Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Norwood Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Norwood Elementary School

19810 NW 14TH CT, Miami, FL 33169

http://norwood.dadeschools.net/

Demographics

Principal: Kevin Williams N

Start Date for this Principal: 7/20/2010

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)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (54%)
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

Norwood Elementary School

19810 NW 14TH CT, Miami, FL 33169

http://norwood.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	90%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	100%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Norwood Elementary School is to provide an environment which will prepare all students to be academically, socially, and physically successful in meeting the challenges of a multicultural society through technology, appropriate instructional strategies, self discipline, and parental and community support.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Norwood Elementary School is to create a learning climate where students, teachers, parents, community members and administrators feel welcome and confident. These stakeholders will be able to access and utilize technology to enhance teaching and learning which will result in improved academic achievement and narrowing of the achievement gap. Therefore, students will be prepared to compete in an ever-changing global society.

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
Monica, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade Teacher, EESAC Chair, and Primary Grade Chair meets with primary grades and assist with planning meetings.
Williams, Kevin	Principal	The principal monitors instruction through daily classroom walk-throughs to ensure fidelity of the implementation on the New Best Standards. He meets with the leadership team and staff to analyzes and disaggregates data. He communicates with parents and staff about attendance and engages the community, as well as allocates resources as needed.
Alemany, Maria	Teacher, ESE	Facilitates regular MTSS meetings, ensures attendance of team members and monitors the implementation of IEPs. Regularly meets with parents to schedule IEP meetings and reviews.
Mitchell, Angela	School Counselor	Provides parents and students with needed services, monitors attendance, and encourages parent engagement. Schedules monthly family events and support students and families with services.
Garcia, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade Teacher, Gradebook Manager, and Intermediate Grade Chair responsible for grade-level planning and coordinating activities. Assist with the writing of the SIP.
Case, Judith	Instructional Coach	Supports teacher's reading instruction through modeling and planning. Disseminates information received from district ELA department to the leadership team and facilitates in-house PD's.
Cartwright-Rind, Tracy	Assistant Principal	Assists the principal with monitoring instruction through daily classroom walk-throughs to ensure fidelity of the implementation on the New Best Standards. Meets with the leadership team and staff to analyzes and disaggregates data. Communicates with parents and staff about attendance and engages the community, as well as allocates resources as needed.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/20/2010, Kevin Williams N

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.*
4

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
35

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

63

Total number of students enrolled at the school

422

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

6

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	45	62	61	60	61	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	365
Attendance below 90 percent	12	18	6	7	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	3	0	5	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	3	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	14	25	31	25	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120

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	4	0	2	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	3	5	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/30/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	71	69	52	72	80	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	422
Attendance below 90 percent	17	8	6	9	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	3	3	9	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	12	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	1	4	0	10	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	3	5	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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				55%	62%	57%	63%	62%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				49%	62%	58%	53%	62%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55%	58%	53%	43%	59%	48%
Math Achievement				67%	69%	63%	64%	69%	62%
Math Learning Gains				69%	66%	62%	50%	64%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	55%	51%	40%	55%	47%
Science Achievement				44%	55%	53%	64%	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	49%	60%	-11%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	65%	64%	1%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2021					
	2019	42%	60%	-18%	56%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	65%	67%	-2%	62%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	76%	69%	7%	64%	12%

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-65%					
05	2021						
	2019	55%	65%	-10%	60%	-5%	
Cohort Comparison		-76%					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	41%	53%	-12%	53%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Grades 1-5 progress monitoring data provided below is based on iReady diagnostic results for Fall (AP1), Winter (AP2), and Spring (AP3).

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32.8%	36.7%	59.2%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33.3%	38.1%	57.1%
	Students With Disabilities	23.5%	11.1%	25.0%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36.2%	34.7%	52.0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	39.2%	35.7%	46.5%
	Students With Disabilities	33.3%	22.2%	22.2%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31.8%	38.6%	53.5%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29.3%	39.0%	57.5%
	Students With Disabilities	0	11.1%	22.2%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9.5%	30.2%	53.5%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10.3%	30.0%	55.0%
	Students With Disabilities	14.3%	11.1%	11.1%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47.7%	54.7%	57.6%
	Economically Disadvantaged	47.6%	54.8%	56.9%
	Students With Disabilities	20.8%	13.0%	16.7%
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13.8%	39.1%	50.8%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12.7%	40.3%	50.0%
	Students With Disabilities	0	8.7%	5.0%
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	35.6%	40.3%	47..2%
	Economically Disadvantaged	36.4%	38.5%	44.6%
	Students With Disabilities	13.6%	13.6%	13.6%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19.2%	39.4%	52.1%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21.2%	40.6%	53.0%
	Students With Disabilities	4.5%	0	9.1%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34.4%	32.8%	53.7%
	Economically Disadvantaged	35.1%	33.3%	51.0%
	Students With Disabilities	17.4%	16.0%	23.1%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	21.9%	36.4%	51.5%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20.7%	37.3%	52.5%
	Students With Disabilities	0	16.7%	20.8%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	0	9.0%	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	8.0%	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0.0%	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	40	29		42	18		29				
BLK	54	48	38	51	35	36	36				
HSP	62			77							
FRL	54	48	38	52	35	36	35				
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	50	51	50	59	53	44	32				
ELL	53	67		74	73						
BLK	56	48	54	67	70	65	45				
HSP	53			73							
FRL	55	48	59	66	68	63	44				
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	55	57	35	57	52	43					
ELL	36			64							
BLK	65	54	46	64	48	41	63				
HSP	50	50		64	60						
FRL	63	52	44	63	50	38	63				

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	41
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	288
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	87%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32

Students With Disabilities	
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	70
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	43
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?

2021 data findings:
The school to district comparison indicates 6% less students were absent 18 or more days. Although the school (14%) data is less than the districts (20%), the data still reflects evidence of failure in both ELA and Math. The data showed that (5%) students failed ELA and (6%) students failed the Math state assessment.

2020 data findings:
The school to district comparison indicates 8% less students were absent 18 or more days. Although the school (8%) data is less than the districts (16%), the data still reflects evidence of failure in both ELA and Math. The data showed that 35 students failed ELA and 12 students failed the Math state assessment.

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

2019 data findings:
The majority of our ELL students performed below expectation, only 25% were proficient compared to other subgroups.

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:
The contributing factors included poor attendance and blended learning. Attendance incentives, along with strategic monitoring would help to address and improve this area of concern.

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

2019 data findings:
FSA Math learning gains in increased from 61% in 2018 to 65% in 2019. In 2021, students in the L25 subgroup in Math showed a growth of 33.2% when comparing i-Ready AP1 to AP3 data.

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

2019 data findings:
We created a collaborative planning schedule that allotted time to plan for DI. Administrator will now attend weekly collaborative planning sessions and contribute to conversations with individual grade levels to ensure alignment of resources.
2021 data findings:
We will continue to ensure time is allotted for collaborative planning to plan for DI. Administrator will now attend weekly collaborative planning sessions and contribute to conversations with individual grade levels to ensure alignment of resources. In addition, i-Ready diagnostic results will be monitored and students provided with monthly progress monitoring opportunities for improvement along with incentives. Furthermore before and after-school tutoring was provided.

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

In order to accelerate learning, we will implement data chats, differentiated instructional grouping, tutoring programs, MTSS intervention assistance, professional development, and collaborative planning opportunities.

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 and provide on-site professional development opportunities for teachers and staff throughout the 2021-2022 school year. Several have already been scheduled: Making Connections in Reading (September/21), Book Study (October/21), and Data Chats (ongoing).

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

Collaborative planning will be schedule weekly and a member of the LT will attend to ensure fidelity to the strategies being implemented schoolwide that are aligned to the goals. To ensure the sustainability of improvement we will continue to implement bi-weekly collaborative planning with the addition of an administrator present to ensure school-wide implementation of best practices aligned with strategic goals. Additionally, we will offer extended learning opportunities such as before and after-school tutoring, Saturday Science Camp, Robotics, and Coding Club.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Managing Accountability Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on quantitative data from School Climate Survey and the SIP Survey we would like to target the 52% of the staff that said they only received guidance some of the time in using the data to plan their instruction. Therefore a schedule will be developed with the LT, curriculum coaches to ensure data is used to drive instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	If we successfully implement grade-level data chats, then our staff will be able to use data effectively to plan their instruction, therefore, improving student outcomes.
Monitoring:	The Leadership Team will conduct quarterly data chats and instructional coaches to attend grade-level planning meetings and assist teachers with debriefing assessment data for remediation and enrichment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kevin Williams (pr4001@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy is Data-Driven Instruction. Monthly Online Progress Monitoring, tracking assessment data and data chats with leadership team to ensure fidelity.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Involving administration, LT and staff will assist in integrating Data-Driven instruction. This will ensure that teachers are using relevant, recent, and aligned data to plan lessons that are customized to student's needs. Teachers will continually make adjustments to their instructional delivery and lesson plans as the data drive their teaching and student learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Review the AP1 Data (September/2021)
Review Progress Monitoring (Ongoing)
Review Diagnostic and Placement Test in McGraw-Hill (September/2021)
Identify Tier 2 and Tier 3 Students for Intervention (September/2021)

Person Responsible	Tracy Cartwright-Rind (tcartwright@dadeschools.net)

Schedule Grade Level Data Chats (September/2021)

Person Responsible	Tracy Cartwright-Rind (tcartwright@dadeschools.net)

Grouping Students According to Data (September/2021)

Person Responsible	Tracy Cartwright-Rind (tcartwright@dadeschools.net)

Plan for Tier 2/3 Intervention (September/2021)

Person Responsible	Judith Case (judith_case@dadeschools.net)

Administration will continue to facilitate data chats with curriculum coaches to drive instruction. (November 1 - December 17, 2021)

Person Responsible	Kevin Williams (pr4001@dadeschools.net)

Administration will continue to provide teachers with support in creating DI groups, progress monitoring and student data trackers. (November 1 - December 17, 2021)

Person Responsible	Tracy Cartwright-Rind (tcartwright@dadeschools.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the data review of the the 2020-2021 School Climate Staff Survey, 72% of the staff felt a lack of concern and support from parents.
Measurable Outcome:	If we successfully implement family engagement opportunities, then our parents will have the tools needed to be actively engaged in their child's educational success, by an increase in parental participation.
Monitoring:	The Leadership Team will meet and discuss various virtual and in-house events that will facilitate making connections and supporting families.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tracy Cartwright-Rind (tcartwright@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy will be parent workshops. Parent FSA Night, Wellness check-ins, and Parent Technology workshops.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Parental involvement will ensure that students are supported emotionally and academically. This will improve student achievement and mental well-being.

Action Steps to Implement

Open House (September/2021)

Person Responsible	Kevin Williams (pr4001@dadeschools.net)

Title I Orientation (October/2021)

Person Responsible	Tracy Cartwright-Rind (tcartwright@dadeschools.net)

Health and Wellness for Families Event (November/2021)

Person Responsible	Angela Mitchell (annmitch@dadeschools.net)

FSA Parent Night (January/2022)

Person Responsible	Tracy Cartwright-Rind (tcartwright@dadeschools.net)

Administration will facilitate virtual and school site parent and family engagement opportunities: Dad's Virtual Take Your Child To Work, and Bedtime Stores K-2. (November 1 - December 17, 2021)

Person Responsible	Kevin Williams (pr4001@dadeschools.net)

Administration will plan additional virtual and in-house events such as parent workshops and FSA Parent Night that will be facilitated by the school counselor, administration and teachers.
(November 1 - December 17, 2021)

Person Responsible	Tracy Cartwright-Rind (tcartwright@dadeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to the 2020-2021 District Tiered EWI Comparison ELA data, there seems to be a correlation between attendance and academic performance. The data shows that 5% of our students failed the ELA assessment while 14% of our students had absences from school. Additional data from Power BI indicates that 52% students in grades 3-5 scored proficient on the 2021 ELA FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	If we successfully implement reading research-based practices and attendance incentives then we will see an improvement in student outcomes in ELA and other academic areas as well.
Monitoring:	The Leadership Team will conduct quarterly data chats, collaborative planning sessions, professional development opportunities and ongoing progress monitoring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kevin Williams (pr4001@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will use research based best practices to target deficiencies in ELA such as data tracking, progress monitoring, and collaborative planning to ensure fidelity.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Data shows that research based best practices used with fidelity can improve student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Action steps to implement include, using data to differentiate instruction, ongoing progress monitoring, before and after school tutoring (Ongoing)

Person Responsible	Tracy Cartwright-Rind (tcartwright@dadeschools.net)

In-House Professional Development: Making Connections in Reading (September/2021)

Person Responsible	Judith Case (judith_case@dadeschools.net)

Book Study (Ongoing)

Person Responsible	Kevin Williams (pr4001@dadeschools.net)

Analyzing ELA Data for DI (Ongoing)

Person Responsible	Tracy Cartwright-Rind (tcartwright@dadeschools.net)

Administration completed schoolwide data chats to target areas of deficiencies in ELA using iReady AP1 data: students have been placed on progress monitoring using various data trackers and collaborative planning will continue to be done with fidelity.(November 1 - December 17, 2021)

Person Responsible	Kevin Williams (pr4001@dadeschools.net)

Administration implemented ELA intervention to target Tier 2 and Tier 3 students: Teacher-Led Centers, Reading Horizon Elevate, iReady and McGraw-Hill Leveled Readers. ELA intervention will continue to be implemented and monitored for fidelity.(November 1 - December 17, 2021)

Person Responsible Tracy Cartwright-Rind (tcartwright@dadeschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to the 2020-2021 District Tiered EWI Comparison Math data, there seems to correlation between attendance and academic performance. The data shows that 6% of our students failed the Math assessment while 14% of our students had absences from school. Additional data from Power BI indicates that 49% students in grades 3-5 scored proficient on the 2021 Math FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	If we successfully implement math research-based practices and attendance incentives then we will see improvement in student outcomes in Math and other academic areas as well.
Monitoring:	The Leadership Team will conduct quarterly data chats, collaborative planning sessions, professional development opportunities and ongoing progress monitoring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kevin Williams (pr4001@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidenced-based math strategies will be implemented, such as differentiated instruction, hands on activities using math manipulatives, data and progress monitoring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Data shows that research based best practices used with fidelity can improve student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Action steps to implement include, using data to differentiate instruction, ongoing progress monitoring, before and after school tutoring.

Person Responsible	Tracy Cartwright-Rind (tcartwright@dadeschools.net)

In-House Math Professional Development (October/2021)

Person Responsible	Tracy Cartwright-Rind (tcartwright@dadeschools.net)

Grade Level Planning on Effective use of Math Manipulatives (November/2021)

Person Responsible	Tracy Cartwright-Rind (tcartwright@dadeschools.net)

Analyzing Math Data Utilizing Performance Matters for DI (Ongoing)

Person Responsible	Tracy Cartwright-Rind (tcartwright@dadeschools.net)

Administration completed schoolwide data chats to target areas of deficiencies in Math using iReady AP1 data: students have been placed on progress monitoring using various data trackers and collaborative planning will continue to be done with fidelity.(November 1 - December 17, 2021)

Person Responsible	Kevin Williams (pr4001@dadeschools.net)

Administration implemented additional resources and programs to monitor and facilitate student achievement in Math: small group instruction, iReady, Reflex and after school coding program. These

additional resources will continue to be monitored to ensure implementation is done with fidelity. (November 1 - December 17, 2021)

Person Responsible   Tracy Cartwright-Rind (tcartwright@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 the 2020-2021 District/Tiered EWI Comparison our school has a 0% suspension rate. We will continue with our current school discipline plan as no further action is needed.

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.

Norwood addresses building positive school culture and the environment by maintaining supportive interactions, meaningful adult connections through hosting activities, creating protocols to foster professional relationships and effective collaborations.

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

The staff promotes a positive culture and environment at Norwood by modeling mutual respect, encouraging honest communication that values trust and respect for others. Families and community partners are encouraged to participate in school events to promote social and emotional well-being as well as furthering academic accomplishments.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Managing Accountability Systems	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00