**Miami-Dade County Public Schools** 

# Miami Gardens Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

# **Table of Contents**

| School Demographics            | 3  |
|--------------------------------|----|
|                                |    |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
|                                |    |
| School Information             | 6  |
|                                |    |
| Needs Assessment               | 10 |
|                                |    |
| Planning for Improvement       | 14 |
|                                |    |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 0  |
| Duduel lo Suppoi i Goais       | U  |

# **Miami Gardens Elementary School**

4444 NW 195TH ST, Miami Gardens, FL 33055

http://mgardens.dadeschools.net/

### **Demographics**

## Principal: Kathleen John Louissant

Start Date for this Principal: 7/19/2015

| 2019-20 Status<br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
|---|--|
| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| 2021-22 Title I School  | Yes  |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)   | 100%   |
| 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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History   | 2021-22: B (57%)<br>2018-19: A (69%)<br>2017-18: A (62%)   |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info  | rmation*   |
| 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   | or more information, <u>click here</u> .   |

### **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:

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

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

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

### **Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

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

### **Table of Contents**

| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
|--------------------------------|----|
| School Information             | 6  |
| Needs Assessment               | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 14 |
| Title I Requirements           | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 0  |

Last Modified: 5/3/2024 https://www.floridacims.org Page 4 of 28

### **Miami Gardens Elementary School**

4444 NW 195TH ST, Miami Gardens, FL 33055

http://mgardens.dadeschools.net/

### **School Demographics**

| School Type and Gi<br>(per MSID |          | 2021-22 Title I School | l Disadvan | <b>Proposition 2 Economically taged (FRL) Rate</b> ted on Survey 3) |
|---------------------------------|----------|------------------------|------------|---|
| Elementary S<br>PK-5            | School   | Yes                    |            | 100%  |
| Primary Servio<br>(per MSID I   | • •      | Charter School         | (Reporte   | Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2)                             |
| K-12 General E                  | ducation | No                     |            | 96%   |
| School Grades Histo             | ry       |                        |            |   |
| Year                            | 2021-22  | 2020-21                | 2019-20    | 2018-19   |
| Grade                           | В        |                        | Α          | А   |

### **School Board Approval**

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

### **SIP Authority**

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

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

### **Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

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

### **Part I: School Information**

### **School Mission and Vision**

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

Miami Gardens Elementary School will achieve educational excellence within a safe learning environment that is staffed by highly motivated and qualified teachers.

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

Miami Gardens Elementary enriches its "community of learners" by conveying an atmosphere of high academic standards, respect for cultural diversity and individual difference.

### 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<br>Title               | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| John<br>Louissaint,<br>Kathleen | Principal                       | The role of the Principal is to ensure that all students are provided with a safe learning environment where relevant and rigourous academics are taking place. Additionally, the Principal also ensures that the staff is empowered and engaged in highly effective practices.  |
| Key, Natre                      | Instructional<br>Coach          | The Instructional Coach is responsible for collaborating with teachers and Leadership Team members for the purpose of providing teachers with strategies, best practices, and professional development in the area of English Langauge Arts. The instructional coach also provides mentoring opportunties for novice teachers, and assists with statewide assessments and data analysis. |
| Hall,<br>Shequilla              | School<br>Counselor             | The Guidance Counselor will assist the teachers with Socio-Emotional Learning (SEL) strategies, participate in the Multi-Tier Support System (MTSS) Team for the purpose of ensuring students are receiving adequate interventions, and communicate with parents to inform them of programs and student progress.  |
| Fernandez,<br>Meiby             | Teacher,<br>K-12                | The teacher will assist the Leadership Team with academic programs as they pertain to Writing and English Language Arts. She will collaborate with the Instructional Coach to ensure that best practices are being shared during faculty meetings, and strategies are being implemented with fidelity.   |
| Gonzalez,<br>Susan              | ELL<br>Compliance<br>Specialist | The ELL Compliance Specialist will assist the Leadership Team in ensuring that all English Language Learner (ELL) students receive instruction according to their ESOL level. She will provide teachers with strategies to use in class, and monitor student progress.   |
| Orr,<br>Guissela                | Teacher,<br>K-12                | The teacher will assist the Leadership Team with academic programs as they pertain to Mathematics and Science. She will collaborate with the Instructional Coach to ensure that best practices are being shared during faculty meetings, and strategies are being implemented with fidelity.   |
| Liguez,<br>Jessica              | Instructional<br>Coach          | The Instructional Coach is responsible for collaborating with teachers and Leadership Team members for the purpose of providing teachers with strategies, best practices, and professional development in the area of English Langauge Arts. The instructional coach also provides mentoring opportunties for novice teachers, and assists with statewide assessments and data analysis. |
|                                 | Assistant<br>Principal          | The role of the Assistant Principal is to support the Principal in ensuring that all students are provided with a safe learning environment where relevant and rigourous academics are taking place. Additionally, the Assistant Principal also ensures that the staff is empowered and engaged in highly effective practices.   |

### **Demographic Information**

#### Principal start date

Sunday 7/19/2015, Kathleen John Louissant

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.

13

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

18

Total number of students enrolled at the school

203

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

0

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

**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 |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |
|--|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator   | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 41          | 32 | 40 | 38 | 23 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 208   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 6  | 10 | 7  | 3  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 29    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 1  | 2  | 4  | 2  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 1  | 5  | 5  | 7  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 21    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 4  | 4  | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 15    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 4  | 2  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 1  | 6  | 8  | 5  | 8  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 28    |

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                            |   |   |   |   |   | Gr | ade | e Le | vel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                            | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6   | 7    | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 4  | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 20    |

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

| Indicator                           |   |   |   |   |   | Gr | ade | e Le | ve |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator                           | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6   | 7    | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 1  | 0   | 0    | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 0   | 0    | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |

### Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/26/2022

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

| Grade Level  |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   | Total |    |    |       |
|--|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|-------|----|----|-------|
| indicator  | K  | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10    | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 20 | 31 | 32 | 28 | 26 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     | 0  | 0  | 182   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 6  | 8  | 9  | 10 | 2  | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     | 0  | 0  | 45    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0  | 1  | 3  | 6  | 4  | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     | 0  | 0  | 25    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0  | 2  | 2  | 6  | 6  | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     | 0  | 0  | 29    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 1  | 4  | 12 | 15 | 4  | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     | 0  | 0  | 51    |

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

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

### The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           |   |   |   |   |   | Gr | ade | e Le | vel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                           | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6   | 7    | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 2 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0  | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |

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

| In dia stan  | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    | Total |    |       |
|--|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|-------|----|-------|
| Indicator  | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11    | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 20          | 31 | 32 | 28 | 26 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 182   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 6           | 8  | 9  | 10 | 2  | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 45    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 1  | 3  | 6  | 4  | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 25    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 2  | 2  | 6  | 6  | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 29    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 3     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 3     |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 1           | 4  | 12 | 15 | 4  | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 51    |

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

| Indicator                            |   | Grade Level |   |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |       |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-------|
| indicator                            | K | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12    | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 2 | 3           | 3 | 8 | 3 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 29    |

### The number of students identified as retainees:

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

# 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).

| Sahaal Grada Component      |        | 2022     |       |        | 2021     |       | 2019   |          |       |  |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--|
| School Grade Component      | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |  |
| ELA Achievement             | 54%    | 62%      | 56%   |        |          |       | 59%    | 62%      | 57%   |  |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 54%    |          |       |        |          |       | 73%    | 62%      | 58%   |  |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 44%    |          |       |        |          |       | 74%    | 58%      | 53%   |  |
| Math Achievement            | 62%    | 58%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 75%    | 69%      | 63%   |  |
| Math Learning Gains         | 74%    |          |       |        |          |       | 73%    | 66%      | 62%   |  |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 59%    |          |       |        |          |       | 71%    | 55%      | 51%   |  |
| Science Achievement         | 55%    | 64%      | 59%   |        |          |       | 56%    | 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-<br>District<br>Comparison | State    | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 01        | 2022              |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|           | 2019              |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
| Cohort Co | mparison          |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
| 02        | 2022              |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|           | 2019              |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
| Cohort Co | Cohort Comparison |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
| 03        | 2022              |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|           | 2019              | 49%    | 60%      | -11%                              | 58%      | -9%                            |
| Cohort Co | mparison          | 0%     |          |                                   |          |                                |
| 04        | 2022              |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|           | 2019              | 60%    | 64%      | -4%                               | 58%      | 2%                             |
| Cohort Co | Cohort Comparison |        |          |                                   | <u>'</u> |                                |
| 05        | 2022              |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|           | 2019              | 59%    | 60%      | -1%                               | 56%      | 3%                             |
| Cohort Co | mparison          | -60%   |          |                                   |          |                                |

|           |                   |        | MATH     |                                   |          |                                |
|-----------|-------------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|----------|--------------------------------|
| Grade     | Year              | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State    | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 01        | 2022              |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|           | 2019              |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
| Cohort Co | mparison          |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
| 02        | 2022              |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|           | 2019              |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
| Cohort Co | Cohort Comparison |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
| 03        | 2022              |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|           | 2019              | 75%    | 67%      | 8%                                | 62%      | 13%                            |
| Cohort Co | mparison          | 0%     |          |                                   |          |                                |
| 04        | 2022              |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|           | 2019              | 67%    | 69%      | -2%                               | 64%      | 3%                             |
| Cohort Co | Cohort Comparison |        |          |                                   | <u>'</u> |                                |
| 05        | 2022              |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|           | 2019              | 68%    | 65%      | 3%                                | 60%      | 8%                             |
| Cohort Co | mparison          | -67%   |          |                                   | <u>'</u> |                                |

|       | SCIENCE |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |  |  |
|-------|---------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Grade | Year    | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05    | 2022    |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |  |  |
|       | 2019    | 56%    | 53%      | 3%                                | 53%   | 3%                             |  |  |  |  |  |

|            | SCIENCE |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |  |
|------------|---------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Grade      | Year    | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |  |  |  |  |
| Cohort Com | parison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |  |

### Subgroup Data Review

|   |             | 2022      | SCHOO             | DL GRAD      | E COMF     | ONENT              | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
|---|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2020-21 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2020-21 |
| SWD                                       | 29          | 40        |                   | 29           | 40         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL                                       | 59          | 50        |                   | 71           | 68         |                    | 60          |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK                                       | 44          | 60        |                   | 50           | 76         |                    | 28          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP                                       | 64          | 50        |                   | 70           | 72         |                    | 73          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL                                       | 53          | 55        | 44                | 64           | 74         | 59                 | 55          |            |              |                         |                           |
| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |             |           |                   |              |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 |
| SWD                                       | 29          |           |                   | 36           |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL                                       | 43          | 40        |                   | 45           | 33         |                    | 53          |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK                                       | 32          | 38        |                   | 30           | 14         |                    | 55          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP                                       | 55          | 42        |                   | 57           | 47         |                    | 61          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL                                       | 42          | 43        |                   | 43           | 34         |                    | 62          |            |              |                         |                           |
|   |             | 2019      | SCHOO             | DL GRAD      | E COMF     | ONENT              | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2017-18 |
| ELL                                       | 62          | 85        | 82                | 76           | 79         | 70                 | 67          |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK                                       | 50          | 58        |                   | 73           | 65         |                    | 41          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP                                       | 67          | 87        | 82                | 77           | 82         | 73                 | 71          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL                                       | 59          | 73        | 72                | 75           | 71         | 71                 | 53          |            |              |                         |                           |

### **ESSA Data Review**

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

| This data has not been apatical for the 2022 20 school year.                    |      |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| ESSA Federal Index  |      |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | ATSI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 55   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 | 39   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 441  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| ESSA Federal Index   |     |
|--|-----|
| Percent Tested   | 99% |
| Subgroup Data  |     |
| Students With Disabilities   |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     | 35  |
| 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                                      | 58  |
| 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                                | 52  |
| 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  | 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%           |     |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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                                | 55  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        |     |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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?

School data review analysis indicates that students in grades 3-5 achieved 54 percent mastery on the English Language Arts (ELA) Florida Statewide Assessment (FSA) during the 2021-2022 school year. This is an increase of 10 percentage points when compared to the 2020-2021 school year. In the area of mathematics, students in grades 3-5 achieved 62 percent mastery during the 2021-2022 school year. This is an increase of 18 percentage points when compared to the 2020-2021 school year. In the area of science, 55 percent of 5th grade students demonstrated mastery during the 2021-2022 school year when compared to 60 percent mastery during the 2020-2021 school year. Science data trends demonstrate that there was a 5 percentage point decrease in proficiency. Although there is a decrease in science achievement, three year data proficiency trends in science have been between the 55 and 60 percent. Subgroup date review indicates that English Language Learners (ELL), Black, Hispanic, and Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) subgroups demonstrated an increase in ELA and mathematics achievement during the 2021-2022 school year. Students with Disabilities (SWD) ELA achievement remained at 29 percentage points during the 2021-2022 school year. In the area of mathematics, this subgroup also decreased in proficiency by 7 percentage points when compared to the 2020-2021 school year.

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

2022 Subgroup data indicates that there is a need for improvement both ELA and mathematics achievement amongst students with disabilities (SWD). State assessment data results indicate that while

ELA overall profiency was 54 percent, only 47 percent of students in 5th grade met high standards. In the area of mathematics, 49 percent of the 5th grade students met high standards.

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

The focus of instruction has been to ensure that all students are provided with a rigorous curriculum and learning opportunities. We will continue to ensure that all students are given opportunities to reach high expectations, while targeting more specific subgroups such as our students with disabilities. This will ensure that all subgroups are meeting grade level expectations, and the achievement gap is closer amongst subgroups. Additionally, professional development will be provided ensuring that teachers are familiar with the new B.E.S.T. standards.

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

Overall learning gains in mathematics increased from 33 percentage points in 2021 to 74 percentage points in 2022. In ELA overall proficiency increased from 44 percentage points in 2021 to 54 percentage points in 2022. mathematics achievement also increased from 44 percentage points in 2021 to 62 percentage points in 2022.

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

Differentiated instruction in ELA as well as mathematics was provided to all students in order to provide students on grade level with enrichment opportunities. Quarterly data chats and intervention was also provided to students in the lowest quartile to ensure these students were making learning gains. i-Ready progress monitoring data was discussed at Leadership Team meetings, and adjustments to lesson delivery was made. Extended Learning opportunities were provided for all students during Saturday Academies as well as before and after school tutoring.

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

To accelerate learning, data-driven instruction, extended learning opportunities, collaborative planning, interventions, and classroom walkthroughs will take place.

# 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.

Monthly job-embedded sessions will take place to target specific student needs. IPEGS and the Learning Environment, (September/22), Response to Intervention (September/2022), ELL strategies (October/22), Schoology (November/22), quarterly data chats with teachers upon completion of progress monitoring and i-Ready (ongoing), and collaboration with instructional coaches (ongoing).

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

Weekly Leadership Team meetings will take place to discuss "look fors" in classrooms and to share activities/strategies taking place throughout the school. Grade Level/Department meetings will take place monthly and administrators will attend to ensure collaborative practices are taking place. Extended Learning opportunities will be offered with before school and Saturday Academy. STEAM activites will take place throughout the year, providing students with rigorous learning opportunities in the areas of science and mathematics.

### **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

2021-2022 Florida Statewide Assessment and i-Ready data demonstrate that ELA student proficiency in grades 3-5 increased by 10 percentage points. Florida Statewide Assessments (FSA) overall proficiency in the area of ELA was 54 percent. Students in grade 3 achieved 66 percent proficiency, students in grade 4 achieved 56 percent proficiency, and students in grade 5 achieved 47 percent proficiency. Spring i-Ready (AP3) data demonstrated that 26 percent of Kindergarten students, 52 percent of 1st grade students, 15 of 2nd grade students, and 23 percent of 3rd grade students were not on track to meeting proficiency in ELA. Based on these results, differentiated instruction will be the focus to address this critical need.

Measurable Outcome:

reviewed.

State the specific

measurable

outcome the school plans to achieve.

This should be a data

based,

objective outcome.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired With the implementation of differentiated instruction, an additional 10% of students in grades 3-5 will score at or above grade level in the area of ELA by the 2022-2023 state assessment from 54% to 64% overall proficiency.

The Leadership Team will conduct weekly walkthroughs for the purpose of monitoring instructional delivery in ELA in classrooms. The Leadership Team will discuss observations from the field and make recommendations on how instructional coaches and administration can support teachers.

Person responsible

outcome.

for

Kathleen John Louissaint (pr3241@dadeschools.net)

monitoring outcome:

Evidencebased

Strategy: Describe the

evidencebased strategy being implemented for this Area

of Focus.

Within the targeted element of ELA our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of Data Driven Instruction. Student performance data will be used to monitor student progress and guide instructional planning and delivery.

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Data Driven Instruction will ensure that all students are being progress monitored. In addition, teachers will use data to make informed decision as they analyze student data and make changes to instruction.

### **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.

(8/22-10/14) Teachers and students will participate in Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, and Mathematics (STEAM) lessons and activities. As a result, student knowledge and critical thinking across all content areas will improve.

Person

Responsible

Jessica Liguez (277004@dadeschools.net)

(8/22-10/14) Teachers will utilize the Reading Horizons intervention program daily in grades K-5th. As a result, targeted lessons in the areas of phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary, and comprehension skills will be provided to increase foundational skills in ELA.

Person

Responsible

Natre Key (nkey60@dadeschools.net)

(8/22-10/14) As a result of monthly collaborative planning meetings, teacher will have to opportunities to discuss instructional needs and share best practices.

Person

Responsible

Kathleen John Louissaint (pr3241@dadeschools.net)

(8/22-10/14) Students will take part in goal-oriented learning. As a result, they will understand learning goals, track their progress, and be held accountable for their outcomes.

Person

Responsible

Kathleen John Louissaint (pr3241@dadeschools.net)

(10/31-12/16) Teachers will take part in iCADS professional development in the area of English Language Arts, for the purpose of reinforcing teaching strategies and learning new content as it relates to the BEST Standards.

Person

Responsible

Natre Key (nkey60@dadeschools.net)

(10/31-12/16) Instructional Coaches will collaborate with teachers to ensure that Differentiated Instruction is being implemented with fidelity and students are making progress.

Person

Responsible

Niurka Martinez (martinezn@dadeschools.net)

### #2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

**Area of Focus** Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

2022 Subgroup Data identified that Students with Disabilities (SWD) were the lowest achieving subgroup at 35 percent proficiency in the areas of English Language Arts (ELA). This is an increase of 2 percentage points when comapred to the previous year (33 percent). Therefore, it is critical to target this subgroup, and ensure that learning explains how it gains are made. Students will be provided with ongoing progress monitoring to ensure students are receiving differentiation and remediation when needed, based on grade level assignments, Topic Assessments, i-Ready Assessments, i-Ready Growth Monitoring.

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

With the implementation of ongoing progress monitoring through the use of the Reading Horizons intervention program, Students with Disabilities subgroup will achieve at least 41 percent proficiency in the area of ELA and Mathematics by the 2022-2023 state exam.

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

The Leadership Team will conduct quarterly data chats with teachers and attend consultation meetings with the homeroom teacher and Special Education teacher to ensure that students needs are being met. Data analysis of i-Ready Assessment Period 1 (AP1), Topic Assessment Data from Performance Matters, Reading Horizons progress monitoring assessments, and i-Ready Growth Monitoring data will be used to ensure students are making adequate progress throughout the school year. Extended learning opportunities will be made available to students who are not showing growth on progress monitoring, or i-Ready growth monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathleen John Louissaint (pr3241@dadeschools.net)

Evidencebased Strategy: Describe the evidencebased strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Within the targeted element of ESSA, as it relates to Students with Disabilities, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of: ongoing progress monitoring. Student performance data in the areas of i-Ready Assessment Period 1 (AP1), Topic Assessment Data from Performance Matters, Reading Horizons progress monitoring assessments, and i-Ready Growth Monitoring data will be used to ensure students are making adequate progress and guide instructional planning and delivery.

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy: **Explain the** 

Ongoing Progress Monitoring will ensure that students are receiving remediation and differentiation by utilizing district resources from Reading Horizons, i-Ready Assessment Data, PowerBi subgroup data, and Performance Matters Topic Assessment Data. Teachers will use this data to identify trends and make informed decision as they analyze student data and make changes to instruction.

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

(8/22-10/14) Teachers will utilize the Reading Horizons intervention program daily in grades K-5th. As a result, targeted lessons will be provided in the areas of phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary, and comprehension skills.

Person
Responsible
Natre Key (nkey60@dadeschools.net)

(8/22-10/14) Teachers will collaborate with administrators and Leadership Team quarterly to discuss student progress and learning targets outlined in the student's Individualized Education Plan (IEP). As a result, teacher will adjust teaching methods according to student progress.

Person
Responsible jessica Esquijarosa (jesquijarosa@dadeschools.net)

(8/22-10/14) Students will take part in goal-oriented learning. As a result, they will understand learning goals, track their progress, and be held accountable for their outcomes.

Person
Responsible
Natre Key (nkey60@dadeschools.net)

(8/22 -10/14) Administrators will conduct bi-weekly walkthroughs to ensure that instructional time is being maximized. As a result, this will enable teachers to use data to drive instruction and make informed decisions relating to goal setting, interventions, course work, and differentiating instruction.

Person
Responsible
Kathleen John Louissaint (pr3241@dadeschools.net)

(10/31-12/16) Collaborate with Special Education Teacher to discuss the progress of Individualized Educational Plan (IEP) learning goals for students, and identify strategies to assist students in achieving their goals.

Person
Responsible
Niurka Martinez (martinezn@dadeschools.net)

(10/31-12/16) Utilize iReady Assessment Period 1 (AP1) data to identify strengths and areas of improvement in the areas of ELA and Mathematics for students with disabilities for the purpose of providing teacher assigned lessons that will target student deficiencies.

Person
Responsible
Jessica Esquijarosa (317818@dadeschools.net)

### #3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Attendance Initiatives

Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:
Include a rationale
that explains how
it was identified
as a critical need
from the data
reviewed.

Early Warning Systems Indicators show that 45 students had attendance rates below 90 percent. Most of these students were in 3rd grade (10 students), and 5th grade (10 students). It is important to identify these students in 4th grade during the 2022-2023 school year and monitor and report their absences. Parent phone calls, home visits, counseling, and referrals to outside agencies will be provided. Additionally, students with perfect attendance will be identified, and incentives will be provided to motivate students.

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

With the implementation of attendance initiatives, students with 10 or more absences will decrease to 15 percent by the end of the 2022-2023 school year.

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

Administrators will collaborate with the Truancy Interventionist for the purpose of identifying students with excessive absences. Attendance reports will be monitored on a weekly basis, and parent phone calls will be made to ensure that students are coming to school. The Community Involvement Specialist will contact parents and provide outside resources to parents. Quarterly Attendance reports will identify students and grade levels with adequate attendance percentages.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jessica Liguez (277004@dadeschools.net)

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

Within the targeted element of Positive School Culture and Environment, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of: Attendance Initiatives. Implementing attendance initiatives will promote a positive school culture where children will be motivated to attend school. Additionally, monitoring student attendance and providing outside resources and support to parents will ensure that parents make attendance a priority.

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

Monitoring attendance will ensure that students are attending school frequently and not missing out on instructional time. Providing incentives to students and classes with 100 percent attendance will motivate them to come to school and learn. When students attend school frequently there is less learning loss. Therefore, it is important to ensure students attend school as much as possible.

### **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.

(8/22-10/14) As a result of monitoring student attendance monthly, class incentives will be provided to the classes with the most perfect attendance days.

Person Responsible

Kathleen John Louissaint (pr3241@dadeschools.net)

(8/22-10/14) As a result of monitoring student attendance, parents whose children have 5 or more absences will be contacted, and additional support will be provided if needed, to ensure students attend school.

Person

Responsible

Jessica Liguez (277004@dadeschools.net)

(8/22-10/14) Quarterly attendance dances will take place, as a result of promoting student attendance. Students will be provided with certificates.

Person

Responsible

Shequilla Hall (shall1@dadeschools.net)

(8/22-10/14) As a result of analyzing quarterly attendance reports, school average percentages will be compared each quarter to ensure students are not absent more often during the second semester.

Person

Responsible

Kathleen John Louissaint (pr3241@dadeschools.net)

(10/31-12/16) Monitor attendance data using PowerBi to identify students with 5 or more absences and have Attendance Review Committee (ARC) meetings with parents, to identify if outside resources are needed.

Person

Responsible

Kathleen John Louissaint (pr3241@dadeschools.net)

### #4. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development

Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:
Include a
rationale that
explains how it
was identified as
a critical need
from the data
reviewed.

2021-2022 School Climate Survey data demonstrated that 54 percent of teachers felt that their ideas were listened to and considered. To increase this percentage, the Instructional Leadership Team was selected for the purpose of providing other teachers with opportunities to share ideas and provide feedback on how to be more receptive to their ideas. There is a critical need to improve staff morale and make teachers feel their ideas are listened to and heard. This will create teams of leaders who share the vision and mission of the school.

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

If we effectively implement the Instructional Leadership Team, our teachers will be provided the opportunity to contribute to school-wide decisions through monthly meetings. Teachers will have opportunities to share best practices and present ideas for the benefit of the students and staff. The percentage of teachers in leadership roles will increase by at least 5 percent during the 2022-2023 school year.

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

With the implementation of Leadership Development, an additional 10 percent of the staff will agree that their ideas are listened to and considered by the end of the school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathleen John Louissaint (pr3241@dadeschools.net)

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

Within the targeted element of the Instructional Leadership Team, we will focus on the evidenced-based strategy of: Involving Staff in Important Decisions. By creating a list of activities throughout the year, teachers will be able to take part in these activities to promote and increase a sense of shared leadership. During monthly grade-level meetings, grade level leaders will share how their grade level and department have taken on leadership roles.

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

Involving the staff in important decisions will improve school culture and improve staff morale, 54 percent of teachers felt their ideas were listened to and considered. Providing teachers with more opportunities to give their input will increase teacher buy-in and promote a positive school culture.

# 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.

(8/22-10/14) As a result of improving staff morale, teachers will be provided with leadership opportunities during faculty meetings to share best practices and strategies used in their classrooms, to impact student learning.

Person

Responsible

Natre Key (nkey60@dadeschools.net)

(8/22-10/14) As a result of providing teachers and teacher leaders with opportunities to facilitate in-house professional development, teachers will have more opportunities to share their area of expertise, and provide the staff with additional support.

Person

Responsible

Kathleen John Louissaint (pr3241@dadeschools.net)

(8/22-10/14) As a result of a needs assessment survey, administrators will have more insight on how to improve school culture. Survey relsults will be discussed during Leadership Team meetings to develop strategies on improve school culture.

Person

Responsible

Kathleen John Louissaint (pr3241@dadeschools.net)

(8/22-10/14) Teachers will be provided with opportunities to spearhead school-wide events throughout the school year. As a result, staff will have opportunities to take part in the decision-making process. This will ensure that staff are professionally and personally vested in the school's success.

Person

Responsible

Kathleen John Louissaint (pr3241@dadeschools.net)

(10/31-12/16) Members of Social Committee will provide staff with team building activities and events that promote a positive school culture for the purpose of raising staff morale.

Person

Responsible

Shequilla Hall (shall1@dadeschools.net)

(10/31-12/16) Members of the Leadership Team will participate in growth mindset professional development for the purpose of identifying strategies to improve themselves.

Person

Responsible

Kathleen John Louissaint (pr3241@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

i-Ready Assessment 2022 Assessment Period 3 (AP3) data indicates that 57 percent of students in K-5 were on target to meeting grade level standards. Twenty six percent were one grade level below, and 16 percent were 2 or more grade levels below. K-2 I Ready data indicated that 26 percent of kindergarten students were 1 grade level below in the area of ELA. In first grade, 52 percent of the students were one grade level below, and in second grade 27 percent were one grade level below and 15 percent were 2 or more grade levels below. Based on these data findings, it has been determined that there is a critical need for students to have foundational skills in Reading. To address this need, student in K-2 will be utilizing more anchor charts for the purpose of understanding lessons and having a visual representation of the lesson being learned as well as utilizing the accountable talk model to assist them with reflecting about the reading and writing process.

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

i-Ready Assessment 2022 Assessment Period 3 (AP3) data indicates that 57 percent of students in K-5 were on target to meeting grade level standards. Twenty six percent were one grade level below, and 16 percent were 2 or more grade levels below. Grade 3-5 i-Ready data indicated that 11 percent of 3rd grade students were 1 grade level below and 22 percent were two grade levels below in the area of ELA. In 4th grade, 26 percent of the students were one grade level below, 10 percent were 2 or more grade levels below. Nineteen percent of 5th grade students were one grade level below and 38 percent were 2 or more grade levels below.

School data review analysis indicates that students in grades 3-5 achieved 54 percent mastery on the English Language Arts (ELA) Florida Statewide Assessment (FSA) during the 2021-2022 school year. This is an increase of 10 percentage points when compared to the 2020-2021 school year. Grade level FSA data demonstrates that 66 percent of 3rd grade students, 56 percent of 4th grade students, and 44 percent of 5th grade students met high standards in ELA. Due to this trend, there is a need to further develop students' reading comprehension skills. To address this need, accountable talk will be utilized to assist students in reflecting about the reading and writing process. While accountable talk will be implemented school-wide, 5th grade students will be the focus group due to their overall proficiency level being below 50 percent.

#### **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)**

If we successfully implement anchor charts, our Kindergarten-2nd grade students will increase their overall profiency by 15 percent during the Spring 2023 administration of the i-Ready Assessment Period 3 (AP3).

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

If we successfully implement accountable talks our 3rd-5th grade students will increase their overall profiency by 15 percent during the Spring 2023 administration of the i-Ready Assessment Period 3 (AP3).

### **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.

Primary and Intermediate Instructional coaches will collaboratively plan with teachers to unpack the Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking (B.E.S.T.) standards. Pacing guides will be used and ELA resources will be identified for the purpose of providing students with strategic lessons to enhance learning. The Leadership Team will take part in biweekly classroom walkthroughs to ensure fidelity of the standards, and monitor student progress.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Martinez, Niurka, martinezn@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. §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?

Within the targeted RAISE instructional practice, our school will focus on the evidenced-based strategy of: anchor charts (K-2) and accountable talks (3-5) grades. The use of anchor charts in the primary grades will enable students to have a visual representation of what is being taught. These anchor charts will be used to reinforce skills that target the Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking (B.E.S.T.) standards. The use of accountable talks in the intermediate (3rd-5th) grades, will challenge students to reflect on the ELA process. Evidence of implementation will be evident in classroom walkthroughs, district pacing guides, and teacher instruction.

### 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?

Utilizing Anchor charts and accountable talks have proven effective in increasing student proficiency. These evidence based strategies were selected because they will be most effective in ensuring students are understanding lessons being taught, while addressing the need for student proficiency.

### **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<br>Monitoring           |
|---|--|
| (8/31-10/14) Instructional Coaches will collaborate with teachers for planning and identifying resources from the pacing guides to ensure students are making progress.   | Key, Natre, nkey60@dadeschools.net             |
| (8/31-10/14)Teachers will monitor the fall i-Ready diagnostic (AP1) and use data to drive instruction by creating intervention groups, that will be fluid and change as student data changes.   | Liguez, Jessica,<br>277004@dadeschools.net     |
| (8/31-10/14) Instructional Coaches will attend District Professional Development (i-CADS) for the purpose of sharing instructional strategies, resources, and informing ELA teachers of current topics pertaining to English Language Arts (ELA). | Key, Natre,<br>nkey60@dadeschools.net          |
| (8/31-10/14) Quarterly Data Chats will take place with teachers and Leadership Team to ensure that students are making adequate progress, and interventions are being provided to ensure student success.   | Martinez, Niurka,<br>martinezn@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.

Miami Gardens Elementary School provides a positive school culture and environment supporting all stakeholders by providing opportunities to celebrate success, promote collective efficacy, develop a positive influence on student outcome and achievement, as well as a strong focus on character development and education.

Through our STE(A)M initiative efforts, collaborative spaces were created for students to engage in inquiry based projects. Students participated in a number of district and community sponsored coemptions, field experiences and exhibitions. Community partnerships and outreach programs were established to promote a positive learning environment. Teachers participated in professional development opportunities and students participated in Growth Mindset activities that fostered a change in their belief that through their collective action, they would be able to positively influence outcomes and achievement. Quarterly data chats were held with administrators, counselors and parents of students in the lowest quartile to review student data, discuss objectives and progress towards goals.

To ensure that stakeholders felt safe both physically and emotionally, character education/development programs were infused throughout the curriculum and school-wide initiatives. A mentorship program was established to connect students in the lowest quartile with a school staff member of their choosing. Weekly meetings with mentors afforded students the opportunity to engage in meaningful conversations that were geared towards both academics and social emotional well being.

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

Stakeholders involved in building a positive school culture and environment are the Principal, Assistant Principal, Instructional Coaches, Teacher Leaders, Counselors (School Leadership Team), and parents. The Principal's role is to build a positive school culture and learning environment, ensure the school's vision and mission is shared with all stakeholders, and that instructional practices are aligned with the school's vision and mission. The Assistant Principal will ensure that school-wide initiatives are being met by collaborating with teachers during grade level meetings, providing professional development, and assisting parents with securing resources to support students' academic and emotional needs. Instructional Coach will provide ongoing professional support, assist teachers with securing and utilizing instructional resources, model effective instruction, and provide constructive feedback to teachers. Teacher Leaders will collaborate with their grade level teams to provide additional resources and support in content areas. The counselors will provide access to mental health resources to ensure that students' social emotional needs are being met. Parents will participate in school-wide activities, EESAC meetings, PTA meetings, and conferences as it pertains to the needs of their child.