

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# Henry H. Filer Middle School



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>26</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>27</b> |

# Henry H. Filer Middle School

531 W 29TH ST, Hialeah, FL 33012

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Rene Bellmas**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/19/2020

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>6-8   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2020-21 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Hispanic Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (53%)<br>2017-18: B (57%)<br>2016-17: C (52%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   |  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |  |

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Table of Contents

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>27</b> |

## Henry H. Filer Middle School

531 W 29TH ST, Hialeah, FL 33012

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

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Middle School<br>6-8                             | Yes                    | 97%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 98%  |

### School Grades History

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

At Henry H. Filer Middle School, our mission is to enrich the community through a multicultural education experience. This sets the groundwork for high school and prepares students to become productive members of the workforce and of society in an advanced technological age. The school addresses the needs of the whole child, and the school provides a center for community activities.

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

At Henry H. Filer Middle School, our vision is to prepare students to reach their maximum potential. The school's educational community and stakeholders are dedicated to educating students so that they become lifelong learners in a complex and competitive society. We will continue to enrich the community through the development of the academic program and enhancement of technology, with emphasis on character education, so that students become productive citizens.

### 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  |
|------------------|---------------------|--|
| Bellmas, Rene    | Principal           | Provides a vision for the school in order to guide the implementation of data decision making in the classroom and teaching practices. Communicates all progress and monitoring with all stakeholders. Assess teaching methods, monitor student achievement, encourage parent involvement, revise policies and procedures, administer the budget, hire and evaluate staff and oversee facilities.  |
| Estevez, Lizette | Assistant Principal | Monitor and assist all leadership team members to ensure all teachers are provided with the appropriate materials and district resources for effective teaching. Deal with the issues of school management, student activities and services, community relations, personnel, and curriculum instruction  |
| Chase, Lucianna  | Teacher, K-12       | Assist in guiding common planning and the development of instructional focus among the ELA department. Monitor the utilization of all district and region resources for instruction. Teacher Leader – plan and deliver lessons. Administer assessments, use data to provide differentiated instruction. Participate in the planning and delivery of professional development for staff.  |
| Gonzalez, Susana | Teacher, K-12       | Assist in guiding common planning and the development of instructional focus among the ELL department. Monitor the utilization of all district and region resources for instruction. Teacher Leader – plan and deliver lessons. Administer assessments, use data to provide differentiated instruction. Participate in the planning and delivery of professional development for staff.  |
| Triana, Georgina | Teacher, K-12       | Ensure that all technological resources are being provided to teachers for effective instructional practices. Assist in guiding common planning and the development of instructional focus among the social studies department. Monitor the utilization of all district and region resources for instruction. Teacher Leader – plan and deliver lessons. Administer assessments, use data to provide differentiated instruction. Participate in the planning and delivery of professional development for staff. |
| Garcia, Thais    | Teacher, K-12       | Assist in guiding common planning and the development of instructional focus among the science department. Monitor the utilization of all district and region resources for instruction. Teacher Leader – plan and deliver lessons. Administer assessments, use data to provide differentiated instruction. Participate in the planning and delivery of professional development for staff.  |

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Sunday 7/19/2020, Rene Bellmas

**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.*

**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.*

14

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

30

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

553

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

10

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

1

### 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                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 189 | 165 | 199 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 553   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45  | 37  | 47  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 129   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38  | 20  | 57  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 115   |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43  | 33  | 31  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 107   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29  | 37  | 43  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 109   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28  | 35  | 48  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 111   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87  | 101 | 126 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 314   |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 48 | 73 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 175   |

**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     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 9 | 21 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 50 |       |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7  | 4 | 7  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 18 |       |

**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                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 190 | 200 | 196 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 586 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41  | 40  | 43  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 124 |       |
| One or more suspensions                       | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |
| Course failure in ELA                         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29  | 52  | 29  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 110 |       |
| Course failure in Math                        | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41  | 22  | 52  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 115 |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38  | 43  | 51  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 132 |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35  | 48  | 58  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 141 |       |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |    |    | Total |     |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|-------|-----|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12  |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 65 | 76 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 198 |

**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     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 8 | 20 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 46 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8  | 3 | 7  | 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 | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             |        |          |       | 40%    | 58%      | 54%   | 42%    | 56%      | 53%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 51%    | 58%      | 54%   | 57%    | 56%      | 54%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 49%    | 52%      | 47%   | 55%    | 52%      | 47%   |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 40%    | 58%      | 58%   | 47%    | 56%      | 58%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 45%    | 56%      | 57%   | 58%    | 56%      | 57%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 44%    | 54%      | 51%   | 47%    | 55%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 49%    | 52%      | 51%   | 54%    | 52%      | 52%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  |        |          |       | 73%    | 74%      | 72%   | 72%    | 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 | 30%    | 58%      | -28%                       | 54%   | -24%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 37%    | 56%      | -19%                       | 52%   | -15%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -30%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 39%    | 60%      | -21%                       | 56%   | -17%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -37%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 24%    | 58%      | -34%                       | 55%   | -31%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 40%    | 53%      | -13%                       | 54%   | -14%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -24%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 21%    | 40%      | -19%                       | 46%   | -25%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -40%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 40%    | 43%      | -3%                        | 48%   | -8%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| BIOLOGY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| CIVICS EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019        | 68%    | 73%      | -5%                   | 71%   | -3%                |
| HISTORY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| ALGEBRA EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019        | 86%    | 63%      | 23%                   | 61%   | 25%                |

| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                             |       |                          |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2021         |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019         |        |          |                             |       |                          |

### Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Grades 6-8-i-Ready diagnostic Results- ELA and Math

Grades 6-8-Midyear Assessments: Social Studies and Science

| Grade 6               |                            |       |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 32.7% | 28.7%  | 41%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 32.6% | 28.6%  | 41.1%  |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 21.7% | 8.3%   | 30%    |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 7.3%  | 7.3%   | 13.2%  |
| Mathematics           | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 22.2% | 26.8%  | 32.8%  |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 22.4% | 27.3%  | 32.8%  |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |       | 8.7%   | 10%    |
|                       | English Language Learners  |       |        | 2%     |

| Grade 7               |                            |       |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 33.5% | 30.3%  | 38.3%  |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 33.1% | 29.3%  | 38.3%  |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 9.7%  | 16.7%  | 8.3%   |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 6.7%  | 11.1%  | 3.6%   |
| Mathematics           | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 19.3% | 25.3%  | 33.7%  |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 19%   | 24%    | 33.5%  |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 7.7%  | 15.4%  | 38.5%  |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 6.8%  | 15.9%  | 20.5%  |
| Civics                | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               |       | 63%    |        |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |       | 61%    |        |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |       | 31%    |        |
|                       | English Language Learners  |       | 27%    |        |

| Grade 8                  |                               |       |        |        |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
| English Language<br>Arts | All Students                  | 27.7% | 35.8%  | 41.7%  |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 27%   | 35%    | 41.3%  |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 9.1%  | 17.4%  | 21.7%  |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 3.6%  | 6.9%   | 10.3%  |
|                          |                               |       |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics              | All Students                  | 19%   | 28%    | 30%    |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 19.3% | 27.2%  | 29.2%  |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 5.9%  | 4.8%   | 22.2%  |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  |       | 8%     | 23.1%  |
|                          |                               |       |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
| Science                  | All Students                  |       | 14%    |        |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged |       | 14%    |        |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities |       | 0%     |        |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  |       | 7%     |        |
|                          |                               |       |        |        |

## Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |             |           |                   |              |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
|---|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 |
| SWD                                       | 18          | 28        | 26                | 11           | 26         | 28                 | 13          | 25         |              |                         |                           |
| ELL                                       | 31          | 41        | 36                | 29           | 37         | 39                 | 37          | 47         | 85           |                         |                           |
| HSP                                       | 37          | 42        | 36                | 33           | 36         | 39                 | 48          | 52         | 84           |                         |                           |
| WHT                                       | 55          | 64        |                   | 36           | 27         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL                                       | 37          | 44        | 35                | 32           | 36         | 38                 | 47          | 49         | 82           |                         |                           |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |             |           |                   |              |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2017-18 |
| SWD                                       | 13          | 33        | 29                | 12           | 27         | 33                 | 33          | 50         |              |                         |                           |
| ELL                                       | 28          | 48        | 49                | 30           | 43         | 44                 | 36          | 64         | 83           |                         |                           |
| BLK                                       | 25          | 30        |                   | 36           |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP                                       | 40          | 52        | 49                | 40           | 46         | 45                 | 47          | 73         | 84           |                         |                           |
| FRL                                       | 38          | 50        | 47                | 39           | 45         | 45                 | 48          | 72         | 84           |                         |                           |

| 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                                       | 18       | 41     | 46          | 25        | 55      | 48           | 19       | 61      |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 21       | 51     | 51          | 30        | 49      | 43           | 38       | 57      | 71        |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 20       | 30     |             | 20        | 30      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 42       | 57     | 55          | 47        | 58      | 48           | 54       | 72      | 80        |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 70       |        |             | 90        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 40       | 56     | 55          | 46        | 58      | 47           | 53       | 71      | 81        |                   |                     |

### 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  | 47  |
| 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 | 61  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 466 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 10  |
| Percent Tested  | 99% |
| Subgroup Data   |     |
| Students With Disabilities  |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 26  |
| 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                                       | 44  |
| 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  | 47  |
| 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   | 46  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      |     |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 46  |
| 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:

All grade level and subgroups learning gains were close in range from 25% to 30%. Black subgroup is the lowest performing subgroup in all content areas. ELL and ESE perform lowest in ELA (24% and 33%) and Science (19% and 23%).

2021 data:

Based on FSA ELA proficiency data there was no change from previous year's 35 percent scoring proficiency. In Math there was a decreased of 1% proficiency from the previous year from 29% to 28%. ELA and Math learning gains decreased 8 percentage points and 9 percentage points respectively. Lowest 25 % ELA decreased from 49% to 35% and Math from 44% to 39%.

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

2019 data:

Based on iReady data, 6th grade reading (from 32.7% to 41%) and math (from 22.2% to 32.8%) demonstrate the greatest need for improvement from Ap1 to AP3. The majority of our ELL subgroups demonstrated minimal increases from 6th grade 7.3% to 14%, 8th grade from 3.6% to 10.3% and a decline in 7th grade from 14% to 11.1% from AP1 to AP2.

2021 data:

Based on FSA ELA proficiency data there was no change from previous year's 35 percent scoring proficiency. In Math there was a decreased of 1% proficiency from the previous year from 29% to 28%. Math is in great need of improvement.

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

2019 data:

The iReady and 2019 assessment data are the contributing factors for this need for improvement. The last 3 years we have focused on implementing common planning and the development of effective instructional plans. New actions necessary for improvement include identifying specific needs for each students, developing intervention strategies for tiered students and the implementation of targeted lessons to ensure bridging the learning gap through differentiated instruction.

2021 data:

Based on FSA ELA proficiency data there was no change from previous year's 35 percent scoring proficiency. In Math there was a decreased of 1% proficiency from the previous year from 29% to 28%. Additional intervention is required in the areas of math grades 6-8.

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

2019 data:

Based on iReady data, 7th grade ELA students made a 7% increase from the Fall to the Spring. In 7th grade Math, students made a 14% increase from the Fall to the Spring.

2021 data:

Based on FSA ELA proficiency data there was no change from previous year's 35 percent scoring proficiency. In Math there was a decreased of 1% proficiency from the previous year from 29% to 28%.

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

The contributing factors to this improvement included the consistent use and monitoring of iReady. As a school, we closely monitored iReady progress and provided incentives and initiatives for usage. Teachers also utilized the iReady Teacher Toolbox for DI.

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

Additional differentiated instruction targeting specific student needs will be necessary to accelerate learning. Along with the implementation of additional DI, teachers are to effectively plan for DI and the use of data analysis. This systematic approach of instruction uses assessment, analysis and actions to meet student's needs.

**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.**

Some professional development opportunities for teachers will include assisting in the planning and development of DI and data analysis. This is to include monthly ongoing PD to ensure all teachers are planning and implementing effective DI plans and data analysis. Professional development session on 9/16/21 and 10/28/21.

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

Additional services to students will include providing small group intervention to students in the lowest 25% and Tier 3 students in iReady in math and reading.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | Based on all assessment and progress monitoring data to include 2021 FSA MATH results at 28 percent proficient, the need for addressing specific needs for each student is necessary for bridging the gap in learning. With that, as a school we find the need to provide DI to our students is crucial in their academic success.  |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | After the consistent implementation of DI, iReady scores should demonstrate a steady increase throughout all AP administrations to show learning gains and growth in reading and math towards a goal 50% of students making proficiency.  |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | iReady progress reports will be monitored weekly by EDGE teachers and ELA and Math teachers.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Lucianna Chase (312726@dadeschools.net)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | Differentiated Instruction is a framework or philosophy for effective teaching that involves providing different students with different avenues to learning (often in the same classroom) in terms of: acquiring content, processing, constructing, or making sense of ideas, and developing teaching materials and assessment measures so that all students within a classroom can learn effectively, regardless of differences in ability. |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | This strategy was selected based on evidenced based research which indicates that DI increases student achievement when you use data consistently and effectively. The resources used for selecting this strategy were state assessment results, district assessment results and iReady progress monitoring reports.  |

**Action Steps to Implement**

9/3/21-10/11/21-Identify relevant data from prior state and district assessments along with iReady results. As a results, teachers will become more familiar with their student data.

**Person Responsible** Lucianna Chase (312726@dadeschools.net)

9/3/21-10/11/21-Identify the gaps within each class using the data from iReady, district mini and unit assessments. As a result, teachers will be able to identify appropriate standard based resources for instruction.

**Person Responsible** Lucianna Chase (312726@dadeschools.net)

9/30/21-10/11/21-Plan for action (intervention). Develop a DI plan for each class to follow using the intervention resources. As a result, a plan will be developed to implement DI to students.

**Person Responsible** Lucianna Chase (312726@dadeschools.net)

9/30/21-10/11/21-Implement iReady intervention using toolbox and DI planning sheet in class. As a result, students will be provided additional assistance in their targeted standard.

**Person Responsible** Lucianna Chase (312726@dadeschools.net)

9/30/21-10/11/21-Evaluate success monthly to include ongoing data chats and include student incentives to ensure engagement. Weekly reports will be provided to debrief with students and realign instruction. As a result, students will demonstrate an increase in iReady usage and completion.

**Person Responsible** Georgina Triana (gtriana@dadeschools.net)

11/1/21-12/17/21-Continue to identify the gaps within each class using the data from iReady, district mini and unit assessments. As a result, teachers will be able to identify appropriate standard based resources for instruction.

**Person Responsible** Lucianna Chase (312726@dadeschools.net)

11/1/21-12/17/21-Continue to implement iReady intervention using toolbox and DI planning sheet in class. As a result, students will be provided additional assistance in their targeted standard.

**Person Responsible** Lucianna Chase (312726@dadeschools.net)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Based on all assessment and progress monitoring data to include 2021 FSA Math results at 28 percent proficient, the area of focus was identified based on SIP teacher data requesting additional assistance in working with data and implementing data driven instruction.

**Measurable Outcome:** The school plans to achieve an increase in student achievement by providing more targeted instruction to meet the needs of the students.

**Monitoring:** Collaborative planning will be monitored monthly by administration. It will provide targeted academic instruction based on data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Rene Bellmas (pr6171@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Standards-Based Collaborative Planning refers to any period of time that is scheduled during the school day for multiple teachers, or teams of teachers, to work together. Its primary purpose is to bring teachers together to learn from one another and collaborate on projects that will lead to improvements in standards-aligned lesson quality, instructional effectiveness, and student achievement. Standards-Based lessons should include detailed objectives, activities and assessments that evaluate students on the aligned standards-based content. Collaborative Planning improves collaboration among teachers and promotes learning, insights, and constructive feedback that occur during professional discussions among teachers. Standards-Based lessons, units, materials, and resources are improved when teachers work on them collaboratively.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Based on the SIP survey results and the teacher's request for additional support and assistance. Resources include iReady toolbox, Edgenuity, Learn Smart and all district resources available.

**Action Steps to Implement**

8/23/21-9/3/21-Assess the PD needs of all staff members. As a result, the school can identify PD sessions for the year.

**Person Responsible** Rene Bellmas (pr6171@dadeschools.net)

9/3/21-10/11/21-Schedule school site PD sessions for the upcoming teacher planning day. As a result, teachers will have an opportunity to attend requested PD with ample time available.

**Person Responsible** Georgina Triana (gtriana@dadeschools.net)

9/3/21-10/11/21-Continue to provide online resources and trainings to teachers based on PD assessment results. As a result, teachers do not have to wait until a teacher planning day for additional resources and training and are able to attend and view virtually.

**Person Responsible** Lucianna Chase (312726@dadeschools.net)

9/3/21-10/11/21-Continue to assess the needs of teachers and their requests for areas of PD. As a result, teachers will be provided with their PD needs on an ongoing basis.

**Person Responsible** Rene Bellmas (pr6171@dadeschools.net)

11/1/21-12/17/21-Continue to provide online resources and trainings to teachers based on PD assessment results. As a result, teachers do not have to wait until a teacher planning day for additional resources and training and are able to attend and view virtually.

**Person Responsible** Lucianna Chase (312726@dadeschools.net)

11/1/21-12/17/21-Continue to assess the needs of teachers and their requests for areas of PD. As a result, teachers will be provided with their PD needs on an ongoing basis.

**Person Responsible** Lucianna Chase (312726@dadeschools.net)

**#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

From the teacher and student's school climate survey results, social emotional learning is critical in the teaching and learning environment.

**Measurable Outcome:**

As a result of incorporating a weekly mindfulness activity, students and teachers will be able to reduce stress and burn out. It benefits students well being, social skills and ability to focus on academic performance.

**Monitoring:**

This is will be monitored by teachers and counselors participating in the weekly activity. In time, students and teachers will demonstrate a more positive and relaxed outlook in coping with stress and anxiety.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Georgina Triana (gtriana@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Mindfulness is the practice of being in a state of active and open attention in the present. Research suggests that in an educational setting, practicing Mindfulness can benefit students' well-being, social skills, ability to focus and academic performance. Mindfulness may also reduce stress and burnout for teachers and administrators. The key element to successful Mindfulness practices is to incorporate consistent times for practice throughout the school week, as little as 10-15 minutes at a time can be beneficial.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

This strategy was selected to help improve and prevent anxiety and stress among teachers and students. Resources for these mindfulness activities include the use of the headspace app, youtube and gonoodle.com.

**Action Steps to Implement**

8/23/21-9/3/21-Introduce the headspace application to teachers and model how it can be used. As a result, teachers will be able to become familiar with the benefits of the application and its uses.

**Person Responsible**

Georgina Triana (gtriana@dadeschools.net)

8/31/21-10/11/21-Begin Mindful Mondays beginning promptly on Monday mornings all students and staff will start their day with a brief mediation to start the week. As a result, teachers and students can begin small practices of becoming more mindful.

**Person Responsible**

Rene Bellmas (pr6171@dadeschools.net)

8/31/21-10/11/21-Begin "After Lunch Breaks". These are one minute breaks to help students and teachers refocus after lunch. This enables students and teachers to regain focus and motivation for the second part of their day. As a result, teachers and students will be more focused and motivated in their afternoon learning sessions.

**Person Responsible**

Georgina Triana (gtriana@dadeschools.net)

8/31/21-10/11/21-Establish a RJP room where students can regroup and realign along with problem solving and learn conflict resolution strategies. As a result, we are teaching students how to be more mindful and become better problem solvers.

**Person Responsible** Georgina Triana (gtriana@dadeschools.net)

11/1/21-12/17/21-Continue Mindful Mondays beginning promptly on Monday mornings all students and staff will start their day with a brief mediation to start the week. As a result, teachers and students can begin small practices of becoming more mindful.

**Person Responsible** Georgina Triana (gtriana@dadeschools.net)

11/1/21-12/17/21-Continue the use of the RJP room where students can regroup and realign along with problem solving and learn conflict resolution strategies. As a result, we are teaching students how to be more mindful and become better problem solvers.

**Person Responsible** Georgina Triana (gtriana@dadeschools.net)



**#4. Leadership specifically relating to Managing Accountability Systems****Area of Focus  
Description and Rationale:**

Based on the staff SIP survey, teachers indicated a need for additional support and resources when planning and implementing data driven instruction.

**Measurable Outcome:**

The school plans on providing targeted ongoing professional development to teachers in the areas of data tracking and DI planning. This will provide teachers with a targeted achievement goal for each student.

**Monitoring:**

Monthly DI Collaborative Planning will be monitored by administration to ensure DI planning is occurring. Classroom walkthroughs will ensure DI planning is being implemented in small group instruction.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Rene Bellmas (pr6171@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Assessing team effectiveness entails a continuous deliberate practice of gauging the level of success based on qualitative and quantitative data. To ensure success, prioritize and periodically track progress of goals and actions, and modify previous plans where necessary to establish efficacious.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Based on data, teachers are requesting additional support and assistance in bridging the achievement gap through DI intervention.

**Action Steps to Implement**

8/23/21-8/31/21-Provide monthly times for DI Collaborative Planning among departments to plan for DI. As a result, time will be allotted for such planning to ensure DI plans are created.

**Person Responsible**

Rene Bellmas (pr6171@dadeschools.net)

8/31/21-10/11/21-Meet monthly to create monthly DI plans per class and period using the iReady data and other district data resources. As a result, DI plans will be tailored to meet the needs of each student based on the most up to date data.

**Person Responsible**

Lucianna Chase (312726@dadeschools.net)

8/31/21-10/11/21-Implement the DI plans in classroom designed during common planning. As a results, students will receive targeted standard based instruction based on the data.

**Person Responsible**

Lucianna Chase (312726@dadeschools.net)

8/31/21-10/11/21-Provide additional support in DI planning sessions for teachers and evaluate successes throughout the planning sessions. As a result, students will be receiving targeted instruction and planning can be continuously tailored to the needs of the students.

**Person Responsible**

Lucianna Chase (312726@dadeschools.net)

11/1/21-12/17/21-Continue to provide monthly times for DI Collaborative Planning among departments to plan for DI. As a result, time will be allotted for such planning to ensure DI plans are created.

**Person Responsible** Lucianna Chase (312726@dadeschools.net)

11/1/21-12/17/21-Continue to implement the DI plans in classroom designed during common planning. As a results, students will receive targeted standard based instruction based on the data.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**According to district disciplinary data of school site referrals, six grade students demonstrated a higher level of receiving referrals (9%) in comparison to the other three grade levels (7th grade-7% and 8th grade-4%). Given the data, providing additional mental health support to incoming six grade students will assist in the transition from elementary school and any provide additional to students with behavioral issues.**

### 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.

As a school we plan to develop and maintain positive student teacher relationships. The school encourages school pride and school spirit as being a part of a team and family. Henry Filer Middle will assist in connecting students with resources for social emotional support. Protocols are in place to ensure safe and hazard free physical surroundings. The school's priority is to ensure we are addressing the social emotional needs of the students through the EDGE period with the MAWI curriculum. As a school, we foster relationships among our counselors and teachers with students to share and address any concerns by having our counselors available to them during lunch and before and after school.

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

Teachers-foster positive student teacher relationships and ensuring a safe learning environment.  
 Students-participation in District Values Matter campaign.  
 Parents-increase parent involvement and communication with other stakeholder.  
 Community-participate in schoolwide activities and involve school in community events.  
 Administration-school leadership be accessible and supportive to all stakeholders.  
 Counselors-provide resources and support to all stakeholder's social emotional well being.

## Part V: Budget

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

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