Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Redland Middle School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| School Demographics | 3 |
|--------------------------------|----|
| | _ |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 27 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 27 |

Redland Middle School

16001 SW 248TH ST, Homestead, FL 33031

http://redlandmiddle.dadeschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Peter Gutierrez B

Start Date for this Principal: 7/28/2021

| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
|---|--|
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Middle School 6-8 |
| 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* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (47%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info | rmation* |
| 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 | or 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 | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 27 |

Redland Middle School

16001 SW 248TH ST, Homestead, FL 33031

http://redlandmiddle.dadeschools.net

School Demographics

| School Type and G (per MSID | | 2020-21 Title I School | Disadvar | 1 Economically ntaged (FRL) Rate nted on Survey 3) |
|-----------------------------------|----------|------------------------|----------|--|
| Middle Sch 6-8 | nool | Yes | | 93% |
| Primary Servi (per MSID | • • | Charter School | (Report | 9 Minority Rate ted as Non-white n Survey 2) |
| K-12 General E | ducation | No | | 97% |
| School Grades Histo | ory | | | |
| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
| Grade | | С | С | С |

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.

Redland Middle School seeks to challenge students, within a safe environment, to become critical thinkers and innovative problem solvers by working collaboratively with stakeholders in order to meet the demands of the 21st century school and workplace.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Redland Middle School strives to enrich the lives of the diverse students we serve in order to create well educated and responsible citizens who are prepared to succeed in a 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 |
|-----------------------|------------------------|---|
| Sanchez, Monica | Assistant Principal | Curriculum and instruction, discipline, and school operations. |
| Louis, Samuel | Principal | Curriculum and instruction, discipline, and school operations. |
| Travaline, Melissa | Reading Coach | Support reading department through instructional coaching cycles, data disaggregation, interventions, and professional development. |
| Villeta, Bryan | Math Coach | Support math department through instructional coaching cycles, data disaggregation, interventions, and professional development. |
| Smith, Latoiya | Dean | Restorative Justice Coordinator, SCSI, discipline |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/28/2021, Peter Gutierrez B

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.

14

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.

18

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

35

Total number of students enrolled at the school

552

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

3

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

4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

| Indicator | | | | | | | Grad | le Le | vel | | | | | Total |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|-------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAI |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 193 | 172 | 168 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 533 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 85 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 223 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 34 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 27 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 25 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 33 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 114 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97 | 109 | 114 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 320 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 52 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 172 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|--|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/20/2021

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:

| In Markey | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 180 | 198 | 203 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 581 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 98 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 261 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 51 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 136 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 54 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 47 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 139 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 50 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 155 |

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

| Indicator | | | | | | (| Grad | le Le | vel | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|-------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 82 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 228 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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 Grade Component | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 35% | 58% | 54% | 35% | 56% | 53% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 47% | 58% | 54% | 48% | 56% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 42% | 52% | 47% | 47% | 52% | 47% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 30% | 58% | 58% | 29% | 56% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 43% | 56% | 57% | 54% | 56% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 44% | 54% | 51% | 64% | 55% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 33% | 52% | 51% | 34% | 52% | 52% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 54% | 74% | 72% | 47% | 73% | 72% |

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 |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 29% | 58% | -29% | 54% | -25% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 34% | 56% | -22% | 52% | -18% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -29% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 34% | 60% | -26% | 56% | -22% |
| Cohort Co | Cohort Comparison | | | | • | |

| | MATH | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|-------------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 19% | 58% | -39% | 55% | -36% | | | | |
| Cohort Con | Cohort Comparison | | | | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | _ | | | | |

| | MATH | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|-------------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison | | | | |
| | 2019 | 26% | 53% | -27% | 54% | -28% | | | | |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -19% | | | | | | | | |
| 80 | 2021 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 17% | 40% | -23% | 46% | -29% | | | | |
| Cohort Co | Cohort Comparison | | | | | | | | | |

| | SCIENCE | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|---------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 28% | 43% | -15% | 48% | -20% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | BIOLO | GY EOC | | |
|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 0% | 68% | -68% | 67% | -67% |
| • | | CIVIC | S EOC | • | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 49% | 73% | -24% | 71% | -22% |
| | | HISTO | RY EOC | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| | | ALGEE | RA EOC | • | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 85% | 63% | 22% | 61% | 24% |
| | | GEOME | TRY EOC | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 0% | 54% | -54% | 57% | -57% |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tools utilized are iReady data, district assessments, and topic tests.

| | | Grade 6 | | |
|--------------------------|---|---------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 20.7 | 23.9 | 25.8 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 19.3 | 23.5 | 23.5 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 18.8 | 18.8 | 18.8 |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 19.4 | 23.9 | 29.0 |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | 20.7 | 27.6 | 24.1 |
| | English Language Learners | | | 21.4 |

| | | Grade 7 | | |
|--------------------------|---|---------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 28.1 | 23.8 | 23.8 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | 26.3 | 22.4 | 21.7 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 12.8 | 18.3 | 20.7 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | 11.8 | 17.1 | 19.1 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | 59 | |
| Civics | Economically Disadvantaged | | 59.3 | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 34.5 | |
| | English Language Learners | | 41.7 | |

| | | Grade 8 | | |
|--------------------------|--|---------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language | All Students Economically | 29.2 | 32.8 | 32.2 |
| English Language Arts | Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | 26.4 | 30.8 | 30.2 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 12.9 | 21.1 | 17.0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | 13.2 | 19.5 | 16.4 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | 6.9 | |

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 | 10 | 25 | 31 | 10 | 30 | 36 | 8 | 29 | | | |
| ELL | 25 | 42 | 41 | 19 | 29 | 40 | 21 | 41 | 36 | | |
| BLK | 25 | 32 | 29 | 15 | 21 | 26 | 17 | 39 | 54 | | |
| HSP | 34 | 42 | 35 | 24 | 28 | 39 | 36 | 47 | 61 | | |
| WHT | 36 | 43 | | 43 | 14 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 28 | 38 | 34 | 20 | 25 | 32 | 29 | 44 | 58 | | |
| | | 2019 | SCHOO | DL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 | 10 | 41 | 45 | 4 | 38 | 46 | 7 | 23 | | | |
| ELL | 32 | 47 | 40 | 24 | 45 | 49 | 20 | 51 | | | |
| BLK | 21 | 39 | 43 | 15 | 30 | 36 | 22 | 53 | | | |
| HSP | 41 | 50 | 41 | 35 | 48 | 48 | 38 | 53 | 92 | | |

| | 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 |
| WHT | 45 | 36 | | 64 | 64 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 33 | 45 | 43 | 28 | 42 | 44 | 30 | 54 | 90 | | |
| | | 2018 | SCHO | OL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SU | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 | 22 | 39 | 36 | 5 | 36 | 53 | 17 | 24 | | | |
| ELL | 18 | 41 | 29 | 15 | 48 | 53 | 24 | 36 | 50 | | |
| BLK | 15 | 38 | 69 | 12 | 43 | 70 | 10 | 28 | | | |
| HSP | 40 | 50 | 39 | 34 | 58 | 62 | 41 | 55 | 76 | | |
| WHT | 65 | 59 | | 47 | 47 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 33 | 46 | 47 | 28 | 53 | 64 | 32 | 44 | 70 | | |

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 | 38 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 6 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 51 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 375 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 90% |

Subgroup Data

| G I | | | | |
|---|-----|--|--|--|
| Students With Disabilities | | | | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 28 | | | |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES | | | |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | | | | |
| English Language Learners | | | | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 35 | | | |

| English Language Learners | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 35 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Native American Students | |
|--|------------|
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students 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 | 29 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 40 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students | |
| | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| | N/A |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | N/A |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% Pacific Islander Students | N/A |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% Pacific Islander Students Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? 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? | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? 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? Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? 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? Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% White Students | N/A |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? 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? Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% White Students Federal Index - White Students | N/A 34 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? 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? 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 34 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? 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? 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? Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | N/A 34 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? 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? 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? Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% Economically Disadvantaged Students | N/A 34 YES |

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?

The trends that emerge are the learning gains of the lowest 25% in ELA and math had a significant decrease. In 2019, ELA learning gains of the lowest 25% were 42% and in 2021 the learning gains of the lowest 25% were 34% resulting in a 8 percentage point decrease. In 2019, math learning gains of the lowest 25% were 44% and in 2021 the learning gains of the lowest 25% were 22%, resulting in a 11 percentage point decrease.

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

The greatest need for improvement is math learning gains and learning gains of the lowest 25% in math and ELA. In 2019, math learning gains were 43% and in 2021 the math learning gains were 26%, resulting in a 17 percentage point decrease. In 2019, math learning gains of the lowest 25% were 44% and in 2021 the learning gains of the lowest 25% were 22%, resulting in a 11 percentage point decrease. In 2019, ELA learning gains of the lowest 25% were 42% and in 2021 the learning gains of the lowest 25% were 34% resulting in a 8 percentage point decrease.

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

The contributing factors that lead to the need for improvement as it relates to math were two novice teachers, limited classroom management skills, as well as the absence of an instructional coach. Additionally, a contributing factor in literacy that may have caused a need for improvement was the implementation and consistency of differentiated instruction. New actions that will assist with improving student achievement will be the shift from small group instruction to differentiated instruction, targeted intervention groupings, utilizing the appropriate instructional materials to address student needs, and the use of progress monitoring resources and topic assessments to ensure students that instructional adjustments and student mastery of the standards are being executed.

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

There was no improvement in the data, however, the FSA ELA scores only decreased by 2 percentage points. In 2019 ELA proficiency was 35% and in 2021 ELA proficiency is 33%.

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

The contributing factors were targeted remediation in small group as well as interventions. While small group occurred, differentiated instruction was still a challenge for teachers to implement. In order to continue to support the Leadership Team will reinforce the instructional framework, provide support to teachers who struggle with implementation, and administrative feedback from classroom walkthroughs.

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

In order to accelerate learning, Redland Middle will need to utilize data-driven decision making and instruction, implement Differentiated Instruction, monitor interventions, effective curriculum and resource utilization, and establish and implement an effective instructional framework.

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

The professional development opportunities that will be provided at Redland Middle School will include data-driven decision making and instruction, differentiated instruction, technology in the classroom.

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

Redland Middle School will offer additional City Year interventions, increased math and reading interventions as well as Saturday School and after school tutoring.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Based on the 2020-2021 student culture data 49% of students felt that they were not cared for by the adults in the school site. This sentiment has increased by 26% over the course of 3 years. As a result, targeting social emotional learning will ensure that students feel cared for by adults at the school site and will improve student-teacher relationships.

If the Social Emotional Learning Strategy is implemented consistently, then by October 2021, the amount of Student Case Management forms will decrease by 50% and

Measurable 2021, the amount of Student Case Management forms will decrease by 50% and **Outcome:** counselors and the mental health coordinator will identify targeted students for mental

health interventions.

Monitoring: The Student Case Management forms will be monitored quarterly by the SCSI teacher,

counselors, and the Mental Health Coordinator.

Person responsible

for Latoiya Smith (smithla@dadeschools.net)

monitoring outcome:

Evidencebased

The Social Emotional Learning strategy will improve student teacher relationships by

Strategy:The Godal Emotional Learning strategy with ensuring students emotional needs are met.

Rationale for using the Social Emotional Learning Strategy is due to the effect of students being at home due to the Covid-19 pandemic stay-at-home order, and not having physical interactions with their teachers and peers. In addition, the Social Emotional Learning Strategy will also improve student-teacher relationships for those students that expressed that they were not cared for by adults at the school site.

Evidencebased Strategy:

Dased Stratogy

Action Steps to Implement

9/6-10/15- Counselors and Mental Health Coordinator will select students for small group interventions. As a result, student groups will formed.

Person
Responsible Monica Sanchez (m_sanchez@dadeschools.net)

9/6-10/15- The Mental Health Coordinator will provide Mental Health Presentations to teachers and parents once a month on Fridays. As a result, teachers and parents will have a better understanding of social emotional learning and challenges that middle school students face.

Person
Responsible Monica Sanchez (m_sanchez@dadeschools.net)

9/6-6/9- The Student Council will conduct surveys and discussions with the student body within the Social Emotional Learning classes and communicate findings on social emotional learning. As a result, administration, The RJP team, and counselors will be able to address student concerns.

Person
Responsible Monica Sanchez (m_sanchez@dadeschools.net)

9/6-6/9- The Restorative Justice Coordinator will conduct professional development during faculty meetings on Restorative Justice Practices to build teacher capacity. As a result, teachers and City Year Corps Members will implement Restorative Justice Practice's in their classrooms which will impact student-teacher relationships and student-student relationships.

Person
Responsible
Latoiya Smith (smithla@dadeschools.net)

11/1-12/17-On professional development days and faculty meetings, an RJP professional development session will be provided on site. As a results, teacher will be able to connect with their students and support social emotional learning. As a result, the RJ P team and counselors will be able to address student concerns.

Person

Responsible Latoiya Smith (smithla@dadeschools.net)

11/1-12/17-EESAC will meet with Student Council to discuss Social Emotional Learning surveys and findings to develop next steps to address student needs.

Person
Responsible
Latoiya Smith (smithla@dadeschools.net)

1/31-4/29- City Year Corps Members and students in Peer Counseling will assist with the implementation of RJP and SEL practices. The RJP Coordinator will check in with the City Year Corps members and the Counselors will check in with the students in Peer Counseling and monitor implementation. As a result, students will have additional mentorship opportunities.

Person
Responsible Latoiya Smith (smithla@dadeschools.net)

1/31-4/29- Counselors and RJP Coordinator will visit classrooms to model student check ins with targeted student groups. The Counselors and RJP Coordinator will provide weekly reflections during Leadership Team Meetings. As a result, teachers will have opportunities for modeling in their classroom.

Person
Responsible Latoiya Smith (smithla@dadeschools.net)

#2. Leadership specifically relating to Managing Accountability Systems

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2020-2021 School Performance Data, the overall school grade was 36% which was an eleven percent decrease from the 2018-2019 overall school grade of a 47%. As a result, managing accountability systems by providing consistent, developmental feedback and regular review of data will ensure that clear expectations are provided and that all stakeholders are working towards a common goal.

Measurable Outcome: If consistent management accountability systems and regular review of data are implemented, based on the 2021-2022 FSA data our School Grade Calculation will be 43%

during the 2021-2022 school year.

The Leadership Team will conduct targeted administrative walkthroughs and data chats that focus on topic assessment, interim, and i-Ready data to be used to provide specific teacher feedback.

Person responsible

Monitoring:

for Samuel Louis (slouis@dadeschools.net)

monitoring outcome:

Evidence-

based

for

Consistent meetings with stakeholders to review data and developmental feedback from targeted walkthroughs will assist in setting clear expectations. The Leadership Team will monitor and communicate high-expectations for teachers and students to achieve the school's overall mission and goals.

Rationale

Strategy:

The rationale for using the strategy of consistent, developmental feedback and regular data

Evidencebased chats, is the decrease in school performance from the 2018-2019 school to to the

2020-2021 school year.

Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

8/30-10/15- The Administrative Team will conduct weekly targeted walk-throughs utilizing the Framework of Effective Instruction and provide teachers with specific, developmental feedback. As a result, teachers will use specific developmental feedback to adjust instruction.

Person Responsible

Samuel Louis (slouis@dadeschools.net)

8/30-6/9- The Administrative Team will conduct quarterly data chats using data trackers and data chat forms with teachers and guide teachers in reflecting on data and setting individual goals. As a result, teachers will utilize data chat forms to set student goals as reflected through differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible

Monica Sanchez (m_sanchez@dadeschools.net)

8/30-6/9- The Administrative Team will guide the work of the instructional coaches through individual feedback and weekly coaches meetings where reflection, goal setting, and strategic planning will take place. As a result, instructional coaches will utilize feedback to adjust or improve teacher support.

Person Responsible

Monica Sanchez (m_sanchez@dadeschools.net)

8/30-6-9- Instructional Coaches will implement targeted coaching cycles and support teachers through weekly collaborative planning to support school goals. As a result, instructional practices will be reflected in classroom walkthroughs.

Person Responsible

Melissa Travaline (235108@dadeschools.net)

11/1-12/17- Instructional Coaches will provide additional guidance to teachers based on administrator feedback from walkthroughs. As a result, instructional practices will be reflected in classroom walkthroughs.

Person Responsible

Monica Sanchez (m_sanchez@dadeschools.net)

11/1-12/17- The Administrative Team will attend collaborative planning sessions for content areas. As a result, collaborative planning outcomes will drive instructional walkthroughs.

Person Responsible

Monica Sanchez (m_sanchez@dadeschools.net)

1/31-4/29- The Administrative Team will conduct weekly targeted walk-throughs with a focus on interventions and test-taking strategies. The walk-through focus will be data-driven instruction, scaffolding of questions, and test-taking strategies. As a result, teachers will receive specific developmental feedback to adjust instruction.

Person

Responsible Monica Sanchez (m_sanchez@dadeschools.net)

1/31-4/29- The math instructional coach and literacy interventionists will implement interventions that focus on AP2 iReady data and Algebra MYA data. The Administrative Team will follow up with walk-throughs of the interventions and focus on the targeted student groups and remediation of skills. As a result, targeted students will receive additional interventions.

Person Responsible

Bryan Villeta (299815@dadeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of
Focus
Description
and
Rationale:

On the 2018-2019 school performance data, the lowest 25% in ELA decreased 8 percentage points from 42% to 34%. In math the decrease was 11 percentage points from 44% to 33%. Based on the data, it was noticed that targeting differentiation will ensure that all students individual needs are being met.

Measurable Outcome:

If we successfully implement differentiation, then our lowest 25% students will increase by a minimum of 7 percentage points as evidenced by the 2021-2022 assessment.

Redland Middle will utilize Differentiated Instruction evidenced based strategy to be implemented daily in literacy and math classes. Initial groupings will be based on designated data points but will be fluid based on formative progress monitoring data. During Leadership and Grade Level Team meetings, initial and progress monitoring data points will be analyzed to ensure student growth is positive. In addition, the Leadership

Monitoring:

Team will conduct quarterly data chats to provide instructional recommendations to facilitate the implementation of the evidence-based strategy Differentiated Instruction. Lastly, the Leadership Team will conduct targeted walk-throughs to ensure fidelity of implementation.

Person responsible

monitoring

Monica Sanchez (m_sanchez@dadeschools.net)

outcome:

Evidence-

Strategy:

based

Redland Middle School will focus on the evidenced-based strategy of data-driven instruction. Data-Driven instruction will assist us in accelerating the learning gains of our lowest 25%. Data-Driven instruction will be monitored throughout the use of progress progress monitoring.

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy: The rationale for using the Differentiation Instruction strategy is a significant decrease of overall learning gains in both reading and math. Reading had a decrease of 8 percentage points and 17 percentage points in Math. In the lowest 25%, Reading decreased by 8 percentage points and Math decreased by 11 percentage points. Through the use of differentiation, students will be remediated based on their individual needs.

Action Steps to Implement

8/30-10/15- Instructional Coaches will provide professional development for the math and reading departments on the use of data-driven instruction, student grouping, and remediation. As a result, teachers will have student groups, utilize appropriate resources, and differentiated instruction will be reflected in lesson plans.

Person Responsible

Melissa Travaline (235108@dadeschools.net)

8/30-10/15- Based on Leadership Team quarterly data chats, coaching cycle discussions, and progress of differentiated instruction groups in classes. Math, ELA, and Reading teachers will receive coaching cycles focusing on the implementation of differentiated instruction. As a result, teachers will implement differentiated instruction with fidelity.

Person Responsible

Bryan Villeta (299815@dadeschools.net)

8/30-6/9- Based on teacher-student data chats and one-on-one teacher-coach/administration data chats, data trackers will be utilized in math and reading classes so that teachers can conference with students,

monitor student progress, and address individual student needs. As a result, students will take ownership of their data and groups will be fluid based on topic tests, iReady diagnostics, and interim assessments.

Person Responsible

Melissa Travaline (235108@dadeschools.net)

8/30-6/9- Administration will conduct weekly walkthroughs to ensure implementation of data-driven instruction and targeted differentiation. As a result, teachers will maintain fluid groups to ensure that targeted instruction is being met.

Person

Responsible

Monica Sanchez (m_sanchez@dadeschools.net)

11/1-12/17- Instructional Coaches will provide in-class coaching support that will focus on addressing students' varying levels for differentiating whole/small group instruction. As a result, students will have additional support to support their individual needs.

Person

Responsible

Bryan Villeta (299815@dadeschools.net)

11/1-12/17- Instructional Coaches will provide individual planning sessions that will focus on addressing students' levels for differentiating whole/small group instruction. As a result, teachers will be able to plan for their specific student needs.

Person

Responsible

Melissa Travaline (235108@dadeschools.net)

1/31-4/29- The ELA department will implement biweekly cold reads in order to effectively progress monitor instruction and remediate through small group instruction. The reading transformation coach will debrief results with teachers and assist teachers with planning for remediation and share out during leadership team meetings. As a result, teachers will progress monitor to remediate student deficiencies.

Person

Responsible

Melissa Travaline (235108@dadeschools.net)

1/31-4/29- The Math department will utilize the data from topic assessments to guide the bell-ringers and differentiated instruction. The math transformational coach will debrief results with teachers and assist teachers with planning for remediation and share out during leadership team meetings. As a result, teachers will utilize data to remediate student deficiencies.

Person

Responsible

Bryan Villeta (299815@dadeschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2020-2021 School Climate Survey Results, there was an 18 percent increase in students with 31 or more absences. As a result, on the 2020-2021 school performance data, Reading decreased 3 percentage points in proficiency, from 35% to 33%. Math decreased 8 percentage points, from 30% to 22%. Civics decreased 8 percentage points, from 54% to 46%. Science decreased by 2 percentage points from 33% to 31%. Consequently, targeting student engagement will ensure that all learners are provided opportunities to succeed in the classroom and impact student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

If we successfully increase student engagement, the number of students with 31 or more absences will decrease by 7 percent and overall proficiency will increase by 5 percentage points across all content areas.

Monitoring:

The Leadership Team will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor student engagement. In addition, attendance will be monitored on a daily basis and students will be provided with incentives. Actions will include students engaging with the text, peer collaboration, and collaboration with teachers.

Person responsible

for monitoring outcome:

Samuel Louis (slouis@dadeschools.net)

Evidencebased Strategy: Redland Middle will focus on the evidence-based strategy of blended learning as a means to engage students with a variety of learning modalities. As a result, students will be motivated to attend class and be provided additional opportunities to interact with district provided curriculum to increase student achievement.

Rationale

for Evidencebased Strategy: Due to the decrease in all areas, the Instructional Practice of Student Engagement was chosen to provide learners with a variety of learning opportunities and appeal to diverse learning modalities.

Action Steps to Implement

8/30- 6/9- Redland Middle School will provide quarterly professional development focusing on Schoology and other platforms to support classroom instruction. As a result, professional development sessions will provide opportunities for students to be exposed to content in a different way to meet their learning styles.

Person Responsible

Bryan Villeta (299815@dadeschools.net)

8/30-6/9- Teachers will provide digital opportunities for students to collaborate and engage with one another to foster a connection with peers and teachers. As a result, ongoing collaboration will occur on assignments, discussion boards/posts, and buddy journals.

Person Responsible

Melissa Travaline (235108@dadeschools.net)

8/30-6/9- Teachers will provide students with constructive and timely feedback via Schoology or Microsoft Teams to cultivate an environment in which allows for students to be more focused and successful. As a result, students will be empowered to participate in virtual posts and online discussions.

Person Responsible

Bryan Villeta (299815@dadeschools.net)

8/30-6/9- The Administrative Team will provide teachers with constructive feedback based on observations of the use of blended learning platforms. As a result, teachers will utilize Microsoft Teams or Schoology to provided blended learning.

Person

Responsible

Monica Sanchez (m_sanchez@dadeschools.net)

11/1-12/17- The Schoology liaison will provide opportunities during team meetings and department meetings for teachers to receive support. As a result, teachers will receive individualized support.

Person

Responsible Monica Sanchez (m_sanchez@dadeschools.net)

11/1-12/17- Instructional Coaches will work with teachers during planning on implementing digital platforms. As a result, teachers will receive individualized support.

Person

Responsible Bryan Villeta (299815@dadeschools.net)

1/31-4/29- The Schoology liaison will provide professional development during faculty meetings for the remainder of the school year. The transformation coaches will follow up individually with the reading and math departments. As a result, teachers will receive additional support with Schoology.

Person Responsible

Melissa Travaline (235108@dadeschools.net)

1/31-4/29- Teacher best practices will be highlighted during faculty meetings for the remainder of the school year. The Social Studies and Science teams will follow up with teachers during team meetings. As a result, teachers will take leadership roles within their departments.

Person

Responsible

Bryan Villeta (299815@dadeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, 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.

Redland Middle School's primary area of concern is bullying/physical attacks, which had a moderate risk. Utilizing our mental health coordinator and trust counselor students will be allotted opportunities to participate in small group sessions to alleviate the identified behaviors. Midweek mindfulness check-ins will be presented to the student body once a week When incidents are notified to administration Restorative Justice Practice circles will be conducted. These activities will have an impact on the student's overall mental health will and will assist in decreasing the amount of harassment or bullying. The amount of Student Case Management Forms identifying our areas of concern will decrease with the implementation of these practices.

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.

Redland Middle School builds a positive school culture by fostering professional relationships between school staff that supports effective collaboration. Social media, academic incentives, attendance incentives, and staff incentives are implemented to promote a positive school culture. New teachers are supported through mentorship and coaching support. We provide students with ongoing counseling support and provide weekly meetings to parents to address areas of concern. The integration of social emotional learning is conducted within classrooms. Bullying, harassment, and intolerance are addressed swiftly.

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

Mr. Louis, Principal focuses on teacher morale and a positive school culture. Ms. Sanchez, the Assistant Principal focuses on student and staff connections as well as engaging the team. Ms. Smith, SCSI focuses on conflict resolution through Restorative Justice Practices as well as school discipline to ensure safety. Mr. Granberry, Behavior Management Teacher focuses ESE student behaviors and discipline. Ms. Travaline, the Reading Coach focuses on teacher development as well as morale in her department.

Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning | \$0.00 |
|---|--------|--|--------|
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Leadership: Managing Accountability Systems | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement | \$0.00 |
| | | Total: | \$0.00 |