



---

## 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>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# Flamingo Elementary School

701 E 33RD ST, Hialeah, FL 33013

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Ileana Sotolongo R**

Start Date for this Principal: 11/18/2015

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <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>Hispanic Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: B (60%)<br>2018-19: B (59%)<br>2017-18: B (60%)  |
| <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>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

# Flamingo Elementary School

701 E 33RD ST, Hialeah, FL 33013

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

## School Demographics

|   |                               |   |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File) | <b>2021-22 Title I School</b> | <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                               | Yes                           | 100%  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)          | <b>Charter School</b>         | <b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><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 | B       |         | B       | B       |

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

We uphold high standards and expectations so that each student is challenged to reach his or her potential.

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

We are committed to provide our students with a meaningful education for a promising future.

### 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   |
|--------------------|---------------------------|---|
| Sotolongo, Ileana  | Principal                 | Ensure commitment to the implementation and documentation of the SIP, instructional practices, and the various tiers of interventions, the allocation of resources, and communication with all stakeholders.  |
| Rodriguez, Rita    | Assistant Principal       | Facilitate data collection and analysis, provide professional development to teachers, and support the implementation of various tiers of interventions and SIP strategies.   |
| Diaz, Elli         | School Counselor          | Facilitate development of behavior intervention plans and collaborate with Student Services personnel to provide support for intervention fidelity and documentation, and facilitate data-based decision making. As Mindfulness champion, facilitate activities and strategies for both staff and students to cultivate a positive and motivating school culture and environment.   |
| Rodriguez, Marleen | ELL Compliance Specialist | Provide professional development sessions to teachers, and support the implementation of the LEP plans for English Language Learners, and the implementation of the intervention plans and SIP strategies.  |
| Perez, Linda       | SAC Member                | Ensure fidelity of implementation and documentation of the SIP, ensure adherence to timelines, and facilitate communication with other SAC members. As Kindergarten Grade Level Chairperson, manage grade level team in a manner that promotes positive relationships and collaboration. Oversee the communication of grade level and schoolwide events to grade level staff, students and their parents.   |
| Fuste, Monica      | Teacher, K-12             | As Grade 1 Chairperson, manage grade level team in a manner that promotes positive relationships and collaboration and ensures implementation of SIP strategies, activities and schoolwide initiatives. Oversee the communication of grade level and schoolwide events to grade level staff, students and their parents.  |
| Dominguez, Ela     | Teacher, K-12             | As Grade 3 Chairperson, manage grade level team in a manner that promotes positive relationships and collaboration and ensures implementation of SIP strategies, activities and schoolwide initiatives. Oversee the communication of grade level and schoolwide events to grade level staff, students and their parents.  |
| Rodriguez, Susan   | SAC Member                | As SAC Chairperson ensure fidelity of implementation and documentation of the SIP, ensure adherence to timelines, and facilitate communication with other SAC members. As Grade 4 Chairperson, manage grade level team in a manner that promotes positive relationships and collaboration and ensures implementation of SIP strategies, activities and schoolwide initiatives. Oversee the communication of grade level and schoolwide events to grade level staff, students and their parents. |

| Name          | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|---------------|----------------|--|
| Sanchez, Elmo | Teacher, K-12  | As Grade 2 Chairperson, manage grade level team in a manner that promotes positive relationships and collaboration and ensures implementation of SIP strategies, activities and schoolwide initiatives. Oversee the communication of grade level and schoolwide events to grade level staff, students and their parents. |
|               | Math Coach     | As Math Instructional Coach facilitate site-based professional development in Mathematics content, instructional strategies, and technology to staff that is aligned to students' needs based of formative assessment data.  |

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Wednesday 11/18/2015, Ileana Sotolongo R

**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.*

10

**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.*

23

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

26

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

453

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

2

**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                              | 44          | 66 | 69 | 70 | 78 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 397   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 9           | 9  | 9  | 15 | 8  | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 56    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 2  | 10 | 11 | 18 | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 43    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 4  | 9  | 10 | 17 | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 42    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 13 | 5  | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 33    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 7  | 11 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 34    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 1           | 4 | 11 | 15 | 15 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 60    |

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     | 2           | 4 | 11 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 33    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 7/15/2022

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                              | 40          | 58 | 54 | 92 | 53 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 389   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 6           | 10 | 10 | 12 | 6  | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 56    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0  | 2  | 25 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 49    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 1  | 6  | 4  | 11 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 34    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |
| 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           | 5  | 27 | 55 | 7  | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 124   |

**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 | 1           | 1 | 6 | 14 | 7 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 42    |

**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     | 1           | 1 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 17    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |

**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                              | 40          | 58 | 54 | 92 | 53 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 389   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 6           | 10 | 10 | 12 | 6  | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 56    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0  | 2  | 25 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 49    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 1  | 6  | 4  | 11 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 34    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |
| 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           | 5  | 27 | 55 | 7  | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 124   |

**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 | 1           | 1 | 6 | 14 | 7 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 42 |

**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     | 1           | 1 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 17 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0 | 0 | 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).

| School Grade Component      | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 59%    | 62%      | 56%   |        |          |       | 66%    | 62%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 66%    |          |       |        |          |       | 65%    | 62%      | 58%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 53%    |          |       |        |          |       | 57%    | 58%      | 53%   |
| Math Achievement            | 62%    | 58%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 66%    | 69%      | 63%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 72%    |          |       |        |          |       | 63%    | 66%      | 62%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 61%    |          |       |        |          |       | 45%    | 55%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 45%    | 64%      | 59%   |        |          |       | 48%    | 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 | 59%    | 60%      | -1%                        | 58%   | 1%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 72%    | 64%      | 8%                         | 58%   | 14%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -59%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| ELA               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|                   | 2019 | 58%    | 60%      | -2%                        | 56%   | 2%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -72%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| 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 | 61%    | 67%      | -6%                        | 62%   | -1%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 73%    | 69%      | 4%                         | 64%   | 9%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -61%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 59%    | 65%      | -6%                        | 60%   | -1%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -73%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 44%    | 53%      | -9%                        | 53%   | -9%                     |
| 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                                       | 28       | 26     | 9           | 40        | 63      | 70           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 58       | 69     | 60          | 61        | 75      | 69           | 38       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 59       | 67     | 54          | 62        | 73      | 63           | 46       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 58       | 67     | 53          | 60        | 71      | 63           | 44       |         |           |                   |                     |

  

| 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                                       | 7        | 21     |             | 14        | 14      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |

| 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 |
| ELL                                       | 50       | 45     | 29          | 33        | 15      | 13           | 20       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 55       | 45     | 28          | 41        | 21      | 12           | 32       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 53       | 47     | 36          | 39        | 20      | 16           | 29       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 29       | 48     | 50          | 37        | 42      | 33           | 13       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 61       | 62     | 59          | 67        | 65      | 47           | 44       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 67       | 65     | 56          | 67        | 63      | 46           | 49       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 65       | 64     | 59          | 66        | 63      | 46           | 48       |         |           |                   |                     |

**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  | 61   |
| 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 | 66   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 484  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |

**Subgroup Data**

| Students With Disabilities  |    |
|---|----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                | 42 |
| 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                                | 62 |
| 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   |     |
|--|-----|
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%            | 0   |
| Asian Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Asian Students   |     |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                      | 0   |
| Black/African American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                    |     |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?            | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%     | 0   |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 61  |
| 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                                | 60  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

#### **What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?**

2022 Science Achievement data indicate school increased the Science Achievement by 13 percentage points from 32% in 2021 to 45% in 2022. However, Science Achievement trend data indicate the school historically continues to perform below 50% in the NGSS Science Assessment.

2022 ELA data indicate learning gains of the Lowest 25th Percentile students increased by 20 percentage points, from 46% in 2021 to 66% in 2022.

2022 Mathematics data indicate learning gains of the Lowest 25th Percentile students greatly increased by 42 percentage points, from 19% in 2021 to 61% in 2022.

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

Science achievement data on the NGSS Science Assessment is lower than District by 4 percentage points and lower than similar T1S schools by 3 percentage points.

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

There is a need to improve student's prior knowledge in Science by scaffolding instruction and by ensuring accountability and rigor of Science instruction in the primary grades. There is a need to address the needs of our lowest 25th percentile students in all subject areas particularly in ELA/Reading by providing Standards-based grading and instruction, differentiation, interventions, and corrective timely feedback after assessments.

It must be noted that there is also a need to improve student attendance and engagement across all grade levels and content areas, as well as differentiated instructional practices. Attendance incentives, interactive learning environments, consistent/effective data chats, and standards-based grading/instruction will help address these general needs.

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

2022 Mathematics achievement, learning gains, and learning gains of the lowest 25th percentile showed the most improvement. According to the 2022 FSA data, Mathematics proficiency increased by 22 percentage points, learning gains increased by 50 percentage points and the learning gains of the lowest 25% in mathematics increased by 42 percentage points when compared to 2021 FSA data.

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

Standard-aligned, rigorous instruction contributed to the improvement in overall Mathematics achievement and learning gains. Other contributing factors included the implementation of Grade Level Collaborative planning sessions using data to guide instruction and reflecting on effectiveness of teaching strategies. Additionally, the support and assistance of the Math Coach and a District's Mathematics Support Specialist were instrumental in improving teaching practices and learning outcomes.

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

To accelerate learning, we will continue to provide teachers with professional development in the B.E.S.T. Standards; ELA, Math and Science Intervention programs; conduct quarterly data chats with teachers to review and discuss iReady, district assessments and FAST progress monitoring results; as well as facilitate collaborative planning sessions to differentiated Instruction (DI) and thus meet students' diverse needs.

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

The PLST will develop/offer whole group sessions PD to support teachers on the following topics: Schoology learning management system, B.E.S.T. Standards implementation, standards-aligned instruction, and data driven instruction and interventions.

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

Collaborative planning will be scheduled bi-weekly to reflect on effectiveness of instructional strategies and plan for instruction and interventions. Extended Learning Opportunities will be provided with after school and interventions, as well as Saturday Academies to provide remediation and enrichment. Additionally, parent workshops will be conducted to inform them of the B.E.S.T. Standards full implementation and to review progress monitoring/i-Ready results.

#### **Areas of Focus**

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

:



**#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Celebrating Successes**

**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 feedback from Staff indicates only 66% of teachers Agree or Strongly agree that they like working at this school. The survey further indicates only 48% of teachers feel staff morale is high at our school. This data indicates there is a critical need to increase staff morale, particularly when staff satisfaction directly correlates to staff attendance and productivity.

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

If we successfully implement Celebrating Successes, particularly in the areas that contribute to student achievement and engagement, our staff morale, engagement and satisfaction, will increase by 20 percentage points in the 2022-2023 Climate Survey that will be administered in May 2023.

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

The School Leadership Team will provide opportunities for teachers to collaborate, provide input and share ideas in matters of school improvement. Leaders will also regularly provide positive reinforcement by celebrating successes, highlighting and recognizing teacher attendance, class and/or schoolwide initiatives, and practices in rigorous and technology-assisted instruction, among others. Additionally, leaders will check in with team members throughout the year to identify need for boosting morale and provide rewards and incentives.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Ileana Sotolongo (pr1921@dadeschools.net)

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

The evidence-based strategy of Celebrating Successes within our school community will engage our teachers and staff and increase their productivity and satisfactions by making them feel good about their contributions to the school team.

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

Our teachers are afforded onsite professional development and support regularly and they have opportunities to participate in the School Advisory Council. However, we need to highlight teacher's strengths and successes and provide opportunities to listen to their input and suggestions and allow them to take on leadership roles in committees or programs for the benefit of the school community.

**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.

(8/12/22) Introduce SIP priority goal of Celebrating Successes to address staff morale and related factors such as staff attendance and accountability during Opening of Schools Meeting and subsequent staff meeting.

**Person Responsible** Ileana Sotolongo (pr1921@dadeschools.net)

(9/21/22) PLST Members will facilitate a survey to solicit input and suggestions for schoolwide short term and long term/standing committees to implement initiatives that support our school improvement efforts.

**Person Responsible** Elmo Sanchez (esanchezjr@dadeschools.net)

(8/31-10/14) Leadership Team will facilitate grade level collaborative planning sessions where each member will have an opportunity to share best practices or successes with the implementation of strategies to address students' needs based on progress monitoring data.

**Person Responsible** Rita Rodriguez (rirodriguez@dadeschools.net)

(8/31-10/14) Teachers will share best practices during monthly Faculty and Staff meetings on general topics that affect teachers across grade levels and disciplines, such as technology integration, SEL practices, DI, and interventions, among others.

**Person Responsible** Marleen Rodriguez (mrod11@dadeschools.net)

**#2. 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.**

2022 FSA results indicate overall improvement in ELA, Mathematics and Science proficiency, as well as in ELA and Mathematics learning gains and learning gains of the lowest 25th percentile when compared to 2021 results. However, 2022 FSA ELA proficiency results indicate an increase of only 4 percentage points from 55% in 2021 to 59% in 2022. The slight improvement together with the full implementation of the new B.E.S.T. Standards in ELA, new instructional materials, new FAST Progress monitoring Assessments, and fairly new intervention programs, it is critical we use Standard-aligned instruction and assessments to be able to meet the needs of students and improve their overall achievement in ELA/Reading.

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

With the implementation of standard-aligned instruction student performance on classroom, formative, and summative assessments will indicate improvement in all subject areas, specifically the achievement of Grade 3-5 students will increase from 59% to 62% in the 2023 ELA FAST PM3 administration.

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

This area of focus will be monitored by walkthroughs during the ELA instructional block in grades K-5, data chats, lesson plans and student work folders for indication of standard aligned instruction and assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Ileana Sotolongo (pr1921@dadeschools.net)

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

Standard-aligned Instruction  
Standards-based collaborative planning sessions; Mentoring by Teacher Leaders; Professional Development opportunities and sharing of best practices during faculty meetings; Data chats to assess student progress and strategies effectiveness; lesson plans and assessments.

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

Standards-aligned Instruction will ensure that teachers are using learning objectives, assessments, activities and resources that are aligned to the standards and customized to meet the needs of all students.

**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.

(8/12/22) Introduce SIP priority goal of Standards-aligned instruction to incorporate new B.E.S.T. standards and assessments during Opening of Schools Meeting.

**Person Responsible** Ileana Sotolongo (pr1921@dadeschools.net)

(8/15/22) Facilitate Initial PD on the new B.E.S.T. standards, District resources, Schoology Learning Management Platform and Standards-based instruction.

**Person Responsible** Elmo Sanchez (esanchezjr@dadeschools.net)

(8/31-10/14) Facilitate grade level collaborative planning meetings to particularly emphasize Standards-based instruction, assessments, and grading.

**Person Responsible** Marleen Rodriguez (mrod11@dadeschools.net)

(8/31-10/14) Conduct classroom walkthroughs to monitor Standards-aligned instructional activities, assessments, and provide additional support by means of peer observations and sharing of best practices during Grade Level and Faculty meetings, and/or during PD days.

**Person Responsible** Rita Rodriguez (rirodriguez@dadeschools.net)

(10/31-12/16) Continue to monitor standards-aligned planning, instruction and assessments by reviewing lesson plans and student assignments and observing instruction during walkthroughs.

**Person Responsible** Ileana Sotolongo (pr1921@dadeschools.net)

(10/31-12/16) Continue to facilitate professional development, collaborative planning sessions, and modeling of the implementation of standards adhering to the rigor and grade level limits in ELA, Mathematics and Science.

**Person Responsible** Rita Rodriguez (rirodriguez@dadeschools.net)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**

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

2022 FSA ELA Assessment results indicate the achievement/proficiency of third grade students decreased by 6 percentage points, from 53% in 2021 to 47% in 2022. Additionally, although NGSS Science Assessment results indicate improvement from the prior year, the proficiency continues to be below 50%; at 45%.

Consequently, we intend to focus on Differentiated Instruction (DI) to address the needs of ALL students, particularly third grade students and students achieving in the lowest 25th percentile. DI will allow teachers to remediate and accelerate learning to close the achievement gaps as evidenced in progress in i-Ready, Topic Assessment, FAST progress monitoring, and intervention results.

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

With the implementation of differentiation in all grades and content areas, student performance on classroom, formative and summative assessments will improve, specifically 51% of Grade 3 students will achieve proficiency in the 2023 ELA FAST PM3 administration and 50% of Grade 5 students will achieve proficiency in the Spring 2023 Science Assessment.

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

Differentiated Instruction will be monitored by classroom observations/ walkthroughs, DI folders, data binder, student data trackers, and ultimately by student performance on formative and summative assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Ileana Sotolongo (pr1921@dadeschools.net)

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

Differentiated Instruction:  
 Collaborative planning sessions to differentiate instructions within every class group based on assessment data; Mentoring by Teacher Leaders; Professional Development opportunities and sharing of best practices during faculty meetings; Data chats to assess student progress and strategies effectiveness; scaffolding of instruction; DI folders/ differentiated web-based assignments.

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

Differentiation will ensure that teachers are utilizing relevant and current data to plan for instruction and to create lessons that are student centered and customized to meet their needs. If effective differentiated instructional strategies are implemented with fidelity, then it will result in higher student achievement in all content areas.

**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.

(8/12/22) Introduce SIP priority goal of implementing Differentiation with fidelity across all content areas during Opening of Schools Meeting.

**Person Responsible**

Ileana Sotolongo (pr1921@dadeschools.net)

(8/31-10/14) Facilitate PD on the implementation of DI and collaborative planning best practices during Teacher Planning Day (08/15/22) and Monthly Faculty meetings.

**Person Responsible** Elmo Sanchez (esanchezjr@dadeschools.net)

(8/31-10/14) Conduct classroom walkthroughs to monitor effective implementation of DI and provide additional support as needed by means of peer class observations and sharing of best practices during Grade Level and/or Faculty meetings.

**Person Responsible** Ileana Sotolongo (pr1921@dadeschools.net)

(8/31-10/14) Review formative assessment results (Baseline, Topic, FAST Progress Monitoring, and OPM data) during Data Chats to monitor progress and adjust instruction and interventions as needed.

**Person Responsible** Rita Rodriguez (rirodriguez@dadeschools.net)

(10/31-12/16) Continue to monitor effective implementation of DI and provide additional support as needed by means of

**Person Responsible** Ileana Sotolongo (pr1921@dadeschools.net)

(10/31-12/16) Continue to facilitate a deeper understanding of DI to access diverse learners.

**Person Responsible** Rita Rodriguez (rirodriguez@dadeschools.net)

**#4. 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.**

2021-2022 EOY SIP Survey results in the area of Developing Others indicate 71% of teachers stated they receive support by teacher leaders Weekly to Monthly; conversely 29% (six teachers) stated they receive support from Quarterly to Never. Likewise, survey results in the area of Engages the Team indicate 71% of teachers responded that each year all staff members have the opportunity to be considered for leadership roles at the school; conversely 29% stated they do Not have that opportunity. In addition, in the area of Commitment to Students, 75% of teachers stated their administrators provide them with feedback to improve student outcomes Daliy to Monthly; conversely, 25% stated it took place Quarterly to Annually. It is therefore paramount the we provide teachers with opportunities to reflect on their practices, observe other teachers, receive and provide feedback to support each other and our school improvement goals.

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

After successful implementation of Specific Teacher Feedback/Walkthroughs by administrators and members of the School Leadership/Literacy Team, the percentage of teachers who feel they receive specific feedback and support and opportunities to thrive will increase by 5 percentage points by the end of the 2022-2023 school year.

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

The Administrators will conduct walkthroughs weekly and improve timely feedback practices. Additionally, the School Leadership/Literacy Team will conduct walkthroughs quarterly, provide feedback, and identify model classrooms in each grade level/content area for other teachers to visit and observe. All will debrief on the effectiveness of the feedback practices on improved teaching and learning.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Ileana Sotolongo (pr1921@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being**

The evidence-based strategy of Specific Teacher Feedback/Walkthroughs will not only result in improved teacher practices in the classroom but also in empowering teacher leaders who after observing teacher's practice, will facilitate reflective follow-up and provide positive and constructive feedback.

**implemented for this Area of Focus.**

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Administrators and PLST members who are full-time released or resource teachers, are generally the only leaders afforded time and opportunities to model lessons, observe teachers, provide feedback and reflection. It is important the administration and PLST provide opportunities for other teachers to observe best practices, reflect, collaborate, and provide feedback to ultimately support each other in improving teacher practices and student outcomes.

**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.

(8/12/22) Introduce SIP priority goal of Specific Teacher Feedback/Walkthroughs as part of our efforts to foster a trusting and collegial environment where teachers reflect, give and receive feedback, and take professional risks within our school community.

**Person Responsible** Ileana Sotolongo (pr1921@dadeschools.net)

(8/31-10/14 ) Administration will assign Buddy Teachers to 3 experienced instructional staff members new to our school system. PLST members will schedule them to observe identified model classrooms corresponding to their current teaching assignment. They will also encourage more teachers to pursue clinical supervision in order to supervise interns and support new teachers and/or peers.

**Person Responsible** Marleen Rodriguez (mrod11@dadeschools.net)

(8/31-10/14) PLST will conduct Quarterly walkthrough following specific instructional review protocols, facilitate individual reflective follow-up, and provide positive and constructive feedback. Team will debrief together on the process and monitor resulting changes/improvements.

**Person Responsible** Elmo Sanchez (esanchezjr@dadeschools.net)

(8/31-10/14) PLST will facilitate grade level specific Data Chats following administration of the FAST Progress Monitoring 1 to adjust teaching strategies. Teachers will in turn hold Data Chats with students, establish goals, and start tracking their progress.

**Person Responsible** Rita Rodriguez (rirodriguez@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

2022 SAT-10 Median Percentile results in ELA/Reading for students in K-2 was 42; 8 point lower than other Tier1S schools and 13 points lower than the district's median percentile. Furthermore, 2021-2022 Historical i-Ready Progress Monitoring Data (AP3) indicate 42% of students in Grades K-2 performed one or more years below grade level in ELA and are not on track to achieve proficiency on the 2023 ELA FAST PM3 administration. As 80% of students in K-2 are also English Language Learners (ESOL Levels 1-4), there is a need to develop student's knowledge of the English language structure, to explicitly teach phonics and elementary vocabulary during whole group instruction and/or Teacher Led Center.

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

2022 FSA ELA results indicate only 47% of Grade 3 students in the accountability group achieved at or above Level 3 compared to 73% in Grade 4 and 54% in Grade 5. Thirteen of the Grade 3 students scored a Level 1 and were retained. In all three grade levels the students scored lowest on the Key Idea and Details content cluster with an average of 55.8%: 48.5 in Grade 3, 54.9 in Grade 4, and 63.9 in Grade 5. As a result, it is critical we use both Standards-aligned Instruction and Differentiated Instruction to meet the needs of the individual students, filling any learning gaps, while implementing the grade level B.E.S.T. Standards in ELA.

**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)**

With the implementation of Explicit Instruction in vocabulary and phonics, during whole group or Teacher Led Center, 50% of Grade 2 students will be on track to pass the FAST PM3 administered in the Spring 2023.

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

With the implementation of Differentiated Instruction and Standards-based Instruction, 52% of Grades 3-5 students will achieve proficiency at Levels 3-5 on the FAST PM3 administered in the Spring 2023.

**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.

Standards-based instruction will be monitored by reviewing lesson plans, instructional delivery and assessments to ensure teachers deliberately focus on learning targets. Differentiated instruction will be monitored by classroom observations/walkthroughs, data binder, student DI folders, student data trackers and assessment results.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Sotolongo, Ileana, pr1921@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?

Wonders Reading Program, i-Ready software and Toolbox lessons; Horizons and Elevate Intervention Program, IXL Reading (if available).

**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?

These programs were selected based on the ability to allow all students to acquire the necessary knowledge and skills by scaffolding instruction and providing interventions and enrichment as appropriate. These programs are standards-aligned and meet the expectations of the State.

**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              |
|---|--|
| (8/31-10//14) Academic vocabulary must be taught and stressed in all content areas to develop skills in multiple aspects of the English language and literacy; ensure implementation of interactive word walls.   | Sotolongo, Ileana,<br>pr1921@dadeschools.net   |
| (8/31-10/14) Implement activities in Grades K-3 to support academic vocabulary acquisition, i.e., Vocabulary Parade, Word of the Day, Spelling bees, etc.   | Rodriguez, Marleen,<br>mrod11@dadeschools.net  |
| (8/31-10/14) PLST will facilitate PD to teachers on effective Reading instruction, specifically to address direct teaching of decoding, fluency, and vocabulary as precursors to reading.   | Sanchez, Elmo,<br>esanchezjr@dadeschools.net   |
| (8/31-10/14) Teachers will teach phonics deliberately for students to develop awareness of sounds, syllables, word parts, word families, and language structure while reading to the majority second language students who are not yet able to read themselves. | Rodriguez, Rita,<br>rrodriguez@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.

Our school continues to build a positive school culture and environment by addressing the three R's of Respect, Responsibility and Relationships. Respect and Responsibility are taught and modeled from the top down. Our School Leadership Team, Guidance Counselor, and teachers work with students to set personal goals both academic and behavior, track their progress, and celebrate their successes. The school guidance counselor conducts individual class presentations on the Code of Student Conduct at the beginning of the school year. She makes schoolwide announcements and along with administration, facilitated delivery of Values Matter curriculum activities throughout the school year.

The school guidance counselor and administrators communicate the schoolwide incentive programs for students who exhibit proper behavior and positive attitude. Some activities that enrich and highlight these efforts include nominations by teachers for the Do The Right Thing Award. Do the Right Thing of Miami, Inc. recognizes and rewards Miami youth for their exemplary behavior, accomplishments and good deeds through a unique partnership with the City of Miami Police Department and our own MDCPS Police. Students and staff members are also nominated and recognized for exemplifying the value of the month.

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

Our School Leadership Team, comprised of administrators, counselor, and teacher leaders, are all involved in building a positive school culture and environment. The Principal oversees all school initiatives and plans team-building and morale boosting activities throughout the school year. She offers forums of formal and informal collaboration and sharing among teachers and staff members. The Assistant Principal and Community Involvement Specialist monitor activities, participation, and disseminate the information among all stakeholders via a Weekly Staff Bulletin and a Monthly Parent Activity Calendar. The school counselor and our Healthy Me Program partner counselor implement curricula for students to develop healthy self concepts and to make positive choices. The Teacher Leaders, mostly Grade Level Chairpersons and SAC members, assist in the two way communication with our stakeholders. All stakeholders are responsible for building positive relationships with students, parents, and families, to ultimately affect achievement, productivity, and satisfaction.