

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Poinciana Park Elementary School



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

Poinciana Park Elementary School

6745 NW 23RD AVE, Miami, FL 33147

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

Demographics

Principal: Vernatta Lee Morrison

Start Date for this Principal: 8/10/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: A (63%)
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

Poinciana Park Elementary School

6745 NW 23RD AVE, Miami, FL 33147

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	97%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (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		B	B	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our goals are to provide each student and staff member the opportunity to develop themselves to their fullest potential, to meet the individual needs of each child, and to make each parent an integral part of the educational process. In order to ensure students attain high achievement goals, teachers will provide a safe and stimulating environment in which students can learn. Parents, teachers, and community members will work cooperatively to encourage students to become responsible and productive citizens of the 21st century.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Students at Poinciana Park Elementary School will leave fifth grade prepared and equipped with the necessary skills and knowledge for them to be competitive among their peers at the next level of their educational journey. Students will transfer the acquired skills to strategically solve problems in their everyday life.

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
Jones, Tania	Principal	Ms. Tania L. Burns, Principal: The duties and responsibilities of the principal is to provide strategic direction of the school. The principal monitors curriculum, assesses teaching methods, monitors student achievement, encourages parent involvement, manages school budget, hires and evaluates staff and is charge of school operations and safety of students.
Bryant, Andrell	Assistant Principal	Ms. Andrell H. Bryant, Assistant Principal: Serving in the capacity of governing agent, the principal and assistant principal bears the responsibility of the overall operation of the MTSS/Rtl and the school. To assist the principal with duties and responsibilities to provide strategic direction of the school. The assistant principal monitors curriculum, assesses teaching methods, monitors student achievement, encourages parent involvement, manages school budget, hires and evaluates staff and is charge of school operations and safety of students.
Brown, Marvin	Behavior Specialist	Mr. Marvin Brown (Success Coach): Maintains reports, records, files and all other information and data; encourages teacher/parent communication and community involvement; assists students in conflict resolution, peer mediation and helps students develop life management skills; manages crises; assists in the identification of students with special needs; refers students to intervention/remediation programs, as well as, academic and alternative programs to ensure academic success and personal well-being; reviews school data frequently to ensure that the school counseling program is meeting the academic and social development needs of the students; shares all available information with MTSS/Rtl.
Chester, Candice	School Counselor	Ms. Candice Chester (Guidance Counselor): Maintains reports, records, files and all other information and data; encourages teacher/parent communication and community involvement; assists students in conflict resolution, peer mediation and helps students develop life management skills; manages crises; assists in the identification of students with special needs; refers students to intervention/remediation programs, as well as, academic and alternative programs to ensure academic success and personal well-being; reviews school data frequently to ensure that the school counseling program is meeting the academic and social development needs of the students; shares all available information with MTSS/Rtl.
Doe, Keishaunda	Math Coach	Ms. Keishuanda Blanding (Math Transformation Coach): Conference with teachers to familiarize them with the instructional curriculum; visit classrooms, offer feedback and debrief teachers to improve instruction and student achievement; model lessons to improve instruction and student achievement with feedback and collaborative input; provide assistance with the mathematics and science programs; co-plan lessons with teachers; analyze student's work; interpret assessment data for the purpose of assisting teachers in using results for instructional decision making; conduct individual and group discussions with teachers about teaching and learning; plan and conduct professional development workshops; create presentations for

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		teachers; assist with assessing students and assist in the effective implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans.
Zuccarelli, Leanna	Reading Coach	Leanna Zuccarelli (Reading Transformation Coach): Conference with teachers to familiarize them with the instructional curriculum; visit classrooms, offer feedback and debrief teachers to improve instruction and student achievement; model lessons to improve instruction and student achievement with feedback and collaborative input; provide assistance with the reading program; co-plan lessons with teachers; analyze student's work; interpret assessment data for the purpose of assisting teachers in using results for instructional decision making; conduct individual and group discussions with teachers about teaching and learning; plan and conduct professional development workshops; create presentations for teachers; assist with assessing students and assist in the effective implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/10/2017, Vernatta Lee Morrison

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

27

Total number of students enrolled at the school

176

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

2

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	23	16	20	31	27	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	152
Attendance below 90 percent	9	10	15	21	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	2	0	6	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	8	13	21	17	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84

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	2	6	5	8	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	6	5	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/20/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	18	33	31	36	44	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	207
Attendance below 90 percent	9	19	20	21	22	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	3	0	10	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	3	8	5	11	18	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	4	8	5	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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				45%	62%	57%	38%	62%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				46%	62%	58%	54%	62%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	58%	53%	56%	59%	48%
Math Achievement				59%	69%	63%	50%	69%	62%

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Learning Gains				64%	66%	62%	57%	64%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	55%	51%	47%	55%	47%
Science Achievement				67%	55%	53%	47%	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	39%	60%	-21%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	14%	64%	-50%	58%	-44%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
05	2021					
	2019	32%	60%	-28%	56%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-14%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	51%	67%	-16%	62%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	19%	69%	-50%	64%	-45%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2021					
	2019	77%	65%	12%	60%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-19%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	65%	53%	12%	53%	12%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tool used by grades 1 - 5 to compile the data below was i-Ready.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	42.9%	23.8%	30.0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	42.9%	23.8%	30.0%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	31.6%	9.5%	15.8%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31.6%	9.5%	15.8%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30.8%	16.7%	23.1%
	Economically Disadvantaged	30.8%	16.7%	23.1%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15.4%	8.3%	15.4%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15.4%	8.3%	15.4%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	10.3%	18.5%	22.2%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10.3%	18.5%	22.2%
	Students With Disabilities		9.1%	
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4.0%	12.0%	14.3%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4.0%	12.0%	14.3%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	6.7%	6.5%	13.8%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6.9%	6.7%	14.3%
	Students With Disabilities			6.7%
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0%	10.0%	6.9%
	Economically Disadvantaged		10.3%	7.1%
	Students With Disabilities		7.1%	6.7%
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	13.8%	20.7%	18.5%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11.1%	18.5%	16.0%
	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13.8%	25.0%	21.7%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11.1%	23.1%	19.0%
	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students		30.0%	
	Economically Disadvantaged		28.0%	
	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

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	58	29		65	47		73				
BLK	38	24		47	68		60				
HSP	60			80							
FRL	41	26		51	67		66				
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	60	54		58	65		50				
ELL	46			69							
BLK	41	43	29	54	60	50	61				
HSP	67			80							
FRL	43	44	40	59	65	60	65				

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	47	49	45	66	71	50	62				
ELL	58			83							
BLK	37	58	60	44	51	43	44				
HSP	43	45		79	82						
FRL	38	55	56	50	57	47	45				

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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	257
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	90%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	54
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

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

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	70
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	50
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?

According to the 2021 FSA data for ELA in grade levels 3 - 5, 17% of our students are proficient in ELA. In 2019 FSA data shows that our school had 30% of students proficient in ELA in grade levels 3-5. This data shows a -13% decrease from 2019. According to the 2019 FSA scores, across grade levels, ELA progress has stayed the same for 3-year progress, gains have been minimal as evidenced by the 2019 FSA scores. According to the 2019 data, ESE students are showing 60% proficiency, 30% for ELL and 43% for Economically Disadvantaged. According to the 2019 data, math has fluctuated from 57% in 2017 to 33% in 2018. In 2019, there was an increase to 50% which leads to a prediction of growth of 30% for the upcoming 2021-22 school year.

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

Based upon 2020 i-Ready data from AP2 to AP3 and based upon our 2021 FSA ELA scores where only 17% of our students in grades 3-5 are showing proficient. Our focus needs to be on our rising 5th grade students in order to make proficient growth in ELA for the 2021-22 school year. In the 2020-21 school year, 4th graders showed 41% of growth from AP2 to AP3 in ELA as compared to 5th grade students who only showed a 47% growth in ELA from AP2 to AP3. Based upon 2020-2021 i-Ready Math Data from AP2 to AP3, rising 4th grade students will need to show the most improvement as evidenced by the 2020 data showing 67% of students were falling into Tier 1 or Tier 2 i-Ready category.

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

The contributing factors to this need for improvement is Attendance. Due to the pandemic, student attendance for both PHY and MSO was a detrimental factor to the students' progress and ultimate growth. Internet issues, connectivity issues, hardware issues as well as the personal lives of students disallowed a consistent and productive contribution from the students while attending MSO. Without students in the classroom to receive the instruction, progress was stifled.

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

Based upon 2020-2021 i-Ready Data, 17 out of 18 students showed growth on the AP3 diagnostic. Out of the 18 students 67% of those students made gains of 20 points or more.

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

The contributing factors that led to this improvement are as follows:

2019: During this school year we implemented interventions for our tier 2 and tier 3 with fidelity. We developed a schedule that ensured that we were able to target our fragile students and continuously monitored implementation and data to adjust instruction.

2021: The factors that contributed greatly to this improvement were an increased priority in Intervention efforts in reading, including but not limited to the development of a

schedule that allotted for minimally 25 minutes of intervention and recruitment of 2 intervention teachers.

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

According to the 2019 i-Ready Data, the following strategies needed to be implemented in order to accelerate learning:

- Collaborative Planning
- Monthly Data Chats with teachers
- Tier 2 and 3 Interventions
- Strategic Planning
- Progress Monitoring

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.

Our ELA focus will be on reading Intervention utilizing the Reading Horizon Curriculum as well as additional support on Differentiated Instruction. Teachers will attend weekly collaborative planning; reading horizons will be providing webinars and online professional learning. For Math our focus will be utilizing the Mitigating Learning Loss model provided by MDCPS. In addition, Professional Development on Differentiated Instruction and weekly collaborative planning will be provided by the transformation coach. Coaching cycles will also continue for both ELA and Math to further help teachers to be successful.

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

After school tutoring , Saturday school tutoring, Interactive Learning Labs for L25, ELL's, Math and Writing camps, and i-Ready Morning Labs will also be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2019 data review, our school will implement the Targeted Element of Social Emotional Learning. Through our data review, we noticed that student emotional learning was negatively impacted due to Covid-19. Social Emotional Development is important as it affects students' success in school in many areas but specifically in the areas of student attendance and behavior. This development influences a child's self-confidence, empathy, and the ability to develop meaningful and lasting friendships. Additionally, social-emotional skills also help students successfully manage everyday life. They help students focus, make good decisions, and become supportive members of their community well beyond school.

Measurable Outcome: If we successfully implement the targeted Social and Emotional Learning initiatives, the number of students having two or more early warning indicators will decrease from 33 students during the 2020-2021 school year to 23 students during the 2021-2022 school year.

Monitoring: The school counselor and the mental health therapist will establish and promote responsible decisions. Counseling Logs, schedules, and mental health referrals will be submitted to administration on a weekly basis with emphasis on the Social and Emotional trends.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Candice Chester (misschester@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Within the targeted element of Social Emotional Learning: Our school will promote the physical, emotional, and mental health of students and employees within and beyond school. Additionally, students will participate in the DIAL (Disability Anti-Bullying) program. We will promote mindfulness and mental health awareness in order to contribute to improved students outcomes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Social and Emotional Learning initiatives will effectively apply the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to understand and manage emotions.

Action Steps to Implement

Ms. Chester, school counselor and classroom teachers will work together to identify students that will benefit from social emotional learning services. The initial identification of students will take place from August 23 to September 3, 2021.

Person Responsible Candice Chester (misschester@dadeschools.net)

Our counselor, Ms. Chester, will create a schedule to provide whole group social emotional lessons to classes. Additionally, she will have small group and one-to-one sessions for students that require additional services. The schedule will be provided to all teachers by September 10, 2021.

Person Responsible Candice Chester (misschester@dadeschools.net)

August 23, 2021 and throughout the school year, Ms. Chester will identify and implement social emotional learning activities monthly basis that will benefit our students.

Person Responsible Candice Chester (misschester@dadeschools.net)

August 23, 2021 and throughout the school year, Ms. Chester will work closely with our mental health coordinator on providing monthly counseling sessions for identified and target students.

Person Responsible Candice Chester (misschester@dadeschools.net)

November 1, 2021, Ms. Chester will choose 2 students to share weekly powerful messages that will be announced during the morning announcements.

Person Responsible Candice Chester (misschester@dadeschools.net)

December 5, 2021, Ms. Chester will 1. Start the day with a check-in with identified students. 2. Use story time for teachable moments · 3. Will have students participate in partner activities · 4. Teach kids how to work in a group.

Person Responsible Candice Chester (misschester@dadeschools.net)

January 31, 2022, Ms. Chester will select various students in grades 4 and 5 to participate in the morning announcements.

Person Responsible Candice Chester (misschester@dadeschools.net)

January 31, 2022, Ms. Chester will select 1 student per grade level to receive the "Turn-Around" award at the end of the 3rd and 4th quarters.

Person Responsible Candice Chester (misschester@dadeschools.net)

#2. Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

The Leadership Team will identify staff members who are experts in specific areas to serve as leaders with new initiatives and development. By involving teachers, we hope to create an environment of shared leadership. This initiative will be evident by teacher leaders providing support and development to their colleagues in various areas. To ensure we are on the right track, teachers who receive support will share the knowledge they have gained during faculty meetings.

Measurable Outcome:

By May 31, 2022, 100% of the teacher leaders identified will collaborate, support, and mentor fellow teachers to help them improve their teaching practice. As a result, overall student performance will increase by a minimum of 10 percentage points as evidenced by the 2021-2022 assessment results.

Monitoring:

Opportunities for ongoing collaboration between teacher leaders and their colleagues will afford emergent leaders opportunities to share learned knowledge at faculty meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tania Jones (pr4501@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Research-based professional learning opportunities, including Teacher's Choice, will improve teaching practices across the board.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Professional development opportunities based on deliberate growth targets will help develop stronger and more informed instructional leaders.

Action Steps to Implement

8/30/21 -10/11/21

The leadership team will identify potential teacher leaders, who will be paired-up with a rookie teacher. The leadership team will develop a needs assessment or individual growth target for each teacher.

Person Responsible

Tania Jones (pr4501@dadeschools.net)

8/30/21 -10/11/21

Identify school leaders and mentors. Pair mentors and mentees based on individual strengths and interests.

Person Responsible

Tania Jones (pr4501@dadeschools.net)

8/30/21 -10/11/21

On-going collaborative meetings will take place between mentors and mentees to discuss best practices and help mentees hone their craft.

Person Responsible

Tania Jones (pr4501@dadeschools.net)

8/30/21 -10/11/21

Provide opportunities for mentees to shadow their mentors and discuss the implementation of observed strategies.

Person Responsible Tania Jones (pr4501@dadeschools.net)

11/1/21-12/17/21

The PD Liaison will conduct a needs assessment in order to promote Teachers Choice Pathway 3 professional learning activities. This includes PLCs, teacher driven observations, and/or lesson studies.

Person Responsible Candice Chester (misschester@dadeschools.net)

11/1/21-12/17/21

Administration will maintain on-going mentor/mentee conversations to follow-up on the progress of the mentor/mentee relationship.

Person Responsible Tania Jones (pr4501@dadeschools.net)

01/31/22 - 04/29/22

The administrative team will continue to monitor leadership practices to improve skills to performance.

Person Responsible Tania Jones (pr4501@dadeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: According to the 2021 FSA Data, 17% of our students in grades 3-5 are proficient in ELA. In 2019, 30% of students in grades 3-5 were proficient in ELA. Over the last two years, ELA proficiency dropped 13 percentage points. The 2019-2020 data shows that students were not demonstrating an increase in proficiency on the i-Ready Assessment Data. Bi-weekly assessments also show that students were not proficient on the standards that were being assessed. In order to improve academic achievement and see academic growth in ELA, Differentiated Instruction was identified as a critical need area to address.

Measurable Outcome: According to the 2021 School Grade Components that is inclusive of the 2021 FSAA data we dropped 4 percentage points in ELA proficiency in grades 3-5 and 13 percentage points in LG. According to the 2020 AP3 i-Ready diagnostic, 43% of Kindergarten students, 10% of 1st grade students, 31% of 2nd grade students, and 72% of 3rd grade students are all not on track to score level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized grade 3 English Language Arts assessment. If we successfully implement Differentiated Instruction in grades 3-5, then at least 50% of students will demonstrate a 25 points or more increase in their scale score when comparing the AP1 and AP3 i-Ready Assessments. Differentiated Instruction will improve our ability to provide targeted and Data-Driven Instruction for all students in grades K-5.

Monitoring: The area of focus will be monitored by Tania L. Burns, Principal after each diagnostic period. Student usage and pass rates will be monitored weekly to determine if students are meeting their individual goals. There will be a 50% increase of third grade students scoring a level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment by 3-4 percentage points.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tania Jones (pr4501@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Leadership Team will conduct student and administrative data chats to address student deficiencies in math and reading. The Leadership Team will then use those results to drive instruction and remediate deficient skills.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Data chats provide actual evidence to help determine strategies that are effective, as well as, provide the opportunity to modify instructional practices based on student needs. Topic Assessment, Bi-Weekly, or Standard-Based Data will be disaggregated during data chats.

Action Steps to Implement

August 18, 2021, professional development will be provided to teachers in order to help them develop and utilize data trackers to improve instruction. Teachers will develop data trackers to track mini assessments that are aligned to small group instruction. Progress monitoring will determine if adjustments are needed.

Person Responsible Leanna Zuccarelli (lzuccarelli@dadeschools.net)

September 7, 2021, Professional development will provide teachers with an overview and strategies of the new resources.

Person Responsible Leanna Zuccarelli (lzuccarelli@dadeschools.net)

September 21, 2021, teachers will participate in learning walks to observe best practices in differentiated instruction and resource utilization.

Person Responsible Leanna Zuccarelli (lzuccarelli@dadeschools.net)

October 1, 2021, data chats will be held with teacher/administrator, teacher/student/parent to explain and discuss student progress. Student data trackers will reflect individual goals. Modifications will be made as needed.

Person Responsible Leanna Zuccarelli (lzuccarelli@dadeschools.net)

November 1, 2021, teachers will meet with instructional reading coach during collaborative planning to analyze McGraw Hill progress monitoring assessment data. Teachers will review previous assessments and identify struggling standards based on the McGraw Hill skills reports. Instructional Coach will conduct CTCs to improve the focus and alignment of instruction to the daily learning target (DLT)

Person Responsible Leanna Zuccarelli (lzuccarelli@dadeschools.net)

December 1, 2021 Using this data, coach and teachers will develop bi-weekly focus calendars to address standards to scaffold (current skills) and target (essential skills) to drive differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible Leanna Zuccarelli (lzuccarelli@dadeschools.net)

January 31, 2022, teachers will conduct data chats with students during DI using AP2 data, topic assessment data, and progress monitoring assessments.

Person Responsible Leanna Zuccarelli (lzuccarelli@dadeschools.net)

January 31, 2022, teachers will use the AP2 Data to regroup students for DI to support necessary scaffolding and growth.

Person Responsible Leanna Zuccarelli (lzuccarelli@dadeschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Collaborative Planning is critical so that the individual needs of students can be identified and appropriate resources will be provided to assist students working below grade level. Collaboration will also help support best practices, instructional strategies and data disaggregation for all teachers.

Measurable Outcome: If 100% of teachers participate in bi-weekly collaborative planning to disaggregate data, share best practices and complete lesson planning. Effective implementation of planned lessons will increase in learning gains as evidenced by increased scale scores on i-Ready AP3 data by an average of 25 points.

Monitoring: The area of focus will be monitored by sign in sheets, meeting agendas and minutes. The leadership team will share the meeting notes in leadership team meetings to determine if the desired outcomes are being accomplished. Administration will do weekly walk-throughs focusing on standard aligned instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Andrell Bryant (ahowell1@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Standards-based collaborative planning improves instructional delivery among teachers, promotes learning, provides opportunities to share constructive feedback and best practices.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Standards based collaborative planning includes detailed objectives, resources, activities, assessments, pacing guides, instructional frameworks and item specifications that will promote targeted instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

August 30, 2021, protocols will be set to establish guidelines for collaborative planning meetings. A tentative calendar will be made based on the lesson cycles. Coaches will plan with teachers physically.

Person Responsible Leanna Zuccarelli (lzuccarelli@dadeschools.net)

September 7, 2021, teachers will be trained on the use of newly adopted materials. Common planning will utilize the backwards planning model by addressing the standards first and strategies and implementation second.

Person Responsible Keishaunda Doe (klblanding@dadeschools.net)

September 14, 2021, teachers will develop and effectively implement an Instructional Focus Calendar to monitor pacing and ensure standard aligned Instruction is being taken place.

Person Responsible Leanna Zuccarelli (lzuccarelli@dadeschools.net)

September 27, 2021, Administration will conduct weekly walk -throughs to observe the implementation of the Instructional Focus Calendar. Student work samples will be utilized during collaborative planning to access student mastery.

Person Responsible Tania Jones (pr4501@dadeschools.net)

November 18, 2021, all teachers will participate in a primary(K-2)/secondary (3-5) collaborative planning session. In this session, teachers will be asked to facilitate a mini professional development sharing a best practice used in their classrooms (ex: technology, student engagement, classroom management, collaboration strategies, learning resources)

Person Responsible Keishaunda Doe (kblanding@dadeschools.net)

December 5, 2021, Teachers will identify student engagement strategies during collaborative planning and include these strategies on lesson plans. Administration will conduct walkthroughs to observe these strategies being implemented and provide feedback to teachers and coaches based on observations.

Person Responsible Tania Jones (pr4501@dadeschools.net)

January 31, 2022, teachers and instructional coaches will collaborate to determine resources and materials to best address differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible Leanna Zuccarelli (lzuccarelli@dadeschools.net)

January 31, 2022, teachers and instructional coaches will identify students that will be pulled out for additional support during differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible Keishaunda Doe (kblanding@dadeschools.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 2021 FSA data review, our school will implement the Targeted Element of ELA. We selected the overarching area of ELA based on our findings that demonstrated 15% proficiency in ELA in grades 3-5 on the 2021 FSA. We compared the current 2021 ELA FSA data of 17% proficiency to the 2019 FSA ELA proficiency of 39%. Over the last two years, ELA proficiency dropped 22% percentage points. 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:	If we successfully monitor whole group instruction then our ELA Proficient students will increase by a minimum of 10 percentage points as evidenced by the 2022 State Assessments.
Monitoring:	The Leadership team will participate in weekly data chat to analyze students progress monitoring assessments as well as unit assessments. The leadership team will also follow up with targeted walk-throughs that monitor the alignment of planning to instructional delivery. Explicit feedback will be provided weekly and instructional shifts in planning will occur, based on student mastery. Transformation coaches will collaboratively plan with teachers to support students utilizing close-reading strategies and instructional resources that are standards aligned. Data analysis of progress monitoring assessments, as well as the review of CFU's, will be utilized to track progress and determine the effectiveness of instructional delivery and planning.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tania Jones (pr4501@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students will be manipulating grade level text on multiple days. Teachers and students will be utilizing close-reading strategies to develop a deeper understanding of grade level text. This standards based and intentional instruction will push student thinking to master not only level one but level three questioning throughout all literacy assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Close-reading strategies asks students to carefully read and reread a text with a purpose in mind. As well as back up their thinking with text evidence. When students are close-reading, they focus on authors purpose, vocabulary, and text structure. When students reread a text they have ample opportunity to really comprehend and analyze what they are reading. This strategy enforces student accountability in reading comprehension.
Action Steps to Implement	
August 30, 2021, all ELA teachers will participate in the "Getting 2 the Core" 2-Day McGraw- Hill Wonders and ELA/ELL Implementation training.	
Person Responsible	Leanna Zuccarelli (lzuccarelli@dadeschools.net)
September 7, 2021, the ELA transformation coach will identify the novice ELA teachers to conduct coach-teacher collaboration.	
Person Responsible	Leanna Zuccarelli (lzuccarelli@dadeschools.net)
September 14, 2021, selected teachers will participate in learning walks to observe best practices for Tier 1 reading instruction.	
Person Responsible	Tania Jones (pr4501@dadeschools.net)

September 27, 2021, teachers and the leadership team will participate in data chats to discuss trends within the McGraw-Hill progress monitoring assessments.

Person Responsible Tania Jones (pr4501@dadeschools.net)

November 5, 2021, teachers will use standards from pacing guides to identify daily learning targets/ on lesson plans to determine skills and standards students need to practice and master.

Person Responsible Tania Jones (pr4501@dadeschools.net)

December 5, 2021, Teachers will collaborate with reading instructional coach to create Daily End Product resource utilizing district SRM questions, district planning cards, and previewing the McGraw Hill progress monitoring assessments.

Person Responsible Leanna Zuccarelli (lzuccarelli@dadeschools.net)

January 31, 2022, teachers will collaborate and participate in CTC focused on the GRRM. Instructional coach will model GRRM during whole group instruction for K-5 ELA teachers

Person Responsible Leanna Zuccarelli (lzuccarelli@dadeschools.net)

January 31, 2022, teachers will indicate the GRRM on their lesson plans to align whole group instruction to daily end products.

Person Responsible Leanna Zuccarelli (lzuccarelli@dadeschools.net)

#6. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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 the 2021-2022 District/School Disciplinary comparison data from Power BI. As per this data, Poinciana Park Elementary 10% of students are recorded as having 1 disciplinary referral while 6% were recorded as having 2 or more. In order to see a 50% decrease in the number of disciplinary referrals, students will be provided with opportunities to earn incentives and be recognized for positive behavior and academic achievements. Social emotional support is provided to all students through the use of SEL activities, brain breaks, small group check-ins, and family engagement. Teachers will be informed on the use of referrals to the school counselor, mental health counselor as well as the use of effective classroom management for new teachers.

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.

Poinciana Park Elementary School implements the following strategies for creating a positive school climate and environment: Building effective communication among all stakeholders; Emphasis on individual needs; Creating and promoting a healthy physical environment; Enhancing self esteem; Having respect for diversity; Fostering inclusive and respectful language. Additionally, Poinciana Park Elementary promotes positive relationships between and amongst students, staff, and parents. Anti-bullying strategies and programs that develop social and emotional skills are implemented to help nurture a safe, caring school environment.

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

The following stakeholders will assist in promoting a positive culture and environment at Poinciana Park Elementary School.

Ms. Tania L. Burns - Principal, Establish school norms that build values.

Ms. Andrell Howell-Bryant - Assistant Principal, Encourage innovation in all classrooms.

Ms. Rich - CIS, Creating meaningful parent involvement activities that offer open communication with parents.

Ms. Chester - Counselor, Ensure Values Matters is implemented throughout the school and celebrate

personal achievement and good behavior by implementing a reward system for all students.
 Classroom Teachers - Create routines that are fun for students and builds morale in school.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Leadership Development	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00