Mater Academy Lakes Middle School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Mater Academy Lakes Middle School

17300 NW 87TH AVE, Hialeah, FL 33015

www.materlakes.org

Demographics

Principal: Marjorie Enriquez   Start Date for this Principal: 8/22/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	78%
2021-22 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 Hispanic Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (59%) 2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	[LaShawn Russ-Porterfield](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

School Board Approval

N/A

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

Mater Academy Lakes Middle School

17300 NW 87TH AVE, Hialeah, FL 33015

www.materlakes.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	78%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	98%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		A	A

School Board Approval

N/A

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.

Mater Lakes Academy Middle School, with immeasurable expectations for success in the classroom, in the community, and for the future, partners with teachers, administrators and staff, to create a challenging curriculum, moral values, loyalty and teamwork for a community of learners who are the successful leaders of tomorrow and epitomize the characteristics of truth, honor, and change.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Mater Lakes Academy will be a campus where students learn from teachers who are passionate about their subjects and consider it a privilege to pass knowledge to the minds of our students.

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Rovirosa, Rene	Principal	
Enriquez, Marjorie	Principal	
Gonzalez, Adriana	Teacher, ESE	
Kemper, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	
Aleman, Zahilys	Administrative Support	
Rodriguez, Barbara	Reading Coach	
Paez, Jennifer	Administrative Support	
Burgos, Steven	Administrative Support	
Gil, Melissa	Administrative Support	
Martinez , Alice	Assistant Principal	
Mansfield, Joanna	Teacher, Career/Technical	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 8/22/2022, Marjorie Enriquez

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

49

Total number of students enrolled at the school

887

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

6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	298	270	325	0	0	0	0	893
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	8
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	10	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	34	62	0	0	0	0	129
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	48	49	0	0	0	0	132
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/22/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	297	272	326	0	0	0	0	895
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	8
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	9	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	9	10	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	20	16	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	34	28	0	0	0	0	85
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	25	22	0	0	0	0	70
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	151	91	119	0	0	0	0	361

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	28	30	50	0	0	0	135

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	297	272	326	0	0	0	0	895
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	8
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	9	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	9	10	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	20	16	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	34	28	0	0	0	0	85
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	25	22	0	0	0	0	70
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	151	91	119	0	0	0	0	361

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	28	30	50	0	0	0	135

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	63%	55%	50%				73%	58%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	51%						66%	58%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33%						58%	52%	47%
Math Achievement	66%	43%	36%				79%	58%	58%
Math Learning Gains	65%						68%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62%						52%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	53%	54%	53%				58%	52%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	79%	64%	58%				81%	74%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	73%	58%	15%	54%	19%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	69%	56%	13%	52%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
08	2022					
	2019	73%	60%	13%	56%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	79%	58%	21%	55%	24%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	71%	53%	18%	54%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
08	2022					
	2019	72%	40%	32%	46%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	42%	43%	-1%	48%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	90%	68%	22%	67%	23%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	79%	73%	6%	71%	8%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	93%	63%	30%	61%	32%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	96%	54%	42%	57%	39%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	32	39	30	38	56	60	10	47			
ELL	41	41	32	50	58	54	20	66	35		
HSP	63	51	33	66	65	62	52	80	55		
WHT	59	56		76	81			50			
FRL	60	50	33	63	63	59	50	77	48		

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	28	22	9	28	29	29	18	40			
ELL	53	51	39	48	29	35	41	73	40		
HSP	67	50	35	61	31	35	53	83	52		
WHT	59	35		69	38						
FRL	64	49	33	58	30	34	50	81	50		

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	35	53	30	48	58	50	31				
ELL	57	67	57	67	61	44	33	70	21		
BLK	43	36		64	71						
HSP	73	67	58	79	68	52	58	81	59		
WHT	89	76		94	82						
FRL	71	65	57	77	67	53	56	80	56		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	92
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	619
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0

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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	62
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	64
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	60
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

The Emerging trends include a reduced percentage in progress in the ELA Lowest 25% achievement where we decreased from 34% to 33% . Additionally, the ELA achievement also decreased from 67% to 63% this year.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Some data components showing the lowest performance for the 2022 school year include ELA overall achievement, dropping from a 67% proficiency to 63% as well as low performance in the ELA Lowest 25% going from 34% to 33%. Contributing factors may have been due to teacher turnover during the school year, in addition to our struggling learners in subgroups (BLK, ELL & SWD).

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

Contributing factors to this need for improvement include increased number of ELL learners new to the school and curriculum. New actions will include increased number of classes offered to ELL students as well as tutoring, push in and pull out.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Components that showed the most improvement was in Math learning gains, with an increase now leading by 66% as well as the Math Lowest 25% going from 33% to 66 %. These improvements are mainly attributed to the schools use of data to provide and differentiate instruction to meet the diverse needs of our students. The implementation of our tutoring program which is offered before and after school, in addition to software such as iReady and Math XL.

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

The contributing factors to this Increased improvement includes home learning and online resources were provided for those students who required extra practice. Before and after school tutoring was available school wide in all accountability groups.

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

Increased Math program exposure, integration and resources both online and face-to-face Hands on experiments and data analysis Increased tutoring opportunities before and after school

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

Professional development intended to provide support will include ELA, and BEST Standards professional development focusing on increased critical thinking and accessibility of programs both online and in person (classroom). BEST Standard Strategies will include learner focus, reluctant reader encouragement, and problem solving/critical thinking in ELA and ELL programs alike.

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

Additional services for sustainability will include ESE Director, ESOL, and Department Leaders who construct assistance programs and RTI opportunities to improve learning and achievement. Literacy interventions and tutoring will also be infused.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	The area of focus is ELA and ELA lowest 25% .The Utilization of data at the classroom level is imperative to increasing student achievement as it is ever changing. Teachers will acquire in-depth knowledge of the process in order for them to be able to guide and aid students in making progress towards BEST standards mastery. Students need to be made aware of areas for growth, and held accountable for their progress as they are a crucial component to increasing their proficiency level. The focus will expand as well tot he Lowest 25% as they scored a limited percentage gain of 33% and should be included in the achievement increase goal.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The intended outcome is to meet the needs of Mater Lakes students by utilizing the BEST Standards and strategies that will serve the purpose of providing additional enrichment to students working below grade-level, or having difficulties on specific grade-level benchmarks in Reading. Students will benefit from being in a small group setting where their specific needs can be met. We expect learning scores in ELA to increase to at least 68% and the lowest 25% to increase to 38% .
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	We expect teachers, tutors and department chairs will provide input at grade-level department meetings to review notes with team leaders for the purposes of targeting students that continue to struggle with grade-level text. Finally, the administrative team will monitor the data results on a monthly basis to support teachers with students who are not making adequate progress. Finally, the ESOL department chair will meet with teachers on a quarterly basis to discuss strategies and growth of the lowest 25% in ELA and ESOL in order to increase learner achievement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marjorie Enriquez (enriquezmar@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being	Some of the intervention strategies that will be employed by Mater Lakes Academy to improve the academic performance in the area of reading/ELA for our bottom 25% category will consist of our push-in/pullout tutoring sessions, research based/computer based learning programs (IReady/MHM/Noredink.com), as well as applying differentiated Instruction in all classrooms (Monitored by Curriculum Instructors). Furthermore, administrators and teachers alike will be provided increased professional development opportunities through workshops, PLCs, lesson studies, and other technology based programs to acquire effective techniques to incorporate during all reading content areas.

implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The basis for the strategies include researched-based strategies such as differentiated instruction and computer-based learning programs, have proven to be effective tools in the enhancement of student learning. Moreover, research shows that evidence-based teaching strategies are likely to have the largest impact on student results. Therefore, in an effort to monitor the effectiveness of the action plan, quarterly assessment, diagnostic assessments from iReady reading, mid-year baselines, will indicate student progress throughout the school year. In essence, this will provide useful insight as to the enhancement of instruction. Also, teachers will provide input at grade-level department meetings to review notes with team leaders for the purposes of targeting students that continue to struggle with grade-level text. Finally, the administrative team will monitor the data results on a monthly basis to support teachers with students who are not making adequate progress.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Identify Struggling learners in ELA and ELL as well as Lowest 25% (levels 1-2)
2. Provide Push-in and Pull-out tutoring
3. Monitor data and progress monitoring results via data assessments
4. Infuse classroom opportunities for differentiated instruction
5. Increase Leadership team reviews and observations
6. Increase PD and workshop opportunities

Person Responsible   Marjorie Enriquez (enriquezmar@dadeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Data and participation results from the new DLI system for professional development was identified as an area of focus. New teachers and those with less than 5 years experience should take advantage of the PDs available in order to improve classroom management, discipline, professionalism, BEST Strategies and other such abilities and skills. Educators will be help responsible for areas of professional growth and held accountable for their progress as part of their professional responsibilities.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	We expect Reading, Language Arts and Social Studies teacher participation in professional development to increase by 10% in the 22-23 school year. The intended outcome is to meet the needs of Mater Lakes educators by utilizing the strategies that will serve the purpose of providing additional enrichment and PDs in select subject areas. Educators will benefit from professional and academic settings where their specific needs can be met.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The best way to monito desired outcomes is to focus on registration, participation, evaluation and infusion of PD objectives as practiced in the classroom as evidenced by observations and walkthroughs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marjorie Enriquez (enriquezmar@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being	Increased availability of PDs such as BEST Standards Workshops, Discipline and Management, Professionalism and others will encourage such strategies as the infusion of differentiated instruction, centers and cooperative learning in most subject area classrooms. Learners such as ELA and ELL will benefit from educators who have been exposed to professional trainings that will ensure increased achievement.

implemented for this Area of Focus.	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Some of the researched-based strategies such as differentiated instruction and computer-based/online learning programs, have proven to be effective tools in the enhancement of educator training. Moreover, research shows that evidence-based teaching strategies are likely to have the largest impact on student results if the educators are up to date on the latest skills and curriculum practices. Therefore, in an effort to monitor the effectiveness of the action plan, quarterly evaluations, mid-year evaluations, professional development opportunities in house will indicate an increase in educator training throughout the school year. In essence, this will provide useful insight as to the enhancement of instruction. Also, administrators and department chairs will provide mentorship and one-on-one meetings with beginning teachers and those with less than 5 years experience to facilitate schedules and identify areas of need.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Conduct a needs assessment for professional development needs
2. Create opportunities for necessary PDs for select teachers
3. Monitor educator implementation of PD materials and resources
4. Asses learner achievement as it relates to educator training

Person Responsible [no one identified]

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

NA

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

NA

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

NA

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

NA

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

NA

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

NA

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

NA

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring

NA

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

As a school, we will establish a fluent and open line of communication through EESAC meetings, the school website, school messenger, teacher phone calls/e-mails, social media, and other school meetings keep families informed of academic performance, community events, and parental involvement opportunities. The activities director supports the motivational and incentive programs at the school through organized school events in which the community stakeholders may also participate. School-based clubs and organizations promote their
interests and strengthen relationships within the community. Communication is vital between all parties involved in our students' educational process.

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

Stakeholders and Individuals such as the activities director, Ana Sanchez, play a significant role in promoting communication among the parents, students and the faculty and staff. Zee Aleman is also a prime example of a parent and community liaison as she is the EESAC coordinator along with Ms. Jennifer Paez who is in charge of TITLE 1. These individuals as well as the administrators who post news and events online and via school announcements aid in the communication process which leads to a heathy and effective culture and environment. Connect-Ed also serves to improve the stakeholder communication and involvement in our school and culture.