

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Holmes 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 | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Holmes Elementary School

1175 NW 67TH ST, Miami, FL 33150

<http://holmes.dadeschools.net>

Demographics

Principal: Launa Fuller

Start Date for this Principal: 8/13/2020

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2021-22 Title I School | Yes |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 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: C (49%) 2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: D (35%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | TSI |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

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.

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 | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Holmes Elementary School

1175 NW 67TH ST, Miami, FL 33150

<http://holmes.dadeschools.net>

School Demographics

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

School Grades History

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

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.

At Holmes Elementary School our mission for the 2022-2023 school year is to produce successful lifelong learners. During this mission we will incorporate strategies that create a culture of high expectations in a strong educational atmosphere that is positive, safe and engaging for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision at Holmes Elementary School for the 2022-2023 school year is to develop well-rounded students who aspire to achieve their full potential. This vision, shared by all, will strengthen instructional capacity, incorporate meaningful parent engagement, and unify the relationship between our school and all stakeholders.

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 |
|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Fuller, Launa | Principal | <p>Ms. Launa Fuller is the principal of Holmes Elementary School. Her duties and responsibilities include overseeing all aspects of day-to-day building operations. These task include but are not limited to curriculum, student achievement, payroll, personnel and safety. Her leadership style is one that empowers all members of her staff. Her leadership team members understand the task and are willing and ready to help move Holmes Elementary School to the next level.</p> |
| Johnson, Cliffina | Assistant Principal | <p>Ms. Johnson is the Assistant Principal. Her responsibilities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principal's Designee Overseeing all grade levels Attendance (Student/Staff) Gradebook Manager Curriculum & Instruction / (All Grade Level Chairs) ESOL Fire Drills (Emergency Preparedness) Free & Reduced Meal Program Gradebook Manager IPEGs Evaluations PTSA / Parent Involvement Master Schedule (SIP) School Improvement Plan School Support Personnel Property Control Technology Textbooks Inventory Title I Testing Chairperson Other responsibilities assigned by the Principal |
| Dawkins, Matthew | Teacher, ESE | <p>Mr. Dawkins is our ESE teacher for intermediate grades.</p> <p>Some of his additional duties include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Behavior Plans/Contracts Discipline ESE (IEPs) Master Schedule Monitoring Student Achievement (Data) ESE (SIP) School Improvement Plan SSTs/Staffings/RTi Process Student Services SCAMs (Discipline) |
| Cash, Carol | Reading Coach | <p>Ms. Carol Cash is our Instructional Literacy Coach (Intermediate Grades)</p> <p>Her duties and responsibilities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Articulation |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|----------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | Common Planning Sessions (Weekly) Curriculum & Instruction Interventions Master Schedule Monitoring Student Achievement School-wide Data Trackers Gradebook Mgr (B/U) (SIP) School Improvement Plan Textbooks Future Educators of America |

Ms. Davis-Wright is our Instructional Literacy Coach for primary grades K-2.

| | | |
|----------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Davis-Wright, Nashay | Reading Coach | Her responsibilities include: Articulation Common Planning Sessions (Weekly) Curriculum & Instruction Interventions Master Schedule Monitoring Student Achievement School-wide Data Trackers (SIP) School Improvement Plan Textbooks |
|----------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

| | | |
|------------------|------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Harris, D'Andrea | Math Coach | Ms. D'Andrea Harris is our Mathematics Coach (K-5) Her duties and responsibilities include: Support the development of high quality/effective math instruction at school site; Observe and coach developing math teachers to improve instructional planning, teaching practice, and the use of data, assessment, and instructional technology; Work with various teams (administrators, teachers, leaders) to facilitate analysis of data provided by diagnostics, common assessments, and formative assessments; Help teacher teams develop both school wide and classroom intervention plans; Common Planning Sessions (Weekly); Textbooks |
|------------------|------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Demographic Information

Principal start date
 Thursday 8/13/2020, Launa Fuller

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.*

5

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.*

19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

14

Total number of students enrolled at the school

298

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

4

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

4

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 | 63 | 63 | 46 | 52 | 51 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 343 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 17 | 19 | 10 | 14 | 10 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 8 | 12 | 13 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 7 | 10 | 13 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 23 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 16 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 23 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 7 | 10 | 20 | 15 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 |

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

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 7/29/2022

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 | 21 | 49 | 42 | 47 | 48 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 265 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 | 25 | 18 | 23 | 17 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 13 | 27 | 33 | 24 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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 | 21 | 49 | 42 | 47 | 48 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 265 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 | 25 | 18 | 23 | 17 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 13 | 27 | 33 | 24 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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 | 25% | 62% | 56% | | | | 30% | 62% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 56% | | | | | | 50% | 62% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 79% | | | | | | 50% | 58% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 41% | 58% | 50% | | | | 45% | 69% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 62% | | | | | | 54% | 66% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 58% | | | | | | 44% | 55% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 21% | 64% | 59% | | | | 21% | 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 | 30% | 60% | -30% | 58% | -28% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 25% | 64% | -39% | 58% | -33% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -30% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 25% | 60% | -35% | 56% | -31% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -25% | | | | |

| 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 | 48% | 67% | -19% | 62% | -14% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 35% | 69% | -34% | 64% | -29% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -48% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 40% | 65% | -25% | 60% | -20% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -35% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 18% | 53% | -35% | 53% | -35% |
| 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 | | 43 | | 16 | 50 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 25 | 57 | 78 | 42 | 62 | 58 | 23 | | | | |
| FRL | 24 | 57 | 83 | 41 | 63 | 61 | 22 | | | | |
| 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 | | | | 13 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 22 | 27 | 27 | 34 | 20 | 10 | 22 | | | | |
| HSP | 21 | | | 29 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 22 | 30 | 38 | 33 | 19 | 15 | 23 | | | | |
| 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 | 4 | 26 | 50 | 8 | 39 | 40 | | | | | |
| ELL | 40 | 55 | | 20 | 45 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 30 | 50 | 52 | 46 | 56 | 43 | 19 | | | | |
| HSP | 33 | 64 | | 40 | 50 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 30 | 50 | 50 | 45 | 54 | 44 | 21 | | | | |

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) | TSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 49 |
| 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 | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 342 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 22 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 3 |

| English Language Learners | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 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 | 49 |
| 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 | |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | 50 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

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

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

The district's analysis of Holmes Elementary data trends showed that there was an increase of 5 percentage points in student proficiency achievement in both ELA and Mathematics. Holmes' proficiency for the 2022 FSA ELA was 26% (2021 ELA Data 21%). Holmes' proficiency for the 2022 FSA Math was 40% (2021 Math Data 33%).

Grade 3 ELA proficiency was 30% and Math proficiency was 51%.

Grade 4 ELA proficiency was 29% and Math proficiency was 32%.

Grade 5 ELA proficiency was 21% and Math proficiency was 38%.

All ELA and Math subgroups increased in academic achievement. The Students with Disability (SWD) subgroup was the only subgroup that felled below the Federal Index of 41%. The 2022 FSA data, indicates that 22% of the SWD students were proficient. However, this is an increase from the 2021 FSA, in which only 7% of these students were proficient.

In the area of Learning Gains, the data showed that Holmes Elementary School's learning gain average was higher than the District, Tier 1 Watch, and Tier 2-3 school's average. ELA Learning Gains increased from 34% in 2021 to 67% on the 2022 FSA. Math Learning Gains increased from 31% in 2021 to 70% on the 2022 FSA. Students in the L25 subgroup showed significant achievement growth in ELA and in Math based on the 2022 FSA data.

The 2022 Science proficiency was 21%. Science proficiency decreased by 2 percentage points.

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

The greatest need for improvement based on the 2022 Florida Standards Assessments (FSA) were in the areas of ELA, Reading, and Science Proficiency. The district's comparison indicated that there was an increase in Holmes Elementary School's reading and mathematics from the 2021 FSA Assessment data to the 2022 FSA Assessment data. However, in the area of "Proficiency" there was a large disparity when the district compared Holmes Elementary School to other schools. The district's overall FSA ELA Proficiency was 57% (Holmes 26%). The district's overall FSA Math Proficiency was 55% (Holmes 40%).

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

For the last three years, the school has focused on implementing engagement strategies and differentiated instruction in all classrooms. These strategies aided in learning gains, but no significant growth was evident in the area proficiency. In many of our classrooms, the instruction does not meet the

depth of the standard, and there is limited evidence of the teacher accessing the student's prior knowledge. Other contributing factors that led to proficiency being the greatest area in need of improvement included:

1. Learning Loss due to Covid-19
2. Teacher capacity of the standards in ELA
3. More than 50% of students performing 2 or more grade levels below grade level expectation
4. Limited exposure to vocabulary and phonics resources in ELA, Math, and Science

To address this need for improvement, we will begin to incorporate new factors and strategies which includes:

1. Professional Development and trainings of B.E.S.T. Benchmarks
2. Standard Driven collaborative planning and practices
3. Intensive focus on Tier 2 and Tier 3 students
4. Reading passages with embedded vocabulary in Science
5. Meaningful in-house professional development (ongoing)

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

ELA Learning Gains increased from 34% in 2021 to 67% on the 2022 FSA. Math Learning Gains increased from 31% in 2021 to 70% on the 2022 FSA. Students in the L25 subgroup showed significant achievement growth in ELA and in Math based on the 2022 FSA data. L25 learning gains in ELA increased from 38% in 2021 to 79% on the 2022 FSA. L25 learning gains in the area of Math increased from 15% in 2021 to 58% on the 2022 FSA.

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

The School Leadership Team (SLT) created math and reading strategic intervention groups and intervention plans that remediated standard deficiencies. During collaborative planning, teachers, coaches, interventionists, and often administrators collaborated to plan lessons and disaggregate the data for differentiated instruction (DI). DI and intervention was done with fidelity.

New actions that will take place includes a greater emphasis on improving proficiency in all subject areas.

Administrators will attend more collaborative planning sessions. Additionally, administrators will continue building the capacity of instructional coaches through leadership development and schoolwide decision-making.

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

Strategies implemented to accelerate learning will include:

Standard-based instruction,
Meaningful deep collaborated planning sessions with all stakeholders,
Monitoring of Student Engagement,
Extended Learning Opportunities,
Interventions- RTI
Differentiated Instruction with fidelity

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.

Job-embedded professional development will be offered to support teachers and instructional leaders in the building. Professional developments such as "B.E.S.T. Collaborative Planning with a Lens on the FEI" (August 15th), "Standard-Aligned Instruction in ELA and Math" (September), "Understanding the Data and Tracking OPMs" (October), and the "Aligning Resources to Small Group Instruction" (November/December) trainings have already been outlined as training sessions for this school year. Coaching cycles will also be implemented individually with teachers to support specific needs.

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

For the 2022-2023 school year, additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond will begin with focusing on student grade-level achievement (proficiency), creating a culture of high expectations, building positive learning environments, building capacity of the instructional staff in B.E.S.T., and providing strategic support to both primary and intermediate grade levels across all contents.

Creating a culture of high expectations by:

1. Continuing real-time communication with all stakeholders
2. Using all forms of communication to increase parent engagement and support
3. Attending and monitoring collaborative planning sessions from planning stages to the delivery of instruction.

Building a positive learning environment by:

1. Providing weekly, monthly, and quarterly incentives for students based on performance
2. Providing monthly recognition opportunities for faculty and staff members
3. Providing and monitoring a clean and safe learning environment

Building capacity of instructional delivery by:

1. Providing real-time professional development for all staff
2. Effective use of Instruction Transformation Coaches (primary/intermediate)
3. Effective use of Interventionists (primary/intermediate)

Additionally, the school will offer after-school tutoring, Saturday tutoring camps, and other extended learning opportunities such as Winter Break academy which will aide in providing additional academic support to different subgroups. In the area of ELA, the school will focus extended support for the Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. In the area of Math and Science, the school will focus extended support for the Tier 1 and Tier 2 students.

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 Math

**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

According to the 2022 SAT-10 data, 25% of Holmes Elementary School K-2 students were proficient in math. This is lower than the District (50%), Tier 1 (62%) and Tier 1 Watch/2/3 schools (31%).

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

The 2022 FSA data shows that only 40% of 3rd – 5th graders were proficient in mathematics. This is also lower than the District (55%), Tier 1 (60%), and Tier 1 watch schools (45%). Based on the data and adoption of the new mathematical B.E.S.T benchmarks, we will focus on the target area of Math to boost math proficiency schoolwide.

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

If we are successful with the implementation of Math as the schoolwide area of focus using the Student-Centered Learning (SCL) approach, we anticipate a 10 percentage point increase in overall mathematics proficiency as evident by the 2023 FAST Assessment; PM 3.

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

In order to meet the desired outcome, Student-Centered Learning will be monitored through administrative bi-weekly walkthroughs, Teacher-Coach data chats, Coach-administrator data chats, collaborative planning with end product, targeted intervention for student remediation/enrichment, school-wide data trackers, and coaching cycles.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cliffina Johnson (washingtonc@dadeschools.net)

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

The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this are of focus is Student-Centered Learning which will utilize a variety of instructional approaches, academic-support strategies, and deliberate interventions to meet the learning needs of all students.

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

Student-Centered Learning uses student interests, academic needs, and background knowledge to differentiate learning experiences to help students reach their highest potential. Implementation of the SCL strategy in the area of math will minimize the achievement gap and accelerate academic achievement. Students will demonstrate their understanding by engaging in various rigorous tasks.

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.

Action Step 1:

Transformation Coach will conduct a professional development for math teachers on Professional Development Day. As a result, teachers will have a clear understanding of the new B.E.S.T benchmarks, Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards (MTRS), transitions, online tools, teaching resources, and instructional framework.

Date: 08/15/22

Person Responsible D'Andrea Harris (324876@dadeschools.net)

Action Step 2:

During collaborative planning, the transformation coach will provide benchmark-aligned resources for instruction to include remediation and/or enrichment for students based on topic assessment and progress-monitoring data. As a result, teachers will have student groups, appropriate resources, and lesson plans that reflect DI instruction.

Date(s): 08/22/22 - 10/14/22

Person Responsible D'Andrea Harris (324876@dadeschools.net)

Action Step 3:

Coach will model best practices and strategies during planning and classroom instruction. As a result, teachers will be provided support for the new framework and expectations.

Date(s): 08/22/22 - 10/14/22

Person Responsible D'Andrea Harris (324876@dadeschools.net)

Action Step 4:

School Leadership Team (SLT) will conduct bi-weekly walkthroughs to monitor implementation of specific strategies. Timely feedback will be provided to teachers to encourage reflection and shifts in practices. As a result, the team will ensure that actions steps and expectations are done with efficiency and fidelity.

Date(s): 08/22/22 - 10/14/22

Person Responsible Cliffina Johnson (washingtonc@dadeschools.net)

Action Step 5:

During planning the Transformation Coach will plan for strategic question selection for independent application as well as use the BIG-M to identify common misconceptions and plan for error. As a result, each student will have access to tiered benchmark-aligned practice to increase levels of mathematical thinking and reasoning.

Dates: 10/31/22 - 12/16/22

Person Responsible D'Andrea Harris (324876@dadeschools.net)

Action Step 6:

Transformation Coach will conduct a Professional Development on the framework components and 3-reads protocol to dissect word problems. Collaborative planning will also include modeling the 3-reads protocol for dissecting and solving word problems. As a result, students will demonstrate increased comprehension of word problems as evident by topic assessments.

Dates: 10/31/22 - 12/16/22

Person Responsible D'Andrea Harris (324876@dadeschools.net)

Action Step 7:

The Transformation Coach will conduct walkthroughs to monitor DI implementation. As a result, small group differentiated instruction will occur with fidelity and students will have multiple opportunities to master FL BEST Benchmarks.

Dates: 10/31/22 - 12/16/22

Person Responsible Cliffina Johnson (washingtonc@dadeschools.net)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Shared Leadership

Area of Focus Description and

Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. According to the 2020-2021 School Climate Survey feedback from staff, 88% agreed that their ideas were listened to and considered, in comparison to 69% during the 2021-2022 School Climate Survey feedback. Although there was only a 19-percentage point difference, our targeted area is leadership and relationships. This data indicates there is a need for improvement in leadership and staff relations. We will focus on implementing ongoing Team Building Activities to promote increasing the of voice amongst all staff.

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

If we successfully implement Shared Leadership, our staff morale will increase 11 percentage points in the 2022-2023 Climate survey by June 2022.

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

The Administrative and School Leadership Team will offer on-going opportunities to the teachers, staff and all stakeholders to be a part of the decision-making process related to the school’s organization, operation, and academics. We will utilize stakeholder-led committees to receive input and garner ideas on initiatives/strategies/systems that they would like to have implemented in our school. A shared leadership model is widely regarded as an alternative to more traditional forms of school governance in which the principal or administrative team exercises executive authority and decided most governance decisions without involving all stakeholders. The Holmes Elementary Leadership Team welcomes input from all members involved in the process of student achievement and the overall success of the school. Teachers will be afforded every opportunity to demonstrate leadership skills based on survey responses. Examples may include maintaining a strong Parent Teacher Student Association (PTSA) or an engaged Educational Excellence School Advisory Council (EESAC).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cliffina Johnson (washingtonc@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-

Within the Area of Focus of Positive Culture and Environment, we will focus on Shared Leadership to ensure that our teachers have a voice and can participate in the decision-making process.

**based
strategy
being
implemented
for this Area
of Focus.**

**Rationale for
Evidence-
based**

Strategy:

**Explain the
rationale for
selecting
this specific
strategy.**

We want our teachers, staff, and stakeholders to feel incorporated in the decision-making process of our school. Spearheading different initiatives will provide leadership opportunities for teachers while also considering their input on what initiatives to implement and utilize.

**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.

Action Step 1:

Conduct a staff survey to poll interest in leadership opportunities. As a result, teachers will be given the opportunity to express personal interests in leadership opportunities at the school.

Dates: 08/13/22

Person

Responsible

Cliffina Johnson (washingtonc@dadeschools.net)

Action Step 2:

Allow teachers and staff to plan and coordinate various Professional Developments for the school. This action will build the teachers' capacities and improve collaboration with the SLT and staff.

Date(s): 08/22/22 - 10/14/22

Person

Responsible

Cliffina Johnson (washingtonc@dadeschools.net)

Action Step 3:

Invite teachers to be a part of School Leadership Team (SLT) meetings and include in the decision-making process for school related matters. This action will build the teachers' capacities and improve collaboration with the SLT and staff.

Date(s): 08/22/22 - 10/14/22

Person

Responsible

Cliffina Johnson (washingtonc@dadeschools.net)

Action Step 4:

School Leadership Team will monitor expectations. As a result, the team will ensure that actions are put in place to improve staff relations schoolwide.

Date(s): 08/22/22 - 10/14/22

Person Responsible Launa Fuller (pr2501@dadeschools.net)

Action Step 5:
School Leadership Team will

Date(s): 10/31/22 - 12/16/22

Person Responsible Launa Fuller (pr2501@dadeschools.net)

Action Step 6:
We will continue to identify Team Leaders of the Month during Faculty Meeting. This action will build the teachers' capacities and improve collaboration with the SLT and staff.

Date(s): 10/31/22 - 12/16/22

Person Responsible Cliffina Johnson (washingtonc@dadeschools.net)

#3. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: According to 2022 End of Year Climate Survey data 83% of the staff stated that they are provided the "opportunity to be considered for leadership roles" at the school which is a 17-percentage point difference from the 2021 End of Year Climate Survey. Holmes Elementary School will focus on "Empowering Others" to address the leadership development needs within our school.
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Measurable Outcome: If we successfully implement the "Empowering Others" strategy, our teachers and staff will be provided the opportunity to contribute to school-wide decisions. This will be realized through teachers participating in the logistical elements of meetings, presenting ideas to solve issues that arise, facilitating PDs. We believe these efforts will teachers in leadership roles will increase by at least 10% during the 2022-2023 school year.
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Monitoring: The SLT will monitor the progress of this initiative to inspire staff with the use of in-house surveys and the teacher and staff willingness to participate in leadership roles. This will also be evident when teachers display knowledge they have learned during school-wide meetings involving the SLT and other faculty members.
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cliffina Johnson (washingtonc@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The School Leadership Team will use the evidence-based strategy Empowering Others to strengthen the area of Transformation Leadership Development.
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Empowering Others involves providing stakeholders autonomy and agency in order to take action where necessary, problem solve, and implement best practices that will assist in meeting the needs of all students. The SLT will provide stakeholders lead roles in initiatives and activities and identify the skills necessary to assist stakeholders in being successful in these roles. By engaging all stakeholders in working together towards shared objectives and ensuring all members share responsibility and accountability.
Explain the 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.

Action Step 1:

During the Opening of School Meeting, the administration team will share the End of Year (EOY) Climate Survey data. Teachers will be given the opportunity to review data and share-out ways to improve the school. As a result, all staff will work together to improve the school's climate.

Date(s): 08/12/22

Person Responsible Cliffina Johnson (washingtonc@dadeschools.net)

Action Step 2:

Teachers will be polled to see if they are interested in taking on a leadership role such as an instructional coach, activities director, site coordinator, or other roles at the school. As a result, teachers will be given the opportunity to express personal interests in leadership opportunities at the school.

Date(s): 08/22/22 - 10/14/22

Person Responsible Launa Fuller (pr2501@dadeschools.net)

Action Step 3:

Non-Instructional staff will be provided the opportunity to spearhead events at the school. As a result, leaders will be built throughout the school.

Date(s): 08/22/22 - 10/14/22

Person Responsible Launa Fuller (pr2501@dadeschools.net)

Action Step 4:

Administration Team will monitor expectations. As a result, the team will ensure that action steps are completed to ensure that we improve staff relations schoolwide.

Date(s): 08/22/22 - 10/14/22

Person Responsible Launa Fuller (pr2501@dadeschools.net)

Action Step 5:

We will continue to identify Team Leaders of the Month during Faculty Meeting. This action will build the teachers' capacities and improve collaboration with the SLT and staff.

Date(s): 10/31/22 - 12/16/22

Person Responsible Cliffina Johnson (washingtonc@dadeschools.net)

Action Step 6:

Select teachers to be the Principal and AP for the day. As a result, the teacher leaders will understand the roles of administration and their responsibilities which will assist with improving relationships.

Date(s): 10/31/22 - 12/16/22

Person Responsible Launa Fuller (pr2501@dadeschools.net)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus

Description and

Rationale:

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

According to the 2021-2022 Florida Department of Education (FLDOE) Report Card, there was one subgroup that fell below the 41% proficiency threshold. Students with Disabilities (SWDs) fell below this threshold. The Tier 3 population of our school is made up largely by this group of students. Based on this understanding, we will target the Tier 3 population in reading to improve our ESSA percentile.

Measurable

Outcome:

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

If we successfully implement strategies to support our Tier 3 students, then our with SWD achievement data will increase by an additional 10 percentage point on the F.A.S.T. Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The School Leadership Team will conduct data chats, monitor i-Ready, F.A.S.T., and intervention data consistently. We will also focus our attention on adjusting the grouping and plans of these specified subgroups. By monitoring and adjusting the plan according to data, the school team hopes to improve our ESSA data. The SWD students will be tracked by the ESE teacher to ensure that these students are making improvements.

Person

responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cliffina Johnson (washingtonc@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Within the targeted element of the Students with Disability Subgroup, we will focus on the strategy of "Ongoing Progress Monitoring" in ELA. The OPM strategy will assist in accelerating the learning gains of our Tier 3 students which are the SWD students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The Ongoing Progress Monitoring strategy will allow teachers and the SLT team to assess students' academic performance, to quantify a student rate of improvement or responsiveness to instruction, and to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction. This will also ensure that teachers are using relevant, recent, and aligned data to plan lessons that are customized to student needs. Teachers will continually make adjustments to their instruction, plans, and instructional delivery as new data becomes available.

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.

Action Step 1:

During the faculty meeting, the administration team will share and discuss academic area for improvement based on the 2022 FSA data. The team will focus on student proficiency across all content and subcategories that fell below 41% specially the Students with Disabilities (SWDs). By sharing the data, the entire staff will understand how the subgroup of SWDs affects overall proficiency.

Date(s): 09/06/22

Person Responsible Launa Fuller (pr2501@dadeschools.net)

Action Step 2:

The SWD students' data from district assessments will be tracked by the ESE teacher and leadership team to ensure that these students are making improvements towards proficiency. This action will ensure that the SLT and teachers are monitoring these students' data and are making necessary adjustments as needed.

Date(s): 08/22/22 - 10/14/22

Person Responsible Carol Cash (carolcash@dadeschools.net)

Action Step 3:

The ESE teacher will provide teachers with a list of the ESE students and their accommodations that they must receive. As a result, teachers will be able to provide additional strategies to these students in order to improve their performance.

Date(s): 08/22/22 - 10/14/22

Person Responsible Matthew Dawkins (mjdawkins@dadeschools.net)

Action Step 4:

During collaborative planning the instructional coaches will share the plan and expectations with teachers and interventionists to meet the needs of all students. As a result, teachers and coaches will have the same expectations and goals.

Date(s): 08/22/22 - 10/14/22

Person Responsible Carol Cash (carolcash@dadeschools.net)

Action Step 5:

Coaches will collaborate with teacher to develop additional systems and routines to streamline intervention and DI to assist with improving the proficiency for our Tier 3 students (SWD). As a result, teachers and coaches will be able to provide additional strategies to support these students to improve their performance.

Date(s): 10/31/22 - 12/16/22

Person Responsible Carol Cash (carolcash@dadeschools.net)

Action Step 6:

The SLT will celebrate the success of Students with Disabilities (SWD). This action will reward students for making academic improvements which will encourage them to work towards their individualized growth

plan.

Date(s): 10/31/22 - 12/16/22

Person Responsible Matthew Dawkins (mjdawkins@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

According to the 2022 SAT-10 data, 65% of kindergarten students were on or above grade level, 25% of 1st grade students were on or above grade level, 2nd grade 9% of the students were on or above grade level. In 2021 SAT-10 data shows 54% of kindergarten students were on or above grade level, 7% of 1st grade students were on or above grade level and 11% of 2nd grade students were on or above grade level. Based on the data, differentiated instruction has been proven to be effective in grades K-1. However, the focus will be on Standard-Aligned Instruction to close the learning gaps in ELA.

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

According to the 2022 FSA proficiency data, 30% of the 3rd -grade students are proficient in ELA, 29% of the 4th-grade students are proficient in ELA, and 21% of the 5th grade students are proficient in ELA. The 2021 FSA proficiency data shows 25% of the 3rd grade students are proficient in ELA, 14% of the 4th grade students are proficient in ELA, and 25% of the 5th grade students are proficient in ELA. Based on the data, the Gradual Release of Responsibilities Model (GRRM) has been proven to be effective in moving the intermediate elementary grades. However, with the implementation of new ELA standards, we will focus on direct instruction using the "Standard-Aligned Instruction Strategy" to increase student achievement 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 the Standard-Aligned Instruction Strategy and the continued practice of the Gradual Release of Responsibilities Model (GRRM) at least 40% of the students in grade K-2 will demonstrate a year of growth in ELA.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

With the implementation of the Standard-Aligned Instruction Strategy and the continued practice of the Gradual Release of Responsibilities Model (GRRM) the overall proficiency for grades three through five on the state FAST Assessment will increase by ten percentage points from the previous year's proficiency of 25%.

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.

The Leadership Team will conduct quarterly data chats, adjust groups based on current data in real time, and follow-up with regular walkthroughs to ensure that differentiation is aligned to current data. Administrators will review bi-weekly lesson plans for indication of differentiation for L25 students, in particular. Data Analysis of formative assessments of L25 students will be reviewed monthly to observe progress. We will create an online tracker to monitor OPM data on a bi-weekly basis. This data will be analyzed during Leadership Team meetings to ensure students are demonstrating growth on remediated standards. Extended learning opportunities will be provided to those students who are not showing growth on OPMs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Johnson, Cliffina, washingtonc@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?

Within the targeted area of proficiency, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of Standard-Aligned Instruction for grades K-5. This strategy will enhance the production and execution of lessons based on the learning targets to ensure that the pedagogy of the teacher and all student products are aligned to the intended B.E.S.T standards. This will be evidenced by student work samples i.e., DI folders and RWC lesson outcome pages of completion.

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?

Focusing on the area of "Standard-Aligned Instruction" as an evidence-based strategy will ensure that the delivery of the lessons are aligned to the B.E.S.T. Standards through planning. The identification of learning targets, teaching techniques, and work samples will address the need of all learners. The student work samples will serve as data points to measure their understanding of the standard for the purposes of remediation or enrichment.

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 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Action Step 1: Provide quality in-house professional development during the Opening of Schools mandatory Professional Development Day across all contents. "The B.E.S.T Collaborative Planning with a Lens on the F.E.I". As a result of this practice the teachers will be able to produce lessons that are aligned to the new B.E.S.T ELA standards.</p> <p>Date: August 14, 2022</p> | <p>Cash, Carol, carolcash@dadeschools.net</p> |
| <p>Action Step 2: Weekly collaborative planning will focus on the "direct explicit instruction" that aligns to the B.E.S.T. standards. Additionally, coaches conduct walk throughs to look for evidence of planning. As a result of this practice the teachers will be able to produce weekly lessons that are explicit and aligned to the B.E.S.T. standards.</p> <p>Date(s): 08/22/22 - 10/14/22</p> | <p>Davis-Wright, Nashay, nashaydm@dadeschools.net</p> |
| <p>ELA transformation coaches will monitor the bi-weekly PMA's on-line tracker to help teacher's pinpoint areas of concern in instruction. This action will ensure that the coaches and teachers are monitoring the students' data and are making necessary adjustments as needed.</p> <p>Date(s):08/22/22 - 10/14/22</p> | <p>Davis-Wright, Nashay, nashaydm@dadeschools.net</p> |
| <p>The ELA Coaches will model lessons for teachers. As a result, coaching cycles will be on-going utilizing the framework of the F.E.I.</p> <p>Date(s): 08/22/22 - 10/14/22</p> | <p>Johnson, Cliffina, washingtonc@dadeschools.net</p> |
| <p>The ELA Coaches during collaborative planning, will shift from the "What" is being taught in planning to the process of "How" lessons should be delivered to ensure that deep explicit instruction is provided for students.</p> <p>Date(s): 10/31/22 - 12/16/22</p> | <p>Johnson, Cliffina, washingtonc@dadeschools.net</p> |
| <p>The ELA Transformation Coaches, will introduce specific selected collaborative strategies that will be modelled during instruction on how to incorporate them in lessons to aid in the overall comprehension of the students.</p> <p>Date(s): 10/31/22 - 12/16/22</p> | <p>Cash, Carol, carolcash@dadeschools.net</p> |

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

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

At Holmes Elementary, positive school culture and environment are rooted in the relationships fostered between all stakeholders, emphasis on mental/physical health, emotional support within a safe and secure campus for students and staff. Through numerous students, teacher, parent and community initiative's, Holmes provides unique provide meaningful engagement between stakeholders aimed at addressing student needs and achievement. Administration and the leadership team afford and encourage staff to attend numerous team-building activities and professional developments throughout the school year. Classroom, student and teacher successes and achievements are highlighted, celebrated, and recognized. Holmes provides opportunities for all teachers and parents/guardians to provide their opinion, ideas, and ongoing feedback to Administration. Staff coordinates and conducts student and class conferences to check the pulse of what is successful and what "might need change." (rewrite) Holmes ingratiates all stakeholders by providing all pertinent and necessary information in a timely manner and through multiple mediums to ensure receipt. Email, social media, text & phone messages, monthly calendars, and flyers are implemented to ensure open and constant communication. Holmes Elementary is constantly analyzing and fine-tuning systems to ensure that we are providing a safe classroom that foster remarkable students' achievement through engagement and learning.

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

At Holmes Elementary, stakeholders are tasked with the creation and nurturing of a positive and enriched school culture and environment. The stakeholders involved are the School Leadership team which consists of the principal, assistant principals, instructional coaches, teacher leaders, and counselors. The principal's role is to monitor and oversee all the school's initiatives and respond to concerns with morale by planning team-building and morale boosting activities. The Administrative team will monitor the mentorship programs and assist in ensuring all information is shared with stakeholders in a timely manner. Teacher leaders and instructional coaches assist in providing and responding to feedback from stakeholders. All stakeholders will hold responsibility for making specific efforts to connect and build relationships with students, parents, and families.