

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Gateway Environmental K 8 Learning Center



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 23 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 34 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 34 |

Gateway Environmental K 8 Learning Center

955 SE 18TH AVE, Homestead, FL 33035

<http://gatewayk8.dadeschools.net>

Demographics

Principal: Tiffany Anderson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2015

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Combination School PK-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2020-21 Title I School | Yes |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (46%) |
| 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 | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 23 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 34 |

Gateway Environmental K 8 Learning Center

955 SE 18TH AVE, Homestead, FL 33035

<http://gatewayk8.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) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Combination School PK-8 | Yes | 87% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 97% |

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 our school is to provide a structured environment where students achieve their personal and academic goals while learning to protect and respect their community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of our school is to develop a safe, nurturing educational setting that provides rigor and relevance to lifetime learning.

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 |
|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| Anderson, Tiffany | Principal | The school principal serves as the educational leader, responsible for managing the policies, regulations, and procedures to ensure that all students are supervised in a safe learning environment. Achieving academic excellence requires that the school principal work collaboratively with all stakeholders and communicates effectively to ensure academic and social emotional needs are being met. |
| Bales, Clinton | Assistant Principal | The Assistant Principal (AP) is a member of the school leadership team. This member supports the Principal in providing the instructional and organizational leadership at Gateway Environmental K-8 Learning Center. The AP serves as the school's advocate and works with all stakeholders to maintain the common vision of the school. This vision includes the school's academic and social-emotional success that engages students and their community. The Assistant Principal also works with others to develop and execute a school improvement plan and allocates resources to continually improve student achievement. This member is also committed to building a talented instructional team and working with the Principal to ensure a safe, engaging learning environment for all stakeholders. |
| Defreitas, Michele | Assistant Principal | The Assistant Principal (AP) is a member of the school leadership team. This member supports the Principal in providing the instructional and organizational leadership at Gateway Environmental K-8 Learning Center. The AP serves as the school's advocate and works with all stakeholders to maintain the common vision of the school. This vision includes the school's academic and social-emotional success that engages students and their community. The Assistant Principal also works with others to develop and execute a school improvement plan and allocates resources to continually improve student achievement. This member is also committed to building a talented instructional team and working with the Principal to ensure a safe, engaging learning environment for all stakeholders. |
| Collier, Courtney | Assistant Principal | The Assistant Principal (AP) is a member of the school leadership team. This member supports the Principal in providing the instructional and organizational leadership at Gateway Environmental K-8 Learning Center. The AP serves as the school's advocate and works with all stakeholders to maintain the common vision of the school. This vision includes the school's academic and social-emotional success that engages students and their community. The Assistant Principal also works with others to develop and execute a school improvement plan and allocates resources to continually improve student achievement. This member is also committed to building a talented instructional team and working with the Principal to ensure a safe, engaging learning environment for all stakeholders. |
| Bell, Tiffany | Other | The Center for Special Instruction (CSI) instructor serves as a teacher that supports the school environment in assuring all students follow the School's Student Code of Conduct. The purpose of this instructor is to meet student |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|
| | | academic and social-emotional needs in order to maximize instruction in all school settings. |
| Stinson, Tralana | Reading Coach | Instructional coaches develop, lead and evaluate school core content standards/programs; identify and analyze existing literature specifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. They identify systematic patterns of student need while working with District personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies. Additionally, they assist with whole school screening programs that provide intervening services for children "at risk", assist with design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, data analysis and delivery of professional development. |
| Harris, Nikesha | Math Coach | Instructional coaches develop, lead and evaluate school core content standards/programs; identify and analyze existing literature specifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. They identify systematic patterns of student need while working with District personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies. Additionally, they assist with whole school screening programs that provide intervening services for children "at risk", assist with design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, data analysis and delivery of professional development. |
| Vinas, Victoria | Instructional Coach | Instructional coaches develop, lead and evaluate school core content standards/programs; identify and analyze existing literature specifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. They identify systematic patterns of student need while working with District personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies. Additionally, they assist with whole school screening programs that provide intervening services for children "at risk", assist with design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, data analysis and delivery of professional development. |
| Machado, Myriam | ELL Compliance Specialist | The ESOL Compliance Specialist assists in the coordination of eligibility and placement of potential English language learners (ELLs) at the school level, and ensures an efficient system of staffing for all ELL students. The school ESOL Compliance Specialist provides support to teachers for improving instruction for all ELL students. |
| Vasallo, Mayra | Instructional Media | Instructs students and staff in effective use of the media center, information and technology literacy skills, and use of equipment. Develop policies and procedures to ensure efficient operation, services, and facility use for a 21st century school library media. Provides instruction and assistance with electronic and virtual learning opportunities to faculty, students and staff. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/15/2015, Tiffany Anderson

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.*

17

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.*

68

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

99

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,450

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

4

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

2

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 | 60 | 109 | 134 | 180 | 142 | 165 | 193 | 195 | 219 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1397 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 | 44 | 42 | 71 | 47 | 56 | 97 | 90 | 122 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 577 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 6 | 9 | 29 | 41 | 42 | 28 | 21 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 228 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 6 | 4 | 23 | 26 | 22 | 84 | 63 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 325 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 28 | 43 | 54 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 192 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 24 | 59 | 59 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 230 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 2 | 22 | 73 | 112 | 64 | 69 | 101 | 130 | 133 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 706 |

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 | 7 | 12 | 40 | 39 | 49 | 102 | 78 | 141 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 471 | |

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 | 7 | 4 | 46 | 20 | 7 | 28 | 23 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 202 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 14 | 19 | 15 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/30/2021

2020-21 - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

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

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-------|
| Students with two or more indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 115 | 149 | 153 | 188 | 200 | 195 | 226 | 205 | 145 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1576 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 39 | 47 | 56 | 52 | 64 | 80 | 94 | 97 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 601 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 13 | 8 | 44 | 57 | 18 | 19 | 52 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 235 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 8 | 10 | 25 | 33 | 74 | 66 | 70 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 340 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 35 | 50 | 56 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 207 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 51 | 58 | 78 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 249 |

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 | 16 | 13 | 49 | 63 | 86 | 84 | 109 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 496 |

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 | | 5 | 6 | 4 | 46 | 20 | 9 | 28 | 22 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 204 |
| Students retained two or more times | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 19 | 8 | 19 | 16 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91 |

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 | | | | 42% | 63% | 61% | 42% | 62% | 60% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 48% | 61% | 59% | 57% | 61% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 47% | 57% | 54% | 55% | 57% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 40% | 67% | 62% | 42% | 65% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 45% | 63% | 59% | 56% | 61% | 58% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 46% | 56% | 52% | 52% | 55% | 52% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 42% | 56% | 56% | 41% | 57% | 57% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 61% | 80% | 78% | 60% | 79% | 77% |

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 | 38% | 60% | -22% | 58% | -20% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 43% | 64% | -21% | 58% | -15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -38% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 39% | 60% | -21% | 56% | -17% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -43% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 42% | 58% | -16% | 54% | -12% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -39% | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 33% | 56% | -23% | 52% | -19% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -42% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 46% | 60% | -14% | 56% | -10% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -33% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 36% | 67% | -31% | 62% | -26% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 47% | 69% | -22% | 64% | -17% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -36% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 31% | 65% | -34% | 60% | -29% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -47% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 41% | 58% | -17% | 55% | -14% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -31% | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 18% | 53% | -35% | 54% | -36% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -41% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 39% | 40% | -1% | 46% | -7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -18% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 37% | 53% | -16% | 53% | -16% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 36% | 43% | -7% | 48% | -12% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -37% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 100% | 68% | 32% | 67% | 33% |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 60% | 73% | -13% | 71% | -11% |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 68% | 63% | 5% | 61% | 7% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 89% | 54% | 35% | 57% | 32% |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The i-Ready Diagnostic was the progress monitoring tool used to determine student proficiency in grades first through eighth for both reading and mathematics. District Midyear Assessments were used for both science and civics progress monitoring.

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 29.5% | 29.8% | 42.1% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 29.2% | 29.4% | 42% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 23.1% | 23.1% | 23.1% |
| | English Language Learners | 40% | 0 | 0 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 25% | 31.4% | 40% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 25.4% | 31.1% | 39.8% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 30.8% | 46.2% | 23.1% |
| | English Language Learners | 20% | 0 | 0 |
| Grade 2 | | | | |
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 30.7% | 44.2% | 44.7% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 28% | 43.4% | 43% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 23.8% | 38.1% | 28.6% |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 18% | 27.4% | 35.4% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 17% | 26.4% | 34% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 20% | 33.3% | 23.8% |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 38% | 44.4% | 53.6% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 36.8% | 41.6% | 50.4% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 15.8% | 25% | 47.4% |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 10% | 22.5% | 39.3% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 10.3% | 22.6% | 38.2% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 5% | 10% | 26.3% |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grade 4 | | | | |
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 20.3% | 31.6% | 32.9% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 19% | 30.7% | 31.3% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 4.5% | 4.3% | 26.1% |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 17% | 34.9% | 47.4% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 15.6% | 32.9% | 45.3% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 13% | 26.1% | 47.8% |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Grade 5 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 26.4% | 36% | 31.5% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 26.1% | 35.4% | 30.7% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 5.3% | 18.2% | 18.2% |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 20.3% | 30.6% | 38.3% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 19.7% | 29.7% | 37% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 15% | 22.7% | 18.2% |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Science | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 0 | 16% | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 15% | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 6% | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0% | 0 |
| Grade 6 | | | | |
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 23.8% | 21% | 24.7% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 23.1% | 19.9% | 23.1% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 13.8% | 6.9% | 11.1% |
| | English Language Learners | 10.3% | 6.7% | 24% |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 23% | 32.1% | 32.4% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 20.5% | 29.7% | 28.5% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 14.8% | 17.9% | 18.5% |
| | English Language Learners | 7.4% | 10.7% | 12% |

| Grade 7 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 29.5% | 32.4% | 31.2% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 29.9% | 30.6% | 30.2% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 17.2% | 12.9% | 10.3% |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 16.9% | 30% | 31.3% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 16.2% | 29.7% | 32% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 13.3% | 10% | 18.5% |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Civics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 0 | 43% | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 42% | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 19% | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 20% | 0 |

| Grade 8 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 33.3% | 40.2% | 34.1 % |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 32% | 39.8% | 33.7% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 15.4% | 30.8% | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 17.3% | 23.4% | 28.3% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 17.2% | 23.3% | 27.6% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 7.7% | 10% |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Science | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 0 | 5% | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 5% | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0% | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0% | 0 |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 19 | 33 | 30 | 20 | 23 | 25 | 21 | 26 | | | |
| ELL | 24 | 40 | 52 | 18 | 23 | 21 | 23 | 24 | | | |
| BLK | 26 | 36 | 40 | 17 | 24 | 34 | 21 | 36 | 39 | | |
| HSP | 39 | 41 | 45 | 27 | 26 | 30 | 32 | 40 | 39 | | |
| WHT | 34 | 35 | | 27 | 13 | | 22 | | | | |
| FRL | 34 | 40 | 45 | 23 | 24 | 29 | 27 | 39 | 39 | | |
| 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 | 24 | 42 | 36 | 29 | 45 | 40 | 17 | 41 | | | |
| ELL | 35 | 47 | 44 | 37 | 44 | 38 | 34 | 37 | 100 | | |
| BLK | 33 | 43 | 47 | 31 | 42 | 43 | 30 | 55 | 55 | | |
| HSP | 46 | 51 | 47 | 44 | 47 | 48 | 47 | 64 | 72 | | |

| 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 |
| MUL | 62 | 45 | | 54 | 45 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 50 | 45 | | 53 | 50 | | 55 | | | | |
| FRL | 41 | 49 | 48 | 39 | 45 | 46 | 42 | 60 | 69 | | |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 18 | 44 | 45 | 19 | 44 | 40 | 16 | 40 | | | |
| ELL | 29 | 59 | 59 | 35 | 57 | 65 | 27 | 17 | | | |
| BLK | 31 | 51 | 56 | 30 | 54 | 49 | 23 | 50 | 70 | | |
| HSP | 46 | 60 | 55 | 48 | 55 | 54 | 50 | 64 | 78 | | |
| MUL | 60 | | | 57 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 61 | 78 | | 55 | 71 | | 50 | | | | |
| FRL | 41 | 57 | 56 | 42 | 55 | 52 | 40 | 60 | 77 | | |

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 | 35 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 6 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 46 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 349 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 84% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 25 |
| 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 | 30 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Native American Students | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 32 |
| 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 | 36 |
| 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 | 26 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 34 |
| 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?

2019 progress monitoring data shows an increase in all ELA subgroups from i-Ready AP1 to AP3. The 4th grade math proficiency in all subgroups showed a double digit increase from the i-Ready AP1 to AP3. Based on the 2021 FSA ELA learning gains there was an 9 percentage point decrease when compared to the 2019 data from 48% to 39%.

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

Math learning gains decreased 20 percentage points from 45% in 2019 to 25% on the 2021 FSA. In addition, math learning gains L25 decreased 16 percentage points from 46% in 2019 to 30% on the 2021 FSA.

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 lack of instructional support has contributed to the decline in meeting the needs of all students. In the future, action will be taken to provide additional modeling and support on differentiated instruction in mathematics. An Upper Academy math coach will be hired to provide support for the intensive math teachers and acceleration classes. Collaborative planning sessions and data chats will continue to focus on OPM resources and fidelity.

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

In 2021, students in the SWD subgroup in ELA showed a growth of 31.6 points when comparing i-Ready AP1 to AP3 data. Science and Social Studies proficiency data both increased 1 percentage point from 2018 to 2019 on the FCAT and the EOC Assessment.

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

We monitored data findings and conducted data chats with our ESE teachers and ESE chair. Resources were utilized from the pacing guide in addition to i-Ready supplemental materials.

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

Standards-based collaborative planning, Extended Learning opportunities, TIER 2/TIER 3 interventions along with focused differentiated instruction are all strategies used to accelerate learning.

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

The PLST will develop professional development opportunities on September 7th, 2021, and September 16th, 2021, to explore best practices on differentiated instruction and effective student feedback. In addition, instructional coaches will model lessons and use collaborative planning sessions to adjust groups and provide specific teacher feedback.

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

Collaborative Planning will be scheduled weekly and instructional coaches along with an administrator will be present to ensure fidelity of the research-based strategies to be implemented school-wide. Intensive acceleration (IA) teachers will plan separately to further support the instructional needs of the students. Extended learning opportunities will be provided with afterschool tutoring and Saturday Academies. Special STEM-based clubs and after school enrichment activities will be offered to enhance student learning.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2021 i-Ready AP3 reading data was at 38% proficiency and 37% proficiency for math. We identified that our students were not meeting their grade level proficiency rates. The percentage of students performing on or above proficiency on the ELA FSA for 2020-2021 is 34%. For mathematics the percentage of students performing at a level 3 or above on the Math FSA for 2020-2021 is 24%.

Measurable Outcome: By implementing small group instructional strategies, we will increase our i-Ready proficiency in both reading and math to 45% by June of 2022.

Monitoring: The administration and instructional coaches will attend common planning to ensure teachers are focusing on weekly data trends to drive small group instruction. Additionally, i-Ready weekly data will be analyzed by instructional coaches to assist teachers with monitoring students' academic progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tiffany Anderson (tdanderson@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus is small group instruction. Small group instruction will assist in the learning gains of L25s which will be a systematic approach of instruction to meet student needs. Data-driven instruction will be monitored through the use of data trackers to drive instructional planning and data-driven conversations to include OPMs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The rationale for selecting a small-group strategy is to ensure teachers are using current resources and aligned data to drive instruction that will meet the student's needs. Teachers will continue to make adjustments to small groups as new data becomes available.

Action Steps to Implement

The administrative team and instructional coaches will analyze AP3, SAT-10, and FSA data in order to plan for small group instruction. This will occur from August 31st, to October 11, 2021.

Person Responsible Michele Defreitas (mdefreitas@dadeschools.net)

Teachers will be provided with DI pacing guides to address students' specific needs. In addition, resources from the Wonders Researched-based Program will be used to support small group instruction. This action step will occur from August 31st, to October 11, 2021.

Person Responsible Tralana Stinson (t-stinson@dadeschools.net)

Small group instruction will be reevaluated based on i-Ready progress monitoring data. This action step will occur from August 31st, to October 11, 2021.

Person Responsible Victoria Vinas (vvinas@dadeschools.net)

Curriculum coaches and teachers will monitor small group instruction based on data from current topic assessments and progress monitoring assessments such as Topic Assessment data and bi-Weekly assessments. Teachers will continue to adjust small group instruction based on data collected through October 11, 2021.

Person Responsible Michele Defreitas (mdefreitas@dadeschools.net)

Curriculum coaches will provide teachers with sample data trackers and DI folders to assist in the implementation and tracking of small group instruction. This action step will occur from November 1, to December 17, 2021.

Person Responsible Tralana Stinson (t-stinson@dadeschools.net)

Curriculum coaches will model the instructional delivery of small group instruction to those teachers in need of support based on feedback from administrative walkthroughs and teacher requests. This action step will occur from November 1, to December 17, 2021.

Person Responsible Nikesha Harris (251501@dadeschools.net)

Administration will conduct teacher data chats to review AP2 i-Ready data and DI folders to determine alignment and best implementation steps. This action will occur from January 31 to April 29, 2022.

Person Responsible Tiffany Anderson (tdanderson@dadeschools.net)

Curriculum coaches will facilitate the DI regrouping of students based on AP2 i-Ready data and Topic Assessment data during collaborative planning. This will occur from January 31 to April 29, 2022.

Person Responsible Tralana Stinson (t-stinson@dadeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: According to 2021 i-Ready AP3 results 33% of students scored 2 or more grade levels below in reading and 30 % scored two or more grade levels below in math. In addition, ELA FSA learning gains for 2020-2021 was 39% while the mathematics FSA learning gains was 25%. We identified that our students were not meeting their grade level proficiency rates and not showing growth as needed.

Measurable Outcome: By implementing collaborative planning strategies we will increase our i-Ready proficiency in both reading and math to 45% by June of 2022.

Monitoring: The administration and instructional coaches will attend common planning to ensure teachers are focusing on weekly data trends to drive small group instruction. Additionally, i-Ready weekly data will be analyzed by instructional coaches to assist teachers with monitoring students' academic progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tiffany Anderson (tdanderson@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus is collaborative planning. This strategy will assist teachers in identifying students as well as resources that will assist in the learning gains of L25s. This will be a systematic approach of instruction to meet student needs. During collaborative planning, teachers and instructional coaches will work together using data and instructional resources to plan lessons that will address all students' needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The rationale for selecting a collaborative planning strategy is to ensure teachers are using current resources and aligned data to drive instruction that will meet the student's needs. Teachers will continue to make adjustments to lessons based on new data as it becomes available.

Action Steps to Implement

The administrative team and instructional coaches will facilitate collaborative planning focusing on standard-based instruction. During planning teachers will unwrap the standard and plan with the end in mind. Exit slips and assessments will be developed to address the standard of focus. This action step will occur from August 31, to October 11, 2021.

Person Responsible Tiffany Anderson (tdanderson@dadeschools.net)

Teachers will share best practices during common planning as identified through administrative walkthroughs. Best practices will also be determined by instructional coaches and through data results from bi-weekly assessments, topic assessment data and mini-assessment data. This action step will occur from August 31, to October 11, 2021.

Person Responsible Michele Defreitas (mdefreitas@dadeschools.net)

Teachers and instructional coaches will evaluate the effectiveness of standard-based planning and make adjustments as needed. Data results from bi-weekly and topic assessments will be analyzed to determine standards that were assessed and taught to determine increase in data trends. This action step will occur from August 31, to October 11, 2021.

Person Responsible Nikesha Harris (251501@dadeschools.net)

Coaches will help develop effective lesson plan designs for both whole group and small group instruction and adjust as determined by progress monitoring data. This action step will occur from August 31, to October 11, 2021.

Person Responsible Tralana Stinson (t-stinson@dadeschools.net)

Coaches will use the Collaborative Planning Sheet that includes the Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs), to select Sample Response Mechanism (SRM) aligned to level 3, 4 and 5 ALDs. This action will occur from November 1, to December 17, 2021.

Person Responsible Tralana Stinson (t-stinson@dadeschools.net)

Coaches will use the L25 data results in Power BI during common planning to set teacher goals and discuss trend data and alignment of instructional needs specific to this subgroup. This will occur from November 1, to December 17, 2021.

Person Responsible Victoria Vinas (vvinas@dadeschools.net)

During collaborative planning coaches will realign instructional focus based on new i-Ready AP2 data. Coaches will use the bubble students to set teacher goals and discuss alignment of instructional needs. This will occur from January 31 to April 29, 2022.

Person Responsible Nikesha Harris (251501@dadeschools.net)

During collaborative planning coaches will use the i-Ready Projected Proficiency Report to determine new DI grouping and develop Instructional calendars for crunch time. This will occur from January 31 to April 29, 2022.

Person Responsible Victoria Vinas (vvinas@dadeschools.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Social emotional learning was identified as a critical need based off of the 2021 Staff and Student Climate Surveys. Fifty-one percent of teachers felt overwhelmed and overloaded at their job. Additionally, students who are struggling with social emotional areas are also the students who are receiving more than 1 behavior referral. We acknowledge the need to focus our initiatives to improve students' social and emotional well being in order to decrease reoccurring behavioral referrals.

Measurable Outcome: If we successfully implement the targeted element of meeting student's social emotional needs our students will be able to appropriately resolve conflicts therefore decreasing the amount of 2 behavioral referrals from 3% school wide to 2% by June of 2022.

Monitoring: Administration, instructional coaches, and counselors will work to identify the reasons individual students are struggling with addressing their social emotion needs. RJP data will be tracked weekly and MtSS Power BI reports will be tracked to determine referral rates.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tiffany Anderson (tdanderson@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Within the target element of social-emotional learning, our school will focus on evidence-based strategy of mentorship programs and RJP strategies. Mentor and mentee activities will assist in narrowing the number of students receiving 2 referrals. Student referrals will be monitored weekly to decrease the number of student referrals.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The mentorship program will assist in decreasing the number of student referrals. This initiative will provide the leadership team with a protocol to identify student's social emotional needs, necessary remediation, and incentives.

Action Steps to Implement

The administrative team will analyze the early warning signs data and assign students with more than three referrals a mentor. This will occur from August 31, to October 11, 2021.

Person Responsible Tiffany Anderson (tdanderson@dadeschools.net)

The teachers will be trained in mindfulness strategies and the implementation of Restorative Justice Practices. This will occur from August 31, to October 11, 2021.

Person Responsible Tiffany Anderson (tdanderson@dadeschools.net)

Discipline referral data will be analyzed at the end of each nine weeks to determine the effectiveness of the strategies. This action step will occur from August 31, to October 11, 2021.

Person Responsible Tiffany Bell (tfalco@dadeschools.net)

Our CSI program will be used to incorporate mindfulness strategies and Restorative Justice Practices. This action step will occur from August 31, to October 11, 2021.

Person Responsible Tiffany Bell (tfalco@dadeschools.net)

The Administrative Team will identify candidates for our Mentorship program, Students with Ambitious Goals (S.W.A.G.), based on discipline referral data and CSI intake data logs. This action step will occur from November 1, to December 17, 2021.

Person Responsible Tiffany Anderson (tdanderson@dadeschools.net)

The S.W.A.G. leadership members along with administration will strategically match teacher mentors with students in need of one-on one mentorship. Members of the S.W.A.G Team will participate in monthly organized activities to build positive relationships along with social emotional skills. This action step will occur from November 1, to December 17, 2021.

Person Responsible Tiffany Anderson (tdanderson@dadeschools.net)

Students that attended CSI and never returned will be recognized by participating in a Camp Turnaround celebration. This will occur from January 31 to April 29, 2022.

Person Responsible Tiffany Bell (tfalco@dadeschools.net)

Students identified by teachers and counselors in need of additional social and emotional support will be referred to the mental health counselor. This will occur from January 31 to April 29, 2022.

Person Responsible Michele Defreitas (mdefreitas@dadeschools.net)

#4. Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Specific teacher feedback was identified as a critical need based on the 2021 Staff Climate Surveys and SIP survey. Fifty one percent stated they recieved feedback to improve student achievement quarterly. Only 15% of teachers stated they are receiving adequate feedback to improve student outcomes. We acknowledge the need to focus our initiatives to increase teacher feedback to improve student achievement. |
| Measurable Outcome: | Based on the 2021 Staff Climate Survey teachers disagree that they are receiving adequate feedback to improve student outcomes. The Teachers' 2021-2022 staff climate survey will reflect at least a 10% improvement where staff members will agree that they are receiving adequate feedback from Administration. |
| Monitoring: | This area of focus will be monitored by the administration. The administrative team will provide immediate teacher feedback after walk-throughs, data chats, and collaborative planning meetings. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Tiffany Anderson (tdanderson@dadeschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus is consistent developmental feedback. This involves providing a clear expectation, progress towards that goal and a description of the support and behavior that will be provided. Feedback should be provided regularly as a means of professional growth. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is to inform, engage, and empower our teachers in planning and instruction to meet all student needs. |

Action Steps to Implement

The Administrative Team will identify an area of focus each week based on the IPEGS Standards. This will occur from August 31, to October 11, 2021.

Person Responsible Tiffany Anderson (tdanderson@dadeschools.net)

The Administrative Team will conduct daily walkthroughs and provide feedback within 48 hours on how the teacher can improve their instruction. This action step will begin August 31, to October 11, 2021.

Person Responsible Courtney Collier (courtneycollier@dadeschools.net)

The Administrative Team will conduct a follow-up walkthrough to see the implementation of the instructional strategies that were suggested during the initial walkthrough. This action step will occur from August 31, to October 11, 2021.

Person Responsible Courtney Collier (courtneycollier@dadeschools.net)

The Administrative Team will conduct weekly Leadership Meetings to discuss walkthrough outcomes and TIER teachers, determining the instructional coaching support needed. This action step will occur from August 31, to October 11, 2021.

Person Responsible Tiffany Anderson (tdanderson@dadeschools.net)

The Administrative Team will conduct a professional development training on the IPEGS Standards during a faculty meeting to deeply discuss Knowledge of Learners (Performance Standard 2) and Instructional Delivery and Engagement (Performance Standard 4). This action step will take place from November 1, to December 17, 2021.

Person Responsible Tiffany Anderson (tdanderson@dadeschools.net)

The Administrative Team will conduct teacher data chats to provide feedback on the DPGT and current data trends. Feedback from walkthrough visits will be shared and next steps will be addressed. This action step will occur from November 1, to December 17, 2021.

Person Responsible Tiffany Anderson (tdanderson@dadeschools.net)

The Administrative Team will conduct Mid-Year data chats upon the completion of the i-Ready AP2 diagnostic. Teachers will determine projected goals for proficiency and learning gains based on current data. This action step will occur from January 31 to April 29, 2022.

Person Responsible Tiffany Anderson (tdanderson@dadeschools.net)

The instructional coaches will share best practices on corrective feedback strategies during collaborative planning meetings. These strategies will be based on observations collected during administrative walkthroughs. This action step will occur from January 31 to April 29, 2022.

Person Responsible Tiffany Anderson (tdanderson@dadeschools.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2021 FSA ELA achievement scores, only 34% of our students are reading on grade level. In addition, 39% of our students are making ELA learning gains as determined on the 2021 FSA Assessment. We recognize the need to put our efforts toward increasing the number of proficient readers. The percentage of students in kindergarten through third grade, based on the 2020-2021 reading progress monitoring data, performing 2 or more grade levels below is 23%.

Measurable Outcome: We will increase the percentage of students performing at a level 3 or higher on the 2022 ELA FSA Assessment by 4%.

Monitoring: The administration and instructional coaches will monitor the bi-weekly assessments through Performance Matters reports and track the proficiency rate of students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tiffany Anderson (tdanderson@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Extended learning opportunities will be provided to offer activities designed for students beyond the school day as well as enrichment. These learning opportunities will provide additional support in reading and specific skills as identified through progress monitoring tools.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Extended learning opportunities will provide additional time for students to receive instructional support in reading and help to mitigate learning loss. Students will be targeted based on areas of deficiency and remediation will occur based on those skills as new data is available.

Action Steps to Implement

The administrative team will identify eligible candidates based on progress monitoring data, FSA data and SAT data to participate in extended learning activities. This action will occur from August 31, to September 15, 2021.

Person Responsible Tiffany Anderson (tdanderson@dadeschools.net)

The administrative team and instructional coaches will coordinate and implement extended learning programs such as; TALENTS, Saturday Academy, Title I after-school tutoring and Title III ESOL tutoring. This will occur from August 31, to October 11, 2021.

Person Responsible Tiffany Anderson (tdanderson@dadeschools.net)

The administrative team and instructional coaches will conduct walkthroughs to ensure the fidelity of all programs. This will occur from October 1st, to October 11, 2021.

Person Responsible Tiffany Anderson (tdanderson@dadeschools.net)

The instructional coaches along with the administrative team will review progress monitoring data to determine shifts in program focus based on student needs. This will occur from October 1st, to October 11, 2021.

Person Responsible Tiffany Anderson (tdanderson@dadeschools.net)

The administrative team and the instructional coaches will identify the L25 students to ensure they were invited and are participating in the extended learning opportunities. This will occur from November 1, to December 17, 2021.

Person Responsible Michele Defreitas (mdefreitas@dadeschools.net)

The instructional coaches will identify students in the reading and mathematics FSA 2.2 and 3.0 buckets for Saturday Academy. This will occur from November 1, to December 17, 2021.

Person Responsible Michele Defreitas (mdefreitas@dadeschools.net)

The instructional coaches will identify students in the L25 subgroup and bubble students to target for our Spring Break Academy. This will occur from January 31 to April 29, 2022.

Person Responsible Michele Defreitas (mdefreitas@dadeschools.net)

The instructional coaches will identify bubble students based on i-Ready AP 2 data and Topic Assessment data. These students will be invited to our i-Ready computer labs in the morning to complete additional lessons aligned to their needs. This action step will occur from January 31 to April 29, 2022.

Person Responsible Michele Defreitas (mdefreitas@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 other schools in the state, Gateway K-8 ranked 221 out of 313 combination schools in the state of Florida based on the number of incidents reported. As a result, Gateway K-8 falls into the high category based on the number of incidents reported per 100 students. Our primary focus will be to decrease the number of violent incidents per 100 students. The secondary focus will be to decrease the number of referrals for disruptive behavior. Teachers will be trained in Mindfulness and Restorative Justice Practices and data will be analyzed monthly to determine its effectiveness. Additionally, mindfulness activities will be implemented in the classrooms and in S.C.S.I.

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.

Our strengths within School Culture are in Relationships, Support and Connections. Our school provides many opportunities through the year to engage with parents and families to ensure they have ongoing information and support needed to guide their children. School-wide information is provided to all stakeholders through our Website, Social Media platforms and School Messenger. Our Community Liaison Specialists (CLS) holds monthly parent meetings and provides assistance to families in need. Students in the upper academy will continue to be exposed to Restorative Justice Practices (RJP) and a mentorship program will be reinstated to further support the social and emotional needs of our students. We also offer opportunities to celebrate student and teacher success through our attendance and i-Ready incentive programs.

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

The stakeholders involved in building a positive school culture and environment are the Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coaches, Teacher Leaders and Counselors (our School Leadership Team). The Principal's role is to monitor the mentorship, i-Ready incentives and the RJP programs. Teacher leaders and instructional coaches assist in responding to feedback from stakeholders. All stakeholders will play a role in building and maintaining relationships with students, parents, and families.

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | |
|---|--------|--|--------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Leadership: Specific Teacher Feedback | \$0.00 |
| 5 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |

| | |
|--------|--------|
| Total: | \$0.00 |
|--------|--------|