

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# Earlington Heights Elementary School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>13</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# Earlington Heights Elementary School

4750 NW 22ND AVE, Miami, FL 33142

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Jackson Nicolas**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/15/2016

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: A (63%)<br>2018-19: D (40%)<br>2017-18: A (62%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | N/A  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |  |

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>13</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

## Earlington Heights Elementary School

4750 NW 22ND AVE, Miami, FL 33142

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

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | Yes                    | 100%   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 99%  |

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

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

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

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

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement.

The staff, parents, and community of Earlington Heights Elementary School believe all students have the right and ability to learn. We are committed to providing a solid educational foundation for our students so they may achieve their highest academic potential, while maintaining steady, positive growth.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

All stakeholders of Earlington Heights Elementary School envision a learning environment that nurtures and encourages students to achieve their full potential as life-long learners who become productive citizens and leaders.

### 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  |
|---------------------|---------------------|--|
| Nicolas, Jackson    | Principal           | As the school's principal, Mr. Nicolas provides a mission and shapes a vision for academic success for all students. Data is utilized to drive decision-making, cultivate leadership in others, and provide the appropriate curriculum offerings. Mr. Nicolas establishes high expectations for all students and ensures that the school-based team is implementing a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS). |
| Cathey, Isahuri     | Assistant Principal | As the assistant principal, Ms. Cathey works in collaboration with the principal in implementing the vision and mission for the school. Ms. Cathey ensures fidelity of the MTSS monitoring by evaluating the following: instructional staff's implementation of tiered instruction, process of administering assessments, and the alignment of professional development with faculty needs.                  |
| Ramontal, Shahllynn | Reading Coach       | As the reading coach, Ms. Ramontal provides direct instructional services related to improving and supporting classroom instruction. Ms. Ramontal utilizes the coaching model to support teachers in effective evidenced-based instructional strategies that will improve students' academic success.  |
| Nelson, Darby       | Teacher, K-12       | As a teacher, Ms. Nelson provides direct instructional services related to improving and supporting classroom instruction. Ms. Nelson utilizes engagement strategies to support teachers and students in effective evidence-based instructional strategies that will improve students' academic success.   |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Wednesday 6/15/2016, Jackson Nicolas

**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.*

4

**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.*

5

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

14

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

321

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

3

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

3

**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                              | 52          | 55 | 51 | 60 | 51 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 321   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 14 | 9  | 10 | 6  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 41    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 2  | 6  | 14 | 5  | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 32    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 1  | 1  | 6  | 3  | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 17    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 13 | 11 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 37    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 9  | 5  | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 24    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 3  | 15 | 23 | 16 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 72    |

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           | 2 | 5 | 18 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 42    |

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           | 5 | 10 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 28    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0  | 1  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/7/2022

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                              | 23          | 37 | 49 | 57 | 37 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 260   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 9           | 13 | 9  | 22 | 11 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 96    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 1  | 7  | 5  | 4  | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 23    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 1  | 6  | 4  | 5  | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 27    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6     |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 7           | 11 | 32 | 37 | 14 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 121   |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 2           | 3 | 7 | 9 | 6 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 45    |

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     | 7           | 5 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 26    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |

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                              | 23          | 37 | 49 | 57 | 37 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 260   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 9           | 13 | 9  | 22 | 11 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 96    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 1  | 7  | 5  | 4  | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 23    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 1  | 6  | 4  | 5  | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 27    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6     |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 7           | 11 | 32 | 37 | 14 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 121   |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 2           | 3 | 7 | 9 | 6 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 45    |

#### 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     | 7           | 5 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 26    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |

## 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             | 48%    | 62%      | 56%   |        |          |       | 41%    | 62%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 59%    |          |       |        |          |       | 41%    | 62%      | 58%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 62%    |          |       |        |          |       | 46%    | 58%      | 53%   |
| Math Achievement            | 72%    | 58%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 52%    | 69%      | 63%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 81%    |          |       |        |          |       | 40%    | 66%      | 62%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 73%    |          |       |        |          |       | 41%    | 55%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 43%    | 64%      | 59%   |        |          |       | 18%    | 55%      | 53%   |

### 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 |
| 01                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 02                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 03                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 49%    | 60%      | -11%                       | 58%   | -9%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 41%    | 64%      | -23%                       | 58%   | -17%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -49%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 31%    | 60%      | -29%                       | 56%   | -25%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -41%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 02                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 03                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 63%    | 67%      | -4%                        | 62%   | 1%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 59%    | 69%      | -10%                       | 64%   | -5%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -63%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 35%    | 65%      | -30%                       | 60%   | -25%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -59%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 21%    | 53%      | -32%                       | 53%   | -32%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

### 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                                       | 46       | 62     | 75          | 66        | 80      | 70           | 35       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 44       | 56     |             | 68        | 75      |              | 33       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 46       | 59     | 67          | 73        | 81      | 69           | 49       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 51       | 62     |             | 69        | 81      |              | 33       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 48       | 61     | 65          | 73        | 82      | 76           | 43       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 26       | 44     | 55          | 49        | 78      |              | 38       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 44       | 42     |             | 70        | 62      |              | 67       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 40       | 33     | 50          | 51        | 44      | 50           | 20       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 44       | 39     |             | 61        | 58      |              | 56       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 40       | 34     | 47          | 53        | 49      | 60           | 31       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 17       | 26     | 41          | 38        | 21      |              | 6        |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 57       | 58     |             | 67        | 58      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 37       | 38     | 41          | 47        | 38      | 40           | 13       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 51       | 51     | 60          | 63        | 47      |              | 38       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 41       | 41     | 46          | 52        | 40      | 41           | 18       |         |           |                   |                     |

### 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)  | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 62  |
| 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 | 60  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 498 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8   |
| Percent Tested  | 99% |
| Subgroup Data   |     |
| Students With Disabilities  |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 62  |

| Students With Disabilities   |     |
|--|-----|
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?             | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%      | 0   |
| English Language Learners  |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      | 56  |
| 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                                | 63  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 59  |
| 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   |     |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      | 0   |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 64  |
| 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?

Based on FSA Math Data there was evidence of high quality and explicit instruction in mathematics which enhanced our data in both proficiency and learning gains. In the 2021 school year, math proficiency was at 54%. This school year math increased to 72% proficient. There also is an upward trend in ELA Data within the 4th and 5th grades. Overall proficiency in 4th grade ELA was 53% and 60% in 5th Grade. We see tremendous learning gains within mathematics and ELA. Regarding ELA Data in the 2021 school year, we were at 41% proficient and increased this school year to 48% proficient. Although gains are evident there is still work that needs to be done. Moving forward we are going to continue to focus on our ESE students with ESE services with explicit instruction in ELA.

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

The following data components for 2021 data showed the greatest need for improvement when compared to the district average in ELA grades 3-5. A possible contributing factor is a lack of students' foundation skills. Being that students lacked foundational skills it impacted their ability to comprehend grade-level content. Although interventions were in place there was a lack of fidelity in implementation in 3rd grade specifically.

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

Based on our data we saw that our ELA ESE students were not doing as well as our math ESE students. In order to accelerate, we need to ensure that we are implementing the science of reading throughout all reading components of the day.

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

Based on data review for FSA, iReady, and Topic Assessments math has demonstrated the greatest growth. Math proficiency overall was 72%. 81% of students showed learning gains, and 73% of L25 students showed learning gains.

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

The use of explicit instruction in Mathematics by teachers during whole group and differentiated instruction were contributing factors to improving student proficiency and learning gains. The implementation of interventionist and ESE teachers during small group instruction were also a contributing factor in the success and improvement of mathematics overall data.

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

In order to accelerate learning,

- DI
- Job Embedded PD
- Peer observation
- Academic vocabulary instruction

**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 school will provide ongoing Professional Development during collaborative planning and PLC. This will continue throughout the duration of the school year. The following opportunities will be offered: Targeted instruction during DI, professional development during collaborative planning, and within professional learning communities that will focus on peer observation and academic vocabulary.

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

To ensure sustainability, the school will continue to monitor student attendance through homeroom tracking monitors and daily attendance bulletins. Professional learning communities will be established, and the collaboration will continue throughout the school year with various checkpoints to assess the fidelity and effectiveness of the professional learning community. Implement a progress monitoring system to track intervention and differentiated instruction.

**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 Standards-aligned Instruction****Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

According to the 2022 FSA proficiency data, 72% of students were proficient in math for grades 3-5. 42% of our 5th-grade students were proficient in FCAT science. We will focus on standard implementation to address the new B.E.S.T standards in math. We will focus on academic vocabulary to improve 2023 science data.

**Measurable****Outcome:**

**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

With the implementation of the B.E.S.T standards, we will maintain or improve our mathematics proficiency by 72% or higher. With the implementation of academic vocabulary instruction, we will improve FCAT science proficiency from 42% to 50%.

**Monitoring:**

**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

The leadership team will conduct monthly walkthroughs to provide feedback to teachers, monthly data chats, and adjust groups based on current data in real-time. Additionally, transformation coaches will provide weekly collaborative planning and coach-teacher collaborations. This data will be analyzed during leadership meetings to ensure students are demonstrating mastery of standards. Extended learning opportunities will be provided daily.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Isahuri Cathey (icathey@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Within the targeted element of standards-aligned instruction, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy: implementation of the B.E.S.T standards. B.E.S.T standards will assist in ensuring our proficiency will increase in the area of mathematics. Academic vocabulary instruction will be monitored through the use of interactive journals and topic assessment data.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Standard-aligned instruction will ensure teachers are implementing the new B.E.S.T standards and addressing academic vocabulary needs within science and mathematics. Based on our school's previous data, academic vocabulary has been a domain that our students struggle with. If we train teachers on the implementation of the new B.E.S.T standards and implement academic vocabulary by our teachers daily, then we will increase our overall data in ELA, math, and science.

**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.

8/22-10/11- Students in grade 5 science will create an academic binder that will include a section for vocabulary. The teacher will begin each topic with hands-on activities and then transition into instruction.

**Person Responsible** Isahuri Cathey (icathey@dadeschools.net)

8/22-10/11- During math planning teachers will plan for each topic with a focus on the vocabulary. Teachers will incorporate academic vocabulary during instruction and assess vocabulary during topic assessments.

**Person Responsible** Isahuri Cathey (icathey@dadeschools.net)

8/22-10/11-Teachers will attend professional developments provided by the district or ETO with a focus on B.E.S.T standards in reading and math.

**Person Responsible** Isahuri Cathey (icathey@dadeschools.net)

8/31-10/11-Teachers will incorporate manipulatives during the math "Digging In". The focus will be building students' academic vocabulary.

**Person Responsible** Isahuri Cathey (icathey@dadeschools.net)

10/31-12/16- Transformation Coach will plan, model, and monitor the expectations of the ETO Math framework.

**Person Responsible** Romano Vargas (ra\_vargas1@dadeschools.net)

10/31-12/16- Coach will continue to plan with teachers to ensure alignment of B.E.S.T standard limits and use of academic vocabulary.

**Person Responsible** Romano Vargas (ra\_vargas1@dadeschools.net)



**#2. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback/Walkthroughs****Area of Focus  
Description and****Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

The school leadership team will meet to discuss specific look-for aligned to our areas of focus for academic programs. Teachers will be provided with verbal and written feedback on instructional practices and provide support to teachers based on feedback or teacher requests.

**Measurable Outcome:  
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

If the administrative team provides consistent feedback on instructional practices and allows teachers the opportunities to collaborate with other teacher leaders, then our teachers will increase student engagement. In turn, this will increase academic assessment scores across grade levels. The percentage of teachers being provided feedback will increase by at least 20% for the 2022-2023 school year.

**Monitoring:**

**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

The leadership team will meet on a bi-weekly basis to discuss walkthrough notes and feedback provided to teachers. The team will create a system to follow up on feedback and support provided to teachers.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

**Evidence-based****Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

The evidence-based strategy we will be implementing will be specific teacher feedback/walkthroughs. In order to ensure the strategy, the feedback will be clear, precise, and specific to the observation.

**Rationale for  
Evidence-based  
Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

By creating a feedback/walkthrough system with all staff will allow staff members the opportunities to enhance their craft and have a clear vision of the school's overall goals.

**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.

8/22-During our Opening of Schools presentation, the administrative team will discuss the Areas of Focus for the school year and the school theme. Teachers will have a clear understanding of the reasoning behind the feedback that will be provided by the administration.

**Person Responsible** Isahuri Cathey (icathey@dadeschools.net)

8/22-10/14-Teachers will receive weekly walkthroughs and feedback will be provided to teachers verbally or by email.

**Person Responsible** Jackson Nicolas (pr1561@dadeschools.net)

8/22-10/14-During leadership team meetings, the principal and AP will provide the transformation coaches with feedback on coaching cycles and observations during walkthroughs.

**Person Responsible** Isahuri Cathey (icathey@dadeschools.net)

8/22-10/14-New teachers will receive written feedback and support during the first month of school. The teachers will be provided daily support by the transformation coach or interventionist. The administrative team will support new teachers and focus on small goals.

**Person Responsible** Isahuri Cathey (icathey@dadeschools.net)

10/31-12/16- Feedback will be provided to interventionists and support staff with a focus on fidelity to the frameworks provided.

**Person Responsible** Isahuri Cathey (icathey@dadeschools.net)

10/31-12/16- Walkthroughs with a focus on math framework and DI look-fors.

**Person Responsible** Jackson Nicolas (pr1561@dadeschools.net)

**#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Empower Teachers and Staff****Area of Focus  
Description and  
Rationale:****Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

According to the 2021-2022 School Climate Survey feedback from staff, 50% of staff members felt that staff morale could be improved, in comparison to the 2020-2021 26% School Climate Survey feedback, this indicates a decrease of 24 percentage points.

**Measurable  
Outcome:  
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

If we successfully implement Empower Teachers and Staff, our staff morale will increase by 10 percentage points in the 2022-2023 Climate survey by June 2022.

**Monitoring:  
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

A social committee (Sunshine Committee) will engage staff members in in-house activities and outside of school functions so that teachers can gather with one another and administrators to build bonds and strengthen interpersonal relationships. The Social Committee members will host events to brighten teachers' day and continue to pay it forward to other teachers. The Leadership Team will email a survey to collect ideas on new initiatives or collaborative engagements that staff members would like to incorporate into the new school year.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Darby Nelson (djnelson@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based  
Strategy:****Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Within the Area of Focus of Empower Teachers and Staff, we will focus on empowering teachers to ensure that our teachers and staff have a voice and can participate in the decision-making process.

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

Our team would like to empower teachers and staff members in our school by engaging them in the decision-making process. Allowing teachers and staff members to lead different initiatives will provide leadership opportunities for teachers/staff while also considering their input on what initiatives to implement.

**selecting this strategy.****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.

8/22-During the Opening of Schools Meeting, the Sunshine Committee presented the vision of the committee and activities that will take place throughout the year. Teachers were provided the opportunity to become members of the committee and meet the committee members.

**Person Responsible** Darby Nelson (djnelson@dadeschools.net)

8/22-The Sunshine Committee will send out an interest survey to get to know potential members. The survey includes DOB, favorite color, a favorite treat, etc.

**Person Responsible** Darby Nelson (djnelson@dadeschools.net)

8/22-10/11- The committee will plan a monthly event to engage members outside of the school building. Each session will include a team-building activity.

**Person Responsible** Darby Nelson (djnelson@dadeschools.net)

09/7/22-During our faculty interact and plan for upcoming team building activities. The team has scheduled a team-building activity for 9/9 and feedback will be solicited by staff.

**Person Responsible** Darby Nelson (djnelson@dadeschools.net)

10/31-12/16- Teachers will be spotlighted during faculty meetings to share best practices with all staff members and share best practices from district offered professional development.

**Person Responsible** Isahuri Cathey (icathey@dadeschools.net)

10/31-12/16 Peer observations will be conducted throughout the building to identify best practices for given subjects.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

10/31-12/16- Teachers will be spotlighted during faculty meetings to share best practices with all staff members and share best practices from district offered professional development.

**Person Responsible** Isahuri Cathey (icathey@dadeschools.net)

10/31-12/16 Peer observations will be conducted throughout the building to identify best practices for given subjects.

**Person Responsible** Isahuri Cathey (icathey@dadeschools.net)

**#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction****Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Based on ELA data, students in subgroups English Language Learner, Exceptional Students Education, and Black and African American students performed below 50% proficiency. Research proves that working in small groups and differentiating instruction can close achievement gaps, especially for students working below level. Small-group differentiated instruction can lead to student proficiency.

**Measurable****Outcome:**

**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

If teachers are explicit in their small group differentiated instruction, engaged in common planning and monitor students' data to reinforce and remediate instruction, students will show annual typical growth from iReady AP1 to iReady AP2.

**Monitoring:**

**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

Small group differentiated instruction will be monitored by using progress monitoring trackers found in student folders. Students will set a goal of 70% or higher on differentiated activities and record scores bi-weekly.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Shahllynn Ramontal (sramontal@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based****Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of small-group differentiated instruction. During the ELA block, teachers will deliver explicit small-group differentiated instruction with fidelity. Teachers will use differentiated research-based materials that have been proven to close achievement gaps.

**Rationale for Evidence-based****Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Small group differentiated instruction is a research-based instruction framework that has been proven to mitigate learning loss and increase students' academic achievement. With the implementation of small group differentiated instruction students will receive instruction at their instructional level rather than being presented material at their frustration level. Standard base pre/post-requisite level material will be utilized to address students' needs.

**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.

08/22-10/14 Teachers will take part in common planning to create small group differentiated materials (folders, manipulatives, etc) and trackers.

**Person Responsible** Shahllynn Ramontal (sramontal@dadeschools.net)

8/22-10/14 Reading Coaches acquire materials and meet with teachers weekly to determine the best materials to address student's needs based on past progress monitoring assessments and weekly benchmarks.

**Person Responsible** Shahllynn Ramontal (sramontal@dadeschools.net)

8/22- 10/14 Teachers will establish small groups within their classes to ensure routines and procedures are in place for differentiated instruction using a rotation chart or PowerPoint.

**Person Responsible** Isahuri Cathey (icathey@dadeschools.net)

8/22- 10/14 Reading coaches and teachers will use data from iReady AP1 to develop small groups based on students' needs and resources that align to students' individual needs.

**Person Responsible** Shahllynn Ramontal (sramontal@dadeschools.net)

10/31-12/16- Transformation Coaches will work on alignment of resources for DI groups using most current data to support proficiency.

**Person Responsible** Shahllynn Ramontal (sramontal@dadeschools.net)

10/31-12/16-Transformation coaches will work on monitoring and tracking small group differentiated instruction with the utilization of the school wide tracker.

**Person Responsible** Shahllynn Ramontal (sramontal@dadeschools.net)

## 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

The Area of Focus will be standard align instruction focused on implementation of the Florida B.E.S.T standards. This will affect student by building Phonemic awareness, phonological awareness, phonics, High Frequency Words, and vocabulary. Based on end of year screening and progress monitoring data (iready AP3) students in kindergarten through second grade scored below fifty percent in the areas of

Phonological Awareness, Phonics and High Frequency Words. These students are not on track to score a level three as they are labeled tier 2 and tier 3.

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

The Area of Focus will be standard align instruction focused on implementation of the B.E.S.T standard. This will affect students by building grade level comprehension which will enable 50% of students to score a level 3 or higher. Based on 2022 FSA data forty-eight percentage points were earned in the area of ELA achievement.

#### **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)**

Kindergarten students will score 50% or higher in the areas of phonological awareness and phonics. First grade students will score 50% or higher in the area of phonics. Second grade students will score 50% or higher in the area of vocabulary and sentence level comprehension.

#### **Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

Grade three students will score 40% proficiency on progress monitoring assessment three. Grade four students will score 50% proficiency on progress monitoring assessment.

#### **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.

Standard aligned instruction focused on implementing the B.E.S.T standards will be monitored through ongoing collaborative planning, the use of research based instruction material (Science of Reading), and the implementation of systems such as differentiated instruction, and interventions throughout the building.

#### **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Ramontal, Shahllynn, sramontal@dadeschools.net



**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. Â§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?

Evidence-based practices which will be utilized are data-driven small group differentiated instruction, Intervention (Reading Horizon)- which will address phonics deficiency , the use of coach teacher collaborations, and professional learning communities.

**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?

Reading Horizons Discovery and Elevate is a research based program that addresses phonemic awareness, phonics, High Frequency Words, and Fluency. McGraw Hill Wonder reading series is a reading program aligned to the BEST standards. Phonics for Reading is a research based program used to address foundational skills.

**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                 |
|---|---|
| Literacy coaches will ensure that all teachers are provided with a copy of the BEST standard handbook and the progressions of Stan.   | Floyd, Adriane,<br>adriane1@dadeschools.net       |
| Literacy Coaches will schedule and conduct collaborative planning sessions to ensure standard based aligned instruction is planned to ensure the B.E.S.T standards are implemented. | Ramontal, Shahllynn,<br>sramontal@dadeschools.net |
| All Interventionist will attend a refresher PD with our Transformation Coaches and discuss changes to framework and calendar.   | Ramontal, Shahllynn,<br>sramontal@dadeschools.net |
| Differentiated Instruction planning with be scheduled bi-weekly to align resources to student needs and to address defiant standards.   | Floyd, Adriane,<br>adriane1@dadeschools.net       |
| Transformation Coaches will work in collaborative planning to develop stacked DLT's and aligned DEPs  | Floyd, Adriane,<br>adriane1@dadeschools.net       |
| Transformation Coaches will train, model and monitor new enrichment program and tier 3 programs.  | Ramontal, Shahllynn,<br>sramontal@dadeschools.net |

### 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.

At Earlington Heights Elementary our theme this year is "Together...Growing Our Success." As a team, we will address creating a positive school culture by involving all stakeholders in regards to school improvement. That is the key to our school's success. In an effort to build a positive school culture and environment, all stakeholders are encouraged to attend our monthly EESAC (Educational Excellence School Advisory Council) meetings. During these meetings, stakeholders are apprised of all changes related to school academics and budgetary matters. Stakeholders have an opportunity to share their concerns or add any suggestions to the School Improvement Plan. Additionally, all stakeholders are invited to our Annual Title One meeting. During this time, stakeholders have an opportunity to give their input regarding the PFEP (Parent Family and Engagement Plan). This plan allows parents and guardians to see the various resources that will be used for student achievement. Also, through Title 1 our school offers Parent workshops to equip parents with community resources and address topics on social-emotional learning.

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

At Earlington Heights, our stakeholders are Ms.Nelson (kindergarten teacher), Ms. Wilson (1st-grade teacher), Mrs. Cathey (Assistant Principal), and Mr. Dixon (2nd-grade teacher/21st Century Lead). Our team will continue to engage all stakeholders including members of our EESAC in order to build positive school culture.