

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Charles R Drew K 8 Center



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	29
Budget to Support Goals	30

Charles R Drew K 8 Center

1775 NW 60TH ST, Miami, FL 33142

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

Demographics

Principal: Selena Volcy

Start Date for this Principal: 7/27/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
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 Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	30

Charles R Drew K 8 Center

1775 NW 60TH ST, Miami, FL 33142

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-6</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>97%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>99%</p>

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.

The mission of Charles R. Drew K-8 Center is to recognize that each child is an individual, that all children are creative, and that all children strive to succeed. Our focus is to nurture growth, responsibility, and productivity; to embrace our diverse, multicultural population within a positive school-wide atmosphere. In doing so, we work toward an integrated curriculum that incorporates the art, forms of music, dance, drama and visual arts through hands-on experience and technology. Our students will be challenged to develop and achieve academics, school spirit, self-pride and community values through their talents, daily studies and educational accomplishments.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Charles R. Drew K-8 Center is to create an oasis for learning and a place where everyone achieves. Our 2021-2022 theme this year is "The Road to Success is Always Under Construction". Under the supervision of a dynamic leadership team, we plan to build upon the strengths of staff and students and lead them to the road of success. We plan to showcase the talents of our staff and students through academic achievements and magnet programs.

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
Volcy, Selena	Principal	Provide leadership to establish the vision and purpose of intervention to be implemented and to support school level implementation; leaders should develop buy-in for implementation from key stakeholders; assess key aspects of the overall organizational performance.
Ramos, Tangela	Assistant Principal	Provide support to ensure implementation team are aware of “background information, theory, philosophy values; introduce the components and rationales of key practices; provide opportunities to practice new skills and receive feedback in a safe training environment; assess key aspects of the overall organizational performance.
Chery, Constantin	Assistant Principal	Provide technical assistance at implementation site to “actively work to implement the intervention with fidelity and good effect; assess key aspects of the overall organizational performance.
Kitchen, Ashley	Reading Coach	Provide “craft” information in regards to ELA/Reading, along with advice, encouragement, and opportunities to practice and use skills specific to the intervention, implement and support school-level intervention, assess key aspects of the overall organizational performance.
Toson, Jacayla	Math Coach	Provide “craft” information in regards to math, along with advice, encouragement, and opportunities to practice and use skills specific to the intervention, implement and support school-level intervention, assess key aspects of the overall organizational performance .
Falcon, Iliana	Teacher, PreK	Provide “craft” information in regards to pre k, along with advice, encouragement, and opportunities to practice and use skills specific to the intervention, implement and support school-level intervention, assess key aspects of the overall organizational performance.
Joseph, Richelene	Science Coach	Provide “craft” information in regards to science, along with advice, encouragement, and opportunities to practice and use skills specific to the intervention, implement and support school-level intervention, assess key aspects of the overall organizational performance
Benford, Kimberly	Reading Coach	Provide “craft” information in regards to reading, along with advice, encouragement, and opportunities to practice and use skills specific to the intervention, implement and support school-level intervention, assess key aspects of the overall organizational performance

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/27/2021, Selena Volcy

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.*

8

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.*

33

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

33

Total number of students enrolled at the school

424

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.

5

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	23	32	44	42	46	49	46	54	69	0	0	0	0	405
Attendance below 90 percent	10	12	25	16	23	23	13	30	40	0	0	0	0	192
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	3	10	3	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	5	1	3	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	14	22	0	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	14	24	0	0	0	0	55
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	10	31	31	20	31	29	38	51	0	0	0	0	241

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	3	7	5	8	12	16	33	0	0	0	0	84

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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/27/2021

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	40	52	41	59	50	42	64	76	95	0	0	0	0	519
Attendance below 90 percent	12	25	13	25	22	11	31	38	58	0	0	0	0	235
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	13	3	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in Math	0	2	3	3	3	1	1	2	13	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	13	14	23	30	0	0	0	0	87
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	13	14	23	28	0	0	0	0	83

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	2	3	9	8	13	16	32	38	0	0	0	0	121

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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	6

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				28%	62%	57%	36%	62%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				42%	62%	58%	50%	62%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	58%	53%	49%	59%	48%
Math Achievement				44%	69%	63%	57%	69%	62%
Math Learning Gains				49%	66%	62%	56%	64%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	55%	51%	48%	55%	47%
Science Achievement				30%	55%	53%	39%	58%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	19%	60%	-41%	58%	-39%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	41%	64%	-23%	58%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-19%				
05	2021					
	2019	19%	60%	-41%	56%	-37%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
06	2021					
	2019	24%	58%	-34%	54%	-30%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-19%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	38%	67%	-29%	62%	-24%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	60%	69%	-9%	64%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
05	2021					
	2019	27%	65%	-38%	60%	-33%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
06	2021					
	2019	23%	58%	-35%	55%	-32%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	15%	53%	-38%	53%	-38%
Cohort Comparison						

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 tool used to compile proficiency data for ELA and Math was the iReady Diagnostics. The science mid year assessment was used to gather proficiency data for fifth grade science.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	40.5	35.9	29.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	40.5	35.9	29.7
	Students With Disabilities	25	25	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	26.8	21.2	34.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	26.8	21.2	34.3
	Students With Disabilities	25	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	20	21.9	25.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	22.6	26.7
	Students With Disabilities	0	33	33
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	25.9	25	28.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	26.9	25.8	29
	Students With Disabilities	67	33	33
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	36.4	47.7	51.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	37.2	48.8	52.5
	Students With Disabilities	0	40	20
	English Language Learners	0	0	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14	22.7	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	14.3	23.3	35.9
	Students With Disabilities	20	40	40
	English Language Learners	0	100	0
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	0	11.4	25
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	11.4	25
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	16.7
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	13.6	28.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	13.6	28.6
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	16.7
	English Language Learners	0	50	50

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	12.5	17.5	22.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	12.8	17.9	23.1
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	25	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	22.5	21.6	32.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	23.1	22.2	33.3
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	0	3	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	36.2	31.9	21.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	35.6	31.1	18.9
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	21.7	43.2	36.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	20.5	40.5	36.1
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	50	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD		13	17	5	18	17		20			
ELL	25	40		50	50						
BLK	25	27	22	24	20	22	19	42	48		
HSP	26	57		33	43						
FRL	25	29	26	24	21	25	21	46	52		
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	5	20	21	11	27	30	6				
ELL	20			20							
BLK	27	42	42	44	49	45	30	76	87		
HSP	35	43		43	48		30	80			
FRL	28	41	43	44	49	46	29	76	86		
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	9	18	12	21	31	21					
BLK	36	49	44	56	54	46	38	85	100		
HSP	42	53		67	65						
FRL	36	50	49	57	55	48	37	85	100		

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	30
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	267
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	11

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	41
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	28
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	30
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

An emerging trend across grade levels for ELA is a large gap in learning when compared to scores from the district as well as the state. As evidenced by FSA ELA data, 25% of our students scored proficient with 29% making learning gains and only 26% of our L25s making learning gains. Another noticeable trend is a large gap in learning when compared to scores from the district as well as the state in fifth & sixth grade math. Our math proficiency was at 20% with 21% of our students making learning gains. As it pertains to our L25 population, only 25% of our students made learning gains. Scores in science also show a learning gap when compared to scores from the district as well as the state. Our overall science proficiency was at 21%. In addition, civics proficiency was at 45% and our middle school acceleration was at 21%, as evidenced by the 20-21 FSA scores.

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

Areas of concern for ELA can be found in grades three & five. Fifth grade math and science are also areas of concern as evidenced by assessment data. The data also shows low scores within the SWD subgroup as compared to the other subgroups.

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

Due to a variety of factors, differentiated instruction was not done with fidelity or at the rigor required to increase performance in these particular subgroups. New actions needed to address this need will include, differentiated instruction models, increased targeted support for our SWD population, access to modified curriculum with access points to close learning gaps and planning for standards-based instruction. In addition, the general education teacher and ESE teacher will collaboratively plan to create universal access plans for SWD populations.

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

Based off progress monitoring data from 2019, third grade showed the most improvement in ELA and Math.

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

Contributing factors to this improvement include academic retention from previous year, standards-aligned instruction and collaborative planning with instructional coaches. In addition, teachers increased student engagement through technological systems.

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

Strategies that will be implemented in order to accelerate learning are, setting high expectations for students and keeping all stakeholders informed and involved.

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.

Professional development opportunities will focus on differentiated instruction, standards-based instruction, desegregating data, high yield intervention strategies, growth Mindset/goal setting and use of technological programs and resources.

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

Additional services include BEST/Common Core standards correlation PDs to ensure standards based instruction and schoology trainings to assist in the increase use of technological programs for student achievement.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The data shows that 55% of teachers feel that staff morale is high at the school. Although this is a 12% gain from the 43% demonstrated in the 2019 - 2020 survey, it is still significantly lower than all of the other data points in the survey and demonstrates a need for improvement. Additionally, 64% of the staff felt that administrators solve problems effectively, which represents a decrease of 5 percentage points. This is the only data point that demonstrated a decrease from the previous year's survey.

Measurable Outcome: As it relates to the survey question that focused on staff morale, we plan to increase the score by 15 percentage points on the 2021- 2022 Climate Survey. We also aim to have at least 70% of the staff to agree or strongly agree that administrators solve problems effectively.

Monitoring: We plan to survey the staff quarterly regarding the effectiveness of the Consistent Developmental Feedback and morale boosting initiatives.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tangela Ramos (tangelaramos@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Consistent Developmental Feedback involves providing a clear expectation, progress toward that goal and a description of the behavior and support that will be provided. Feedback will be provided regularly as a means of professional growth.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The Consistent Developmental Feedback strategy was selected because it provides a means to effectively solve problems and provide the faculty with feedback as it relates to how the problems were solved.

Action Steps to Implement

09/08/21 - 09/24/21: The principal will develop a Feedback/Communication Protocol.

Person Responsible Selena Volcy (pr1401@dadeschools.net)

09/27/21 - 10/28/21: The administrative team will use the Protocol when solving administrative problems.

Person Responsible Constantin Chery (professeur@dadeschools.net)

10/18/21 - 10/22/21: The administrative team will survey staff to assess the efficacy of the protocol.

Person Responsible Constantin Chery (professeur@dadeschools.net)

10/25/21 - 10/29/21: The administrative team will review staff responses and make changes as needed.

Person Responsible Selena Volcy (pr1401@dadeschools.net)

11/1/21 - 12/5/21: The administrative team will develop a brief feedback satisfaction survey.

Person Responsible Selena Volcy (pr1401@dadeschools.net)

11/6/21 - 12/6/21: The administrative team will analyze feedback results and make changes as necessary.

Person Responsible Selena Volcy (pr1401@dadeschools.net)

1/31/2022-4/29/2022: The administrative team will develop a mid-year follow-up feedback satisfaction survey.

Person Responsible Selena Volcy (pr1401@dadeschools.net)

1/31/2022-4/29/2022: The administrative team will analyze feedback results and make changes as necessary.

Person Responsible Selena Volcy (pr1401@dadeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Based on school climate results from the 2021 school year, 67% of the staff felt that students were deficient in basic academic skills as opposed to 79% in the previous year. This score for 2021 reflects a 12 point difference from the previous year.

Measurable Outcome: As it relates to the survey question that focused on students being deficient in basic skills, we plan to increase the score by 13 percentage points by incorporating collaborative planning with teachers for standards-based instruction. This strategy will assist in ensuring that teachers are effectively addressing the demands of the standard.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored via administrative walkthroughs. Additionally, administrators will also participate in common planning to ensure that teachers are planning for standards-based instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tangela Ramos (tangelaramos@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Standards-Aligned Instruction: standards-aligned instruction refers to teachers executing lessons based on the standards/learning targets and ensure that all student products and teaching techniques are aligned to the intended standards. Teachers will deliver planned lessons to guide students through the demands of the standards/learning target. Students will show evidence of mastering the lesson objective through their work samples/tasks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Based on the responses from the school climate survey, teachers felt that students were not equipped with basic academic skills. In order to address this concern we will be incorporating the strategy, Standards-Aligned Instruction, to ensure that teachers are effectively delivering planned lessons that address the demands of the standard.

Action Steps to Implement

9/27/2021- The first step to address the Area of Focus begins with our instructional coaches assisting teachers with strategies used when addressing the needs of our Lowest 25.

Person Responsible Ashley Kitchen (a.west@dadeschools.net)

9/27/2021- Instructional Coaches will train teachers to unwrap standards including the use of item specifications while incorporating ESOL strategies during the delivery of instruction to our ELL and SWDs.

Person Responsible Jacayla Toson (tosonj@dadeschools.net)

9/27/2021- Teachers will be allowed to demonstrate their understanding of the delivery of standards aligned instruction through modeling their lessons during common planning sessions.

Person Responsible Tangela Ramos (tangelaramos@dadeschools.net)

9/27/2021: Instructional Coaches will model for new teachers on coaching cycles.

Person Responsible Tangela Ramos (tangelaramos@dadeschools.net)

11/01/21-12/17/21: Instructional Coaches and Teachers are Utilizing the item specification to plan backward to ensure all lesson plans are standard- aligned.

Person Responsible Tangela Ramos (tangelaramos@dadeschools.net)

11/01/21-12/17/21: Instructional Coaches will utilize the hyperlink on the pacing guide to locate the ESOL strategies and model the integration of these strategies that are aligned with the standards.

Person Responsible Tangela Ramos (tangelaramos@dadeschools.net)

11/01/21-12/17/21: Teachers will select appropriate instructional resources and tools to assign tasks to each standard effectively.

Person Responsible Jacayla Toson (tosonj@dadeschools.net)

11/01/21-12/17/21: Teachers will assess and evaluate the standards for content mastery and utilize a data tracker for progress monitoring.

Person Responsible Jacayla Toson (tosonj@dadeschools.net)

1/31/22-4/29/22: Based on results from progress monitoring teachers will develop lessons to remediate deficient skills for the lowest performing subgroups. Teachers and coaches will develop intervention groups to provide an additional layer of support.

Person Responsible Richelene Joseph (251848@dadeschools.net)

1/31/22-4/29/22: Coaches will provide monthly PD opportunities to reinforce standards-aligned instruction and planning for special subgroups, such as, L25, ELL and ESE.

Person Responsible Kimberly Benford (kimberly.benford@dadeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the subgroup data review from Power BI, students with disabilities were an area of concern. This subgroup of students scored 5% proficiency in ELA and 11% in math as evidenced by the 2019 Subgroup Data Review.

Measurable Outcome: As it relates to the survey question that focused on students coming prepared academically to their classes, we plan to increase the proficiency score for students in this subgroup by 5 percentage points in ELA and math. By incorporating an universal design for learning, we can focus on closing learning gaps within our lowest achieving subgroups.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored via student work samples, assessment scores and data discussions during common planning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tangela Ramos (tangelaramos@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Universal Design for Learning (UDL): Universal Design for Learning (UDL) is a scientifically valid framework for guiding educational practice that provides flexibility in how information is presented, in how students respond or demonstrate knowledge and skills, and in how students are engaged. It reduces barriers in instruction, provides appropriate accommodations, supports, and challenges, and maintains high achievement expectations for all students, including students with disabilities and students who are Limited English Proficient.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Incorporating a UDL will assist in closing learning gaps within our lowest achieving student subgroups.

Action Steps to Implement

8/18/2021: Provide staff professional development in which participants are introduced to the principles and guidelines of Universal Design for Learning. Teachers will have the opportunity to practice varying engagement practices, how content is presented (representation), and how students are allowed to demonstrate understanding (action & expression).

Person Responsible Jacayla Toson (tosonj@dadeschools.net)

9/08 - 9/24: Planning sessions between coaches and teachers will have an increased focus on identifying barriers facing students' ability to proficiently acquire knowledge of new content and the utilization of UDL guidelines for Engagement.

Person Responsible Ashley Kitchen (a.west@dadeschools.net)

9/27 - 10/15: Planning sessions between coaches and teachers will have an increased focus on identifying instructional practices that reduce or remove barriers and methods for varying content presentation methods utilizing the UDL guidelines for Representation.

Person Responsible Jacayla Toson (tosonj@dadeschools.net)

10/18 - 10/28: Planning sessions between coaches and teachers will have an increased focus on methods for varying how students interact with content and show what they know utilizing the UDL guidelines for Action & Expression.

Person Responsible Ashley Kitchen (a.west@dadeschools.net)

11/01/21-12/17/21: Planning sessions between coaches and teachers will have an increased focus on identifying instructional practices that reduce or remove barriers and methods for varying content presentation methods utilizing the UDL guidelines for Representation.

Person Responsible Jacayla Toson (tosonj@dadeschools.net)

11/01/21-12/17/21: Host a biweekly power hour to provide additional UDL implementation support for teachers.

Person Responsible Jacayla Toson (tosonj@dadeschools.net)

11/01/21-12/17/21: Planning sessions between coaches and teachers will have an increased focus on methods for varying how students interact with content and show what they know utilizing the UDL guidelines for Action & Expression.

Person Responsible Ashley Kitchen (a.west@dadeschools.net)

11/01/21-12/17/21: Coaches will add UDL components to the common planning agendas.

Person Responsible Ashley Kitchen (a.west@dadeschools.net)

11/01/21-12/17/21: Celebrate teachers that are regularly implementing the UDL strategy.

Person Responsible Tangela Ramos (tangelaramos@dadeschools.net)

1/31/2022-4/29/2022: Teachers and coaches will continue to work together to identify barriers facing students' ability to proficiently acquire knowledge of new content.

Person Responsible Ashley Kitchen (a.west@dadeschools.net)

1/31/2022-4/29/2022: Teachers and coaches will continue to work together to focus on identifying instructional practices that reduce or remove barriers and methods for varying content presentation methods to engage all students.

Person Responsible Kimberly Benford (kimberly.benford@dadeschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

Area of

Focus

Based on the data from the climate survey, 71% of teachers felt that there was a lack of concern/support from parents. Although this represents a decline of 3 percentage points, the statistic remains a major concern.

Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Successful implementation of family engagement activities and utilize the We Rise resources and other community partners available. We expect parent participation and support to increase, resulting in at least 10% fewer teachers feeling that parents are not involved based on the 2021-2022 Climate Survey.

Monitoring:

The leadership team will conduct staff surveys regarding what active parent participation/ support looks like. The results of the surveys will be utilized to facilitate activities that would encourage parents to participate in the ways teachers prefer, as well as provide development opportunities for staff designed to enhance their parent communication skills. We will then survey teachers quarterly to monitor our progress toward reaching the aforementioned goal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Constantin Chery (professeur@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Family Engagement: Family engagement helps kids feel connected to their caregivers, families and communities. Kids who are connected feel safe, secure, supported and are ready to learn. Family engagement helps parents and other caregivers feel connected and tuned into their children and communities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Studies show that parent involvement is a major factor in student outcomes, including closing the achievement gap between various groups of students.

Action Steps to Implement

08/20/2021: The first step in family engagement is to create genuine and collaborative relationships with families, including home visits, volunteer activities and community events.

Person Responsible

Constantin Chery (professeur@dadeschools.net)

09/01/2021: The second step in family engagement is to create interactive sessions between staff and families, including open houses and orientations.

Person Responsible

Constantin Chery (professeur@dadeschools.net)

9/01/2021: Next, we will link all interactions to learning to help build families' capacities in supporting their students' academic growth, to include parent academy workshops.

Person Responsible

Tangela Ramos (tangelaramos@dadeschools.net)

10/28/2021: Lastly, we will survey teachers quarterly to monitor our progress toward reaching the aforementioned goal.

Person Responsible

Constantin Chery (professeur@dadeschools.net)

11/01/21-12/17/21: The administrative team will analyze survey results.

Person Responsible Constantin Chery (professeur@dadeschools.net)

11/01/21-12/17/21: The administrative team will make adjustments to our goal based on the data received from the survey.

Person Responsible Constantin Chery (professeur@dadeschools.net)

1/31/2022-4/29/2022: Solicit parent involvement support from Dade community partners to assist in increasing parental involvement.

Person Responsible Constantin Chery (professeur@dadeschools.net)

1/31/2022-4/29/2022: Formulate a family fun night in partnership with community partners to assist in increasing parental involvement and to disseminate academic and wellness information.

Person Responsible Constantin Chery (professeur@dadeschools.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on results from the iReady AP3 diagnostic, our school will implement the Targeted Element of ELA. We selected the overarching area of ELA based on our findings that demonstrated 29% of the school is three or more grade levels behind in regards to reading and 14% of our students are two or more grade levels behind. These data points reveal that 43% of the school is not on track to making adequate progress in reading. Tier 1 instruction, in both planning and delivery, did not result in an increase in proficient students. Therefore, we will strategically develop, explicitly deliver, and systematically monitor tier 1 instruction.

Measurable Outcome: As it relates to improving student achievement through the use of differentiated instruction (DI), we plan to increase the school wide reading proficiency score by 20% as evidenced by the 2022 State Assessments. By incorporating DI with fidelity within the ELA classrooms, teachers can focus on providing targeted remedial instruction for our lowest achieving students.

Monitoring: The Leadership team will participate in weekly collaborative planning, following up with targeted walk-throughs that monitor the fidelity of DI instruction. Explicit feedback will be provided weekly and instructional shifts in planning will occur, based on feedback. Transformation coaches will collaboratively plan with teachers, utilizing progress monitoring data to create explicit remedial instruction. Collection of observational data and explicit feedback will be utilized to adjust planning and instruction. Data analysis of bi-weekly progress monitoring assessments, as well as the review of products, will be utilized to track progress and determine the effectiveness of instructional delivery and planning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tangela Ramos (tangelaramos@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Within the Targeted Element of ELA, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of: Differentiated Instruction (DI). DI involves providing different students with different avenues to learning 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. DI will be monitored by observation of developed instruction, product reviews, and progress monitoring performance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Incorporating the usage of DI with fidelity will assist in closing learning gaps within our lowest achieving student. DI is an evidence based strategy that has been proven to assist in targeting and closing learning gaps. Continual feedback related to delivery, product effectiveness, and assessment performance will guide shifts and enhancements in instructional delivery and student performance.

Action Steps to Implement

8/31 – 10/11: Teachers will administer iReady AP1 reading diagnostic and the LAFS baseline test in performance matters to establish students' academic needs.

Person Responsible Ashley Kitchen (a.west@dadeschools.net)

8/31 – 10/11: Instructional coaches and teacher will analyze baseline data to put students in instructional groups based on deficiencies.

Person Responsible Kimberly Benford (kimberly.benford@dadeschools.net)

8/31-10/11: Instructional coaches and teachers will create DI folders including students' profile sheets from iReady and data trackers to track DI biweekly assessment data.

Person Responsible Ashley Kitchen (a.west@dadeschools.net)

8/31-10/11: Instructional coaches and teachers will collaboratively develop DI lessons that address students' deficiencies.

Person Responsible Kimberly Benford (kimberly.benford@dadeschools.net)

8/31-10/11: Teachers will explicitly model and guide students through the DI lessons. DI lessons will be taught in two week intervals.

Person Responsible Ashley Kitchen (a.west@dadeschools.net)

8/31-10/11: At the end of the two weeks, teachers will administer a progress monitoring assessment. Teachers will score the assessment and place the score in the DI folder on the tracker.

Person Responsible Kimberly Benford (kimberly.benford@dadeschools.net)

8/31-10/11: Instructional coaches and teachers will analyze progress monitoring data biweekly and create lessons based on performance. Progress monitoring data will guide shifts and enhancements in instruction.

Person Responsible Ashley Kitchen (a.west@dadeschools.net)

11/01/21-12/17/21: Utilizing the data from iReady AP1 and the 2020-2021 FSA ELA , teachers will conduct data chats with students.

Person Responsible Kimberly Benford (kimberly.benford@dadeschools.net)

11/01/21-12/17/21: Instructional Coaches will utilize the data from iReady AP1, the ELA baseline assessment and the 2020-2021 FSA ELA to pre-plan with CSS for DI.

Person Responsible Tangel Ramos (tangelaramos@dadeschools.net)

11/01/21-12/17/21: Instructional coaches and teachers will collaboratively develop DI lessons that address students deficiencies.

Person Responsible Kimberly Benford (kimberly.benford@dadeschools.net)

11/01/21-12/17/21: Instructional coaches and teachers will analyze biweekly data from DI lessons to adjust instruction as needed.

Person Responsible Ashley Kitchen (a.west@dadeschools.net)

1/31/2022-4/29/2022: After analyzing AP2 data, teachers and coaches will work together to formulate intervention groups to address student deficiencies.

Person Responsible Kimberly Benford (kimberly.benford@dadeschools.net)

1/31/2022-4/29/2022: Teachers and coaches will work together to source and create lessons to remediate deficient standards as evidenced by AP2 results and DI biweekly data.

Person Responsible Ashley Kitchen (a.west@dadeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

When compared to all elementary schools statewide, Charles R. Drew K8 Center falls into the very low category in regards to violent, property and drug/public order incidents. Charles R. Drew K8 reported 0.0 incidents per 100 students for the 2019-2020 school year. In addition, Charles R. Drew K8 Center reported 0.0 suspensions per 100 students for the the 2019-2020 school year. These data points reveal that the behavior initiatives implemented during the 2019/2020 school year were successful. We will continue to maintain a schoolwide discipline program, promote character education/values matter and create consistent protocols to maintain a healthy and safe school environment.

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.

The school addresses building a positive school culture and environment by maintaining a schoolwide communication system to keep all stakeholders informed. Another way in which the school addresses positive school culture is by nominating faculty and staff members to be showcased during faculty meetings. Students are also recognized monthly for Values Matters. Teachers are given opportunities to share best practices during faculty meetings and collaborative planning sessions. Students also participate in student enrichment programs. The leadership team also regularly celebrates student and staff success with various awards and incentives.

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

All members of the leadership team will provide and facilitate cultural activities throughout the school.

Dr. Selena Volcy, Principal
 Mrs. Tangela Ramos, Assistant Principal
 Mr. Constantin Chery, Assistant Principal
 Ms. Jacayla Toson, Math Coach
 Mrs. Ashley Kitchen, Literacy Coach
 Ms. Kimberly Benford, Literacy Coach

Ms. Richelene Joseph, Science Coach
 Mr. Vivinix Pierre, Dean of Students
 Ms. Renita Latson, Activities Director

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Specific Teacher Feedback	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00