and walkthroughs. Teachers will maintain fluid groups and/or push out differentiated lessons based on current data. Progress monitoring will be conducted to document improvements and any necessary remediation. Data will be reviewed by the leadership team and additional support will be provided as necessary for those who are not showing growth.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Moraima Almeida-Perez (pr1371@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiated instruction addresses the specific needs of students without restricting their engagement. It is considered an effective practice for enhancing the knowledge and skills of students. Teachers can use a variety of grouping formats at different times determined by such criteria as students' skills and prior knowledge. It may be particularly valuable for students with disabilities and L25 students who usually require explicit, intensive instruction in reading as well as opportunities for collaborative group work with classmates who are more proficient readers. Teachers may also push out electronically differentiated lessons individually or to a small group.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	There are several benefits to differentiated instruction which include more efficient use of teacher and student time, increased instructional time, increased peer interaction, and opportunities for students to improve generalization of skills.

Action Steps to Implement	

Teachers will conduct on-going formal and informal assessments to better assess areas in need of remediation.

Person Responsible	Tania Vega (tcvega@dadeschools.net)

Teachers will utilize i-Ready Toolbox to provide targeted instruction.

Person Responsible	Tania Vega (tcvega@dadeschools.net)

Teachers will maintain a record of differentiated instruction and have each student monitor their target data chart.

Person Responsible Tania Vega (tcvega@dadeschools.net)

During weekly PLCs, best practices will be shared to provide teachers effective implementation of differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible Moraima Almeida-Perez (pr1371@dadeschools.net)

In order to review the implementation of Differentiation and identify any necessary adjustments needed to improve, administration will facilitate monthly Leadership Team meetings from November 1, 2021 through December 21, 2021.

Person Responsible Moraima Almeida-Perez (pr1371@dadeschools.net)

Instructional focus standards and resources available in the Pacing Guides will be discussed durings PLCs. After reviewing and discussing student data, teachers will plan data-driven lessons in the classroom including targeted differentiated instruction from November 1, 2021 through December 21, 2021.

Person Responsible Tania Vega (tcvega@dadeschools.net)

Teachers will utilize the IXL platform to differentiate instruction and IXL LIVE for on the spot differentiation from January 31, 2022 through April 29, 2022 to prepare students for testing.

Person Responsible Tania Vega (tcvega@dadeschools.net)

Daily interventions, Title III afterschool tutoring, and Saturday Academy will be implemented to target the ELL students and the L35 students from January 31, 2022 through April 29, 2022 to prepare students for testing.

Person Responsible Moraima Almeida-Perez (pr1371@dadeschools.net)

#3. Leadership specifically relating to Managing Accountability Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on data from the End of the Year SIP survey, we selected the Targeted Element of Managing Accountability Systems. Managing Accountability Systems is setting expectations and practices around the ongoing examination of data to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction to improve student outcomes. Teachers felt that if data chats with administration were held more frequently, administration would be able to ask the hard questions needed to ensure that instructional strategies were being implemented to increase student proficiency. Furthermore, administration could show school data trends by subject and/or grade level and reconfigure intervention groups as needed. Finally, teachers felt the celebrations of learning were also a necessary component when managing accountability systems.
Measurable Outcome:	If we successfully implement the Targeted Element of Managing Accountability Systems, then data chats with administration will be held quarterly. Results from the End of Year SIP survey will indicate that data chats were held with fidelity.
Monitoring:	This will be monitored by scheduling data chats and announcing it in the Weekly Anhinga. Patterns of proficiency and student needs will dictate who participates in schoolwide intervention programs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Moraima Almeida-Perez (pr1371@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Quarterly data chats will be scheduled by grade level as well as by subject area. This will allow teachers and administrators alike to see patterns of student achievement, needs for schoolwide programs (instructional, curricular, and/or professional learning), next steps for students, grouping of students for instruction and intervention, and patterns in proficiency.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Using data to guide instruction is necessary to move students towards proficiency. Sharing data with teachers by grade levels and subject groups allows all stakeholders to see how the school is moving towards the overarching goal of improving student proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

The administrative team will analyze data on an on-going basis and share findings with the leadership team in order to plan strategically to move students towards proficiency.

Person Responsible	Moraima Almeida-Perez (pr1371@dadeschools.net)

Administration will conduct data chats with fidelity. Dates will be published in the Anhinga. This will allow stakeholders to see patterns of student achievement and then follow-through on the next steps necessary to to move students forward to proficiency.

Person Responsible	Moraima Almeida-Perez (pr1371@dadeschools.net)

Lesson plans are reflective of high expectations and implementation of data-based instruction.

Person Responsible	Tania Vega (tcvega@dadeschools.net)

Teachers will be provided support in the area of data-based instruction. Data will be distributed as it becomes available depicting school trends.

Person Responsible Tania Vega (tcvega@dadeschools.net)

Data and information pertaining to student performances in ELA and Math will be presented to teachers during Data Chats. Between November 1, 2021 and December 21, 2021, the emphasis will be progress monitoring assessments.

Person Responsible Tania Vega (tcvega@dadeschools.net)

Prior to Data Chats, report cards will be reviewed to see who is not doing well and may be in need of Interventions and/Progressing Monitoring. Remediation steps will be reviewed and adjusted as necessary during the period from November 1, 2021 through December 21, 2021.

Person Responsible Tania Vega (tcvega@dadeschools.net)

The leadership team attended the Instructional Data Tools Presentation on Performance Matters, PowerBI, and i-Ready. The information will be shared with each grade level to support teacher academic achievement from January 31, 2022 through April 29, 2022.

Person Responsible Moraima Almeida-Perez (pr1371@dadeschools.net)

Administration will conduct Data Chats with teachers during January 31, 2022 through April 29, 2022 after i-Ready testing is complete.

Person Responsible Tania Vega (tcvega@dadeschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the data review, our school will implement the Targeted Element of Social Emotional Learning (SEL). According to the student school climate survey, questions pertaining to social emotional learning showed a downward trend. It is noteworthy to say that due to the pandemic, there was a negative impact on students' emotional welfare.
Measurable Outcome:	If we successfully implement the targeted element of Social Emotional Learning, then the results from the student climate survey will increase by 15 percentage points.
Monitoring:	There will be an increase in the number of students being nominated for Values Matters as compared to the numbers nominated in previous years.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Moraima Almeida-Perez (pr1371@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The leadership team will promote Social Emotional Learning by focusing on Mindfulness strategies, Values Matter, and Character Education.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The implementation of Mindfulness and Values Matter are effective in improving social skills, attitudes, behavior, and academic performance.

Action Steps to Implement

Implementing and sharing mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction (MBSR) will teach mindfulness meditation as a health intervention to promote social emotional learning.

Person Responsible	Tania Vega (tcvega@dadeschools.net)

Teachers will nominate students that demonstrate model behavior of the monthly core values.

Person Responsible	Moraima Almeida-Perez (pr1371@dadeschools.net)

The school counselor will push out information on child-friendly sites that can be used to promote SEL in the classroom on a monthly basis.

Person Responsible	Moraima Almeida-Perez (pr1371@dadeschools.net)

The school counselor will be available for students who are in need of help. Additionally, class visits/ lessons will be conducted on a quarterly basis.

Person Responsible	Tania Vega (tcvega@dadeschools.net)

To teach SEL, teachers need to be aware of and continue to develop their own social-emotional skills; only then can they model and teach those skills to the students. The leadership Team will lead this cause by placing positive messages, treats, etc. in teacher's mailboxes to show that they are valued. This will take place from November 1, 2021 through December 21, 2021.

Person Responsible	Moraima Almeida-Perez (pr1371@dadeschools.net)

Positive affirmation posters will be placed throughout the school to improve self-esteem and create a positive and empowering atmosphere during the period of November 1, 2021 through December 21, 2021.

Person Responsible Tania Vega (tcvega@dadeschools.net)

The school counselor will continue to share from January 31, 2022 through April 29, 2022 monthly Brain Breaks from QuaverSEL that focus on the core value of the month. This is an innovative approach to social and emotional learning that focuses on the needs of students and the teachers and counselors who support them.

Person Responsible Mariana Sanchez (msanchez98@dadeschools.net)

Free Parenting Webinars from Parent Club at FIU will continue to share with parents via the school website and monthly calendar from January 31, 2022 through April 29, 2022. The webinars assist parents with managing stress, building relationships with their child, and developing coping skills to use when stressed.

Person Responsible Moraima Almeida-Perez (pr1371@dadeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

According to SafeSchoolsforAlex.org's School Safety Dashboard, Marjory Stoneman Douglas Elementary School reported 0.0 incidents per 100 students. This rate is less than the Statewide elementary school rate of 1.0 incidents per 100 students. There are no violent incidents, property incidents, nor drug/public order incidents. Suspensions, both indoor and outdoor, remain at 0.0 per 100 students. The Values Matter initiative along with a focus on Social and Emotional Learning are pillars that are the foundation of a positive school culture and environment of Marjory Stoneman Douglas Elementary School.

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.

MSD maintains a pattern of supportive interactions which foster positive staff-student relationships. MSD encourages mutual respect for individual differences and promote tolerance and inclusivity. MSD celebrates success of students and staff by emphasizing accomplishments and collaboration. MSD assists students in connecting with resources available to support their physical and emotional challenges. MSD ensures that addressing the social emotional wellness of students is a school priority.

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

The stakeholders, including the principal, assistant principals, teacher leaders, and school counselor, foster positive relationships between students, staff, and families that support effective collaboration and communication. MSD encourages family and community participation in school events, extracurricular activities, and student achievement.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Managing Accountability Systems	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00