**Miami-Dade County Public Schools** 

# **Crestview 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       | 17 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 26 |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 26 |

# **Crestview Elementary School**

2201 NW 187TH ST, Opa Locka, FL 33056

http://cvwe.dadeschools.net/

### **Demographics**

Principal: Maria Hardwick V

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2021

| <b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)   | Active   |
|---|--|
| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(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 Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History   | 2018-19: A (63%)<br>2017-18: B (58%)<br>2016-17: D (40%)                                       |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info  | ormation*  |
| 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. F   | or more information, <u>click here</u> .   |

## **School Board Approval**

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

Last Modified: 4/19/2024 https://www.floridacims.org Page 3 of 27

### **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:

- 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 <a href="https://www.floridacims.org">www.floridacims.org</a>.

### 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       | 17 |
| Title I Requirements           | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 26 |

# **Crestview Elementary School**

2201 NW 187TH ST, Opa Locka, FL 33056

http://cvwe.dadeschools.net/

### **School Demographics**

| School Type and Gi<br>(per MSID I |          | 2020-21 Title I School | l Disadvant | Economically<br>taged (FRL) Rate<br>ted on Survey 3) |
|-----------------------------------|----------|------------------------|-------------|--|
| Elementary S<br>PK-5              | School   | Yes                    |             | 91%  |
| Primary Servio<br>(per MSID I     | • •      | Charter School         | (Reporte    | Minority Rate<br>ed as Non-white<br>Survey 2)        |
| K-12 General E                    | ducation | No                     |             | 99%  |
| School Grades Histo               | ory      |                        |             |  |
| Year                              | 2020-21  | 2019-20                | 2018-19     | 2017-18  |
| Grade                             |          | Α                      | Α           | В  |

### **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 <a href="https://www.floridaCIMS.org">https://www.floridaCIMS.org</a>.

### 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.

Committed to providing an innovative educational experience that promotes inclusivity and diversity.

### Provide the school's vision statement.

Establishing infinite possibilities to all students through diverse and innovative instructional practices.

### 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<br>Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|-----------------------|------------------------|--|
| Hardwick,<br>Maria    | Principal              | Provides a common vision for use of data-based decision-making; ensures that the school-based team is implementing interventions, conducts effective assessment for purposes of progress monitoring; ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation; ensures adequate professional development to support Rti implementation and communication with parents regarding school-based plans and activities.               |
| Fullard,<br>Melissa   | Teacher,<br>ESE        | Oversees school's SPED department to ensure teh SWD subgroup demonstrates continuous progress as delineated in the IEP while working towards the achievement of goals based on standards; provides intervention to small groups of students.   |
| Dorsey,<br>Shanese    | Teacher,<br>K-12       | Provide professional development and classroom follow-up on best practices on science and other integrated course subjects; coordinates intervention activities; assist with benchmark assessments and progress monitoring data.   |
| Mandrell,<br>Brittani | Assistant<br>Principal | Assist the principal with providing a common vision for use of data-based decision-making; ensuring that the school-based team is implementing interventions, conducting effective assessment for purposes of progress monitoring; implementation of intervention support and documentation; adequate professional development to support Rti implementation and communication with parents regarding school-based plans and activities. |
| Flete,<br>Sadery      | Instructional<br>Coach | Provide professional development and classroom follow-up on best practices on ELA and other integrated course subjects; coordinates intervention activities; assists with benchmark assessments and progress monitoring data.  |
| Bertrand,<br>James    | Instructional<br>Coach | Provide professional development and classroom follow-up on best practices on Mathematics and other integrated course subjects; coordinates intervention activities; assist with benchmark assessments and progress monitoring data.   |

### **Demographic Information**

### Principal start date

Thursday 7/29/2021, Maria Hardwick V

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.

3

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.

12

## Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

24

Total number of students enrolled at the school

268

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

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

**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 |
|--|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator  | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAI |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 29          | 46 | 41 | 39 | 50 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 235   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 7           | 18 | 13 | 12 | 18 | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 72    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 3  | 5  | 6  | 7  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 24    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 3  | 4  | 5  | 10 | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 23    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 1           | 10 | 18 | 22 | 29 | 8  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 88    |
|  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

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

| Indicator                            |   |   |   |   |   | Gr | ade | e Le | vel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                            | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6   | 7    | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAI |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 3  | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 29    |

### The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           |   | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |  |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| Indicator                           | K | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |  |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 1 | 4           | 4 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19    |  |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0           | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4     |  |

### Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/29/2021

### 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 |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                                     | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                   | 51          | 45 | 45 | 59 | 41 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 295   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                   | 14          | 14 | 13 | 18 | 6  | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 75    |
| One or more suspensions                       | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                         | 0           | 4  | 8  | 6  | 6  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 27    |
| Course failure in Math                        | 0           | 4  | 6  | 9  | 4  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 24    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |

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

| Indicator                            |   |   |   |    |   | Gra | ade | Le | vel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|----|---|-----|-----|----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                            | K | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5   | 6   | 7  | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 5 | 8 | 10 | 6 | 3   | 0   | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 32    |

### The number of students identified as retainees:

| ludio etcu                          |   | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator                           | K | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 1 | 4           | 4 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0           | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### **School Data Review**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component      |        | 2021     |       |        | 2019     |       | 2018   |          |       |  |  |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--|--|
| School Grade Component      | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |  |  |
| ELA Achievement             |        |          |       | 60%    | 62%      | 57%   | 54%    | 62%      | 56%   |  |  |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 68%    | 62%      | 58%   | 53%    | 62%      | 55%   |  |  |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 70%    | 58%      | 53%   | 36%    | 59%      | 48%   |  |  |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 74%    | 69%      | 63%   | 73%    | 69%      | 62%   |  |  |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 64%    | 66%      | 62%   | 73%    | 64%      | 59%   |  |  |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 56%    | 55%      | 51%   | 70%    | 55%      | 47%   |  |  |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 50%    | 55%      | 53%   | 50%    | 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-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 03                | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|                   | 2019     | 57%    | 60%      | -3%                               | 58%   | -1%                            |
| Cohort Co         | mparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 04                | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|                   | 2019     | 68%    | 64%      | 4%                                | 58%   | 10%                            |
| Cohort Comparison |          | -57%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 05                | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|                   | 2019     | 34%    | 60%      | -26%                              | 56%   | -22%                           |
| Cohort Co         | mparison | -68%   |          |                                   |       |                                |

|            | MATH     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Grade      | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |  |  |
| 03         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |
|            | 2019     | 73%    | 67%      | 6%                                | 62%   | 11%                            |  |  |
| Cohort Con | nparison |        |          |                                   | •     |                                |  |  |
| 04         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       | _                              |  |  |

|                   | MATH              |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |
|-------------------|-------------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|
| Grade             | Year              | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |  |
|                   | 2019              | 84%    | 69%      | 15%                               | 64%   | 20%                            |  |
| Cohort Co         | Cohort Comparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |
| 05                | 2021              |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |
|                   | 2019              | 44%    | 65%      | -21%                              | 60%   | -16%                           |  |
| Cohort Comparison |                   | -84%   |          |                                   |       |                                |  |

|                   | SCIENCE |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |
|-------------------|---------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Grade             | Year    | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |  |  |
| 05                | 2021    |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |
|                   | 2019    | 39%    | 53%      | -14%                              | 53%   | -14%                           |  |  |
| Cohort Comparison |         |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |

## **Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments**

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

i-Ready Diagnostic Assessments

|                          |                              | Grade 1 |        |        |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency      | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students                 | 36.8%   | 43.8%  | 66.7%  |
| English Language<br>Arts | Economically Disadvantaged   | 40.0%   | 48.3%  | 66.7%  |
| 7110                     | Students With Disabilities   | 25%     |        |        |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners |         |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency      | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students                 | 25.6%   | 43.8%  | 57.6%  |
| Mathematics              | Economically Disadvantaged   | 27.8%   | 37.9%  | 60.0%  |
|                          | Students With Disabilities   | 12.5%   |        |        |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners |         |        |        |

|                          |  | Grade 2 |  |        |
|--------------------------|--|---------|--|--------|
|                          | Number/%   |         | \\(\lambda \); \( \tau \) + = \( \tau \) | Consis |
|                          | Proficiency  | Fall    | Winter                                   | Spring |
|                          | All Students   | 37.5%   | 48.4%                                    | 46.7%  |
| English Language Arts    | Economically Disadvantaged                           | 38.7%   | 50.0%                                    | 48.3%  |
|                          | Students With Disabilities English Language          | 16.7%   | 40.0%                                    | 20.0%  |
|                          | Learners   |         |  |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency                              | Fall    | Winter                                   | Spring |
|                          | All Students   | 25.8%   | 35.5%                                    | 48.3%  |
| Mathematics              | Economically Disadvantaged                           | 26.7%   | 36.7%                                    | 50.0%  |
|                          | Students With Disabilities                           | 16.7%   |  |        |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners                         |         |  |        |
|                          |  | Grade 3 |  |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency                              | Fall    | Winter                                   | Spring |
|                          | All Students   | 33.3%   | 54.5%                                    | 45.7%  |
| English Language<br>Arts | Economically Disadvantaged                           | 33.3%   | 54.5%                                    | 45.7%  |
|                          | Students With Disabilities                           |         | 16.7%                                    | 28.6%  |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners                         |         |  |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency                              | Fall    | Winter                                   | Spring |
|                          | All Students   | 15.4%   | 31.8%                                    | 32.6%  |
| Mathematics              | Economically Disadvantaged                           | 15.4%   | 31.8%                                    | 32.6%  |
|                          | Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | 15.4%   |  | 14.3%  |

|                          |  | Grade 4 |            |        |
|--------------------------|--|---------|------------|--------|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall    | Winter     | Spring |
|                          | All Students   | 29.4%   | 43.3%      | 51.7%  |
| English Language         | Economically Disadvantaged   | 34.5%   | 480%       | 54.2%  |
| Arts                     | Students With Disabilities English Language Learners   | 11.1%   | 20.0%      | 40.0%  |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall    | Winter     | Spring |
|                          | All Students   | 17.6%   | 58.6%      | 72.4%  |
| Mathematics              | Economically Disadvantaged   | 20.7%   | 58.3%      | 75.0%  |
|                          | Students With Disabilities   | 11.1%   | 40.0%      | 80%    |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners   |         |            |        |
|                          |  | Grade 5 |            |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall    | Winter     | Spring |
|                          | All Students   | 34.7%   | 54.8%      | 42.5%  |
| English Language<br>Arts | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language                       | 33.3%   | 53.7%      | 43.6%  |
|                          | Learners Number/%  | F-11    | 10/:       | 0      |
|                          | Proficiency  | Fall    | Winter     | Spring |
|                          | All Students Economically  | 20.4%   | 31.0%      | 53.8%  |
| Mathematics              | Disadvantaged  | 20.8%   | 31.7%      | 55.3%  |
|                          | Students With Disabilities English Language Learners   | 80.0%   |            |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall    | Winter     | Spring |
| Science                  | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners |         | 10%<br>10% |        |

### **Subgroup Data Review**

|           | 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |           |                   |              |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
|-----------|---|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach.                               | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 |
| SWD       | 61  | 75        |                   | 61           | 67         |                    | 64          |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 50  | 52        | 45                | 47           | 38         | 27                 | 49          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 52  | 52        | 45                | 48           | 38         | 27                 | 49          |            |              |                         |                           |
|           |   | 2019      | SCHO              | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | ONENT              | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach.                               | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2017-18 |
| SWD       | 69  | 81        | 60                | 77           | 73         |                    | 79          |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 59  | 68        | 69                | 72           | 63         | 52                 | 48          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 80  |           |                   | 90           |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 60  | 66        | 72                | 73           | 64         | 57                 | 46          |            |              |                         |                           |
|           |   | 2018      | SCHO              | OL GRAD      | E COMP     | ONENT              | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach.                               | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2016-17 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2016-17 |
| SWD       | 59  | 60        |                   | 72           | 85         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 53  | 51        | 30                | 73           | 71         | 67                 | 50          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 54  | 51        | 32                | 73           | 73         | 71                 | 51          |            |              |                         |                           |

### **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  | 44   |
| 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                                       | 307  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 7    |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |

# Students With Disabilities Federal Index - Students With Disabilities 66 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   | <u> </u> |
| 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                                | 44       |
| 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  |          |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | N/A      |
| 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   |          |
| White Students Federal Index - White Students                                  |          |
|  | N/A      |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |    |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 44 |
| 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?

### 2021 data findings:

Based on the results of the Florida Standards Assessment, the 2021 FSA ELA proficiency is 52% and the 2019 FSA ELA Proficiency was 60%. This is an 8 percentage point decrease. 2021 FSA ELA learning gains were 51% and the 2019 FSA ELA learning gains were 68%. This is a 17 percentage point decrease. 2021 FSA ELA L25 learning gains were 45% and the 2019 FSA ELA learning gains were 70%. This is a 25 percentage point decrease.

Based on the results of the Florida Standards Assessment, the 2021 FSA Mathematics proficiency is 47% and the 2019 FSA Mathematics Proficiency was 74%. This is a 27 percentage point decrease. 2021 FSA Mathematics learning gains were 37% and the 2019 FSA Mathematics learning gains was 64%. This is a 27 percentage point decrease. 2021 FSA Mathematics L25 learning gains were 27% and the 2019 FSA Mathematics learning gains were 56%. This is a 29 percentage point decrease.

Based on the results of the Florida Standards Assessment, the 2021 Science proficiency is 48% and the 2019 FSA Science Proficiency was 50%. This is a 2 percentage point decrease.

### 2019 data findings:

The school to district comparison shows an increase in the Achievement gap widening from 3rd to 5th grade in both ELA and Math.

All ELA Subgroups Achievement, Learning Gains, and L25 Learning Gains increased.

All Math Subgroups Achievement increased except black students which decreased by 1 percentage point

Science Achievement levels remain neutral.

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

According to the 2019 State Assessment data, The majority of our Math L25 Learning Gains decreased by at least 25 percentage points. Students with Free and Reduced lunch decreased by 14 percentage points.

According to our 2020-2021 Progress Monitoring Data, reading proficiency for students in grade 2 decreased from 48.4% in the winter to 46.7% in the spring.

According to our 2020-2021 Progress Monitoring Data, reading proficiency for students in grade 3 decreased from 54.5% in the winter to 45.7% in the spring.

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

Last year, we focused on implementing standards-based instruction in all classrooms. We will continue to support this while incorporating data-driven instruction to help meet the needs of our students. We will also develop teachers using strategies that focus on scaffolding and intervention for lower performing students to help them access grade level content. We will be strategic with aligning resources and include OPM in our data chats.

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

According to the 2019 State Assessment data, ELA achievement increased by 6 percentage points and Mathematics achievement increased 1 percentage point. ELA Learning Gains increased by 15 percentage points. ELA L25 Learning Gains increased by 34 percentage points.

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

Administrators will continue to attend weekly collaborative planning sessions and contribute to conversations with individual departments to carefully align resources to standards.

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

Standards-Based Planning and Instruction, Data-Driven and Differentiated Instruction, Consistent Monitoring of the Implementation Intervention, and Quarterly Parent Conferences.

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 whole group sessions and job-embedded sessions on using data to drive instruction (September/2021), Aligning resources to small group instruction (October/2021), Tackling OPM data (November/December/2021), making adjustments to groups as data becomes available and continuous data chats with individualized feedback and next steps (ongoing). Coaching cycles will also be implemented individually with teachers to support specific needs (ongoing).

# 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 a member of the Leadership Team will attend to ensure fidelity to the strategies being implemented school-wide that are aligned to the goals. Extended Learning opportunities will be provided with before and after school tutoring and interventions as well as Saturday Academies and Spring Break Academy.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### **Areas of Focus:**

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

Area of
Focus
Description
and
Rationale:

Based on the data review, our school will implement Standards-Aligned Instruction. We selected the area of Standards based instruction on our findings that demonstrated Mathematics proficiency decreased. We are not meeting the mastery of standards therefore it is evident that we must improve our ability to effectively plan to meet the demands of the standards.

Measurable Outcome:

If we successfully implement Standards-Based Instruction, then our students will increase by a minimum of 10 percentage points in Mathematics as evidenced by the 2022 State Assessments.

Assessments

**Monitoring:** Teachers and Administrators will collaboratively plan every week to develop plans that are clear, logical, sequential, and aligned to standards-based learning.

Person responsible

Maria Hardwick (mjones4@dadeschools.net)

monitoring outcome: Evidence-

**Evidence-** Within Standards-Based Instruction, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of: Instructional Planning. Instructional Planning will assist in providing quality and effective core instruction to promote academic achievement.

Rationale

for Evidence- Instructional Planning will ensure that teachers are prepared to present lessons clearly and skillfully using explicit instruction.

based Strategy:

### **Action Steps to Implement**

By September 30, 2021, teachers will participate in data chats and goal setting with the administration and Transformation Coaches.

Person Responsible

Maria Hardwick (mjones4@dadeschools.net)

By October 8, 2021, teachers will meet with students utilizing the most recent standardized assessment data to create/set individual goals.

Person Responsible

Maria Hardwick (mjones4@dadeschools.net)

During phase 2 of implementation, August 30- October 11, teachers will Implement standards-based bellringers to reinforce mathematics standards.

Person Responsible

Maria Hardwick (mjones4@dadeschools.net)

During phase 2 of implementation, August 30- October 11, teachers, transformation coaches, and administrators will analyze data to determine the standard focus for differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible

Maria Hardwick (mjones4@dadeschools.net)

During phase 3 of implementation, November 1- December 17, teachers will provide corrective and descriptive feedback on standards-based bellringers to check for understanding.

Person Responsible

During phase 3 of implementation, November 1- December 17, School Leadership Team will analyze and monitor the progress of the L25 students in ELA and Mathematics.

Person

Maria Hardwick (mjones4@dadeschools.net) Responsible

During phase 5 of implementation, January 31-April 29, Teachers will implement the 100 Math Day Count Down in grades 3-5 to improve student performance in mathematics.

Responsible

Maria Hardwick (mjones4@dadeschools.net)

During phase 5 of implementation, January 31-April 29, Teachers will plan for remediation and enrichment of standards based on topic and ongoing progress monitoring data.

Person

Responsible

### #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: According to 2020-2021 data, 37% of students in grade 3 and 50% of students in grade 5 were proficient on the Florida statewide assessment. According to the 2021-2022 SAT-10 data, 43% of students in K-2 scored above the median. Based on the 2020-2021 iReady AP3 Diagnostic Reports, 47% of students in grade 2 were reading on grade level. Based on the data review, our school will implement Differentiated Instruction. We selected the overarching area of Differentiated Instruction based on our findings that demonstrated ELA learning gains decreased. We are not meeting the unique needs of all learners therefore it is evident that we must improve our ability to utilize instructional strategies to address the individual needs of students.

Measurable Outcome:

Monitoring:

If we successfully implement Differentiated Instruction, then our students will increase by a minimum of 10 percentage points in ELA as evidenced by the 2022 State Assessments.

Teachers will review data biweekly and adjust groups to reflect current data. Administrators will review biweekly lesson plans for indication of differentiated instruction. Data Analysis of formative assessments of all students will be reviewed monthly to observe progress.

Teachers will create a tracker to monitor OPM data on a biweekly basis.

Person responsible

for Maria Hardwick (mjones4@dadeschools.net)

monitoring outcome:

Evidence-

based

Within Differentiated Instruction, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of: Data Driven Instruction. Data Driven Instruction will assist in accelerating the learning gains of our students. Data Driven instruction will be monitored through the use of data trackers to drive instructional planning and data driven conversations to include OPMs.

Rationale

Strategy:

for Data Driven Instruction will ensure that teachers are using relevant, recent, and aligned data to plan lessons that are customized to student needs. Teachers will continually make adjustments to their instructional delivery as new data becomes available.

Strategy:

### **Action Steps to Implement**

During phase 2 of implementation, August 30- October 11, teachers, transformation coaches, and administrators will analyze data to determine a standard focus for differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible

Maria Hardwick (mjones4@dadeschools.net)

During phase 2 of implementation, August 30- October 11, teachers will utilize DI folders for students that includes standards-based trackers and ongoing progress monitoring.

Person Responsible

Maria Hardwick (mjones4@dadeschools.net)

During phase 2 of implementation, August 30- October 11, Teachers will Implement standards-based bell ringers to reinforce standards.

Person Responsible

Maria Hardwick (mjones4@dadeschools.net)

During phase 2 of implementation, August 30- October 11, There will be an implementation of ongoing progress monitoring to ensure standards proficiency for English Language Arts.

Person Responsible

During phase 3 of implementation, November 1- December 17, teachers will analyze DI standards-based trackers and ongoing progress monitoring data during collaborative planning to monitor student performance.

Person

Responsible

Maria Hardwick (mjones4@dadeschools.net)

During phase 3 of implementation, November 1- December 17, teachers will plan effectively for both TLC Centers by aligning appropriate resources to ensure that instruction addresses the needs of learners.

Person

Maria Hardwick (mjones4@dadeschools.net) Responsible

During phase 5 of implementation January 31-April 29, Teachers will utilize goal setting documents and Biweekly assessment data to conduct "progress monitoring" data chats with all Tier II and Tier III students.

Person

Maria Hardwick (mjones4@dadeschools.net) Responsible

During phase 5 of implementation January 31-April 29, Teachers will utilize goal setting documents and assessment data to conduct "progress monitoring" data chats with all Tier II and Tier III parents.

Person Responsible

### #3. Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Based on qualitative data from the School Climate survey and the SIP survey and review of the Core Leadership Competencies, we want to use the Targeted Element of Leadership Development. Teachers in the building didn't feel that they had any voice in the decision-making process, therefore we want to develop teacher leaders by involving them in school-wide initiatives and ensuring they are informed and feel as though they have membership to the school environment. By involving them in school-wide initiatives and allowing them the opportunity to further their learning, student success is positively impacted.

### Measurable Outcome:

If we successfully implement the Targeted Element of Leadership Development, our teachers will be provided the opportunity to contribute to school-wide decisions through committee meetings. This will be realized through teachers participating in the logistical elements of meetings, presenting ideas to solve issues that arise, etc. The percentage of teachers in leadership roles will increase by at least 5% during the 2021-2022 school year.

The Leadership Team will identify specific staff members that are experts in areas that will serve as leads 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 and leadership team meetings.

# Person responsible

Monitoring:

for monitoring outcome:

Brittani Mandrell (brmandrell@dadeschools.net)

Evidencebased Strategy: Within the Targeted Element of Leadership Development, we will focus on the evidence-based strategy of: Involving Staff in Important Decisions. By creating multiple committees and involving teachers in the decision making process, we hope to increase the feeling of shared leadership. Experts in the building will provide a summary of support to the Leadership Team on a monthly basis to ensure we are on the right track to meeting the outcome above.

### Rationale

for Evidencebased Strategy: Involving Staff will assist in integrating the talents of teachers within the building to carry out the vision and the mission of the school. Throughout this process the Leadership Team will create buy in and bring creative and innovative solutions to the forefront.

### **Action Steps to Implement**

During phase 2 of implementation, August 30- October 11, Transformation Coaches will attend monthly professional developments to build coaching capacity.

### Person Responsible

Brittani Mandrell (brmandrell@dadeschools.net)

During phase 2 of implementation, August 30- October 11, Leadership Team Members will receive opportunities to collaborate and participate in the decision-making to improve the school.

### Person Responsible

Brittani Mandrell (brmandrell@dadeschools.net)

During phase 2 of implementation, August 30- October 11, Teacher Leaders will mentor rookie teachers as outlined by the MINT program.

### Person Responsible

Brittani Mandrell (brmandrell@dadeschools.net)

During phase 2 of implementation, August 30- October 11, Teachers will participate in in-services, webinars, and professional development to build their capacity.

Person Responsible

Brittani Mandrell (brmandrell@dadeschools.net)

During phase 3 of implementation, November 1- December 17, transformation coaches will incorporate the coaching teacher cycle to provide additional support to new teachers.

Person Responsible

Brittani Mandrell (brmandrell@dadeschools.net)

During phase 3 of implementation, November 1- December 17, Teacher leaders will have the opportunity to share best practices to improve instructional delivery through peer observation and collaborative planning.

Person

Responsible

Brittani Mandrell (brmandrell@dadeschools.net)

During phase 5 of implementation, January 31-April 29, Transformation Coaches will regularly give positive and negative feedback to teachers on specific practices/strategies.

Person

Responsible

Brittani Mandrell (brmandrell@dadeschools.net)

During phase 5 of implementation, January 31-April 29, Administrators will promote and highlight effective practices during faculty meetings.

Person

Responsible

Brittani Mandrell (brmandrell@dadeschools.net)

### #4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the data review, our school will implement the Targeted Element of Student Attendance. Through our data review, 29% of our students' attendance fell below 90%. Students who struggle with daily attendance are also the students who are not meeting expectations for learning gains as well as proficiency. We recognize the need to tailor our attendance initiatives and improve in making connections with families and the community to ensure attendance is consistently high.

# Measurable Outcome:

If we successfully implement the Targeted Element of Student Attendance, our students will receive quality instruction that will contribute to improved student outcomes. With consistent student incentives, our attendance will increase 6 percentage points by June 2022.

The Leadership Team and Counselor will work to connect with families who struggle with attendance identify the root cause for absences and create a plan of action to ensure students are able to be present daily. The Counselor will mentor individual students who have consistent truancy and connect with them bi-weekly to reward or encourage attendance efforts. The Leadership Team will plan regular student incentives to promote consistent student attendance. Teachers will monitor their daily attendance and submit that data to the Counselor on a monthly basis with an emphasis on attendance trends. To ensure we are on track to meeting the outcome above, this data will be discussed during data chats with all stakeholders.

Teachers and students and parental contact will be made when necessary.

Person responsible

Monitoring:

for monitoring outcome:

Brittani Mandrell (brmandrell@dadeschools.net)

Evidencebased Strategy: Within the Targeted Element of Student Attendance, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of: Attendance Initiatives. Attendance Initiatives will assist in narrowing the absence gap amongst our students. Student absences will be monitored on a monthly basis to prevent a pattern of excessive absences.

Rationale

for Evidencebased Strategy: Attendance Initiatives will assist in decreasing the number of student absences. The initiatives will provide the Leadership Team with a systematic approach to identify attendance issues, remediation, and rewards.

### **Action Steps to Implement**

During phase 2 of implementation, August 30- October 11, Students with excessive absences will receive small group counseling and instruction by the counselor to decrease learning loss.

Person Responsible

Brittani Mandrell (brmandrell@dadeschools.net)

During phase 2 of implementation, August 30- October 11, The counselor will track and monitor student attendance weekly.

Person Responsible

Brittani Mandrell (brmandrell@dadeschools.net)

During phase 2 of implementation, August 30- October 11, The Attendance Review Committee will conduct meetings to provide assistance to parents on improving student attendance.

Person

Responsible Brittani

Brittani Mandrell (brmandrell@dadeschools.net)

During phase 2 of implementation, August 30- October 11, Parents will receive daily messenger calls to notify parents of students' absences.

Person

Responsible

Brittani Mandrell (brmandrell@dadeschools.net)

During phase 3 of implementation, November 1- December 17, The counselor will submit truancy referrals for students who have 15 unexcused absences within 90 calendar days.

Person

Responsible

Brittani Mandrell (brmandrell@dadeschools.net)

On November 19, students who had perfect attendance for the first marking period will be recognized through awards and incentives.

Person

Responsible

Brittani Mandrell (brmandrell@dadeschools.net)

During phase 5 of implementation, January 31-April 29, Crestview will collaborate with The Parent Academy to schedule workshops and receive assistance with family engagement related to student attendance

Person

Responsible

Brittani Mandrell (brmandrell@dadeschools.net)

By February 18, 2022, Students who have 15 unexcused absences within 90 calendar days will be referred to the iAttend Intensive Intervention i3 Program to provide intensive attendance strategies that consist of deliberate and distinctive wraparound services to support students and families with removing barriers that impede regular school attendance.

Person

Responsible

Brittani Mandrell (brmandrell@dadeschools.net)

### **Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

In the 2019-2020 School year, Crestview reported 1.2 incidents per 100 students. When compared to all elementary schools statewide, Crestview falls into the high category ranked 1,052 out of 1,395. Crestview will implement a schoolwide positive behavior plan that implements character education and core values.

### **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 is our commitment to students and our ability to focus on sustainable results. Our school creates experiences throughout the year to engage students with meaningful opportunities for learning. Students are supported through character education and weekly counseling. Staff are provided opportunities to take part in Team-Building protocols where camaraderie is built among the staff. We provide opportunities for both staff and students to provide ongoing feedback and suggestions to school leaders and we schedule informal conferences with staff and students to garner information about their educational experience at our school. We also ensure information is provided to faculty through a weekly newsletter and our Teams page for staff and channels set up by department to connect with one another consistently. We continue to build our skill-set in ensuring our classrooms are highly engaging and foster the highest level of engagement and learning.

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

The stakeholders involved in building positive school culture and environment are the Principal, Assistant Principal, Instructional Coaches, Teacher Leaders, and Counselors (our School Leadership Team). The Principal's role is to monitor and oversee all the school's initiatives and respond to concerns with morale by planning Team-building and morale-boosting activities. The Assistant Principal will monitor programs with student services and assist in ensuring all information is shared with stakeholders in a timely manner. Teacher leaders and instructional coaches will assist in providing and responding to feedback from stakeholders. All stakeholders are responsible for making specific efforts to connect and build 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: Standards-aligned Instruction | \$0.00 |
|---|--------|---|--------|
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA                           | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Leadership: Leadership Development                    | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance             | \$0.00 |

Total:

\$0.00