

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# Morningside K 8 Academy



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</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>  |

# Morningside K 8 Academy

6620 NE 5TH AVE, Miami, FL 33138

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

## Demographics

Principal: Leonardo Mourino

Start Date for this Principal: 7/20/2020

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Combination School<br>PK-8   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: A (69%)<br>2018-19: B (60%)<br>2017-18: B (61%)   |
| <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>10</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>  |

# Morningside K 8 Academy

6620 NE 5TH AVE, Miami, FL 33138

<http://morningside.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) |
| Combination School<br>PK-8                              | 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                            | 96%   |

## School Grades History

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

The mission of Morningside K-8 Academy is to achieve academic excellence in a caring, safe, and healthy environment. The stakeholders deem that all students benefit from a program in which Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, Reading, Speaking and Writing in the English Language are stressed and incorporated with a strong technology component. In the language magnet program, students are given a choice of French, Spanish, or Haitian Creole. The curriculum also includes Art, Music and Physical Education. We emphasize self-worth by valuing our students as individuals and by respecting their different cultures. As part of our curriculum, we provide a differentiated approach to instruction and a focus on literacy that promotes high achievement. We recognize that children have various learning styles, and we are committed to multiple teaching methods to ensure their academic success. Through an integration of the BEST Standards and the use of best instructional practices, an arena is created that stimulates, challenges and guides students to their goals. We strive to unite with parents and community members to form a strong fellowship that will help us achieve success. We endeavor to provide a quality education for each student in a school that adapts to the changing environment.

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

The Morningside K-8 Academy community has high expectations for excellence. Teachers, staff, parents, students, and the community will work together to foster an environment where students are excited about learning and work at the peak of their abilities. We believe that learning is a lifelong process, one in which all the stakeholders are fully committed. We will provide an environment that is child-centered, maintaining a balance between the cognitive and affective domains seeking to develop the whole child. As a community rich in diversity, we take pride in and celebrate our uniqueness. We expect students to take responsibility for their actions, respect one another, and make ethical choices. We challenge our children to become critical and creative thinkers and problem-solvers who can work both independently and collaboratively using their failures as learning tools as they prepare to become productive citizens.

### 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   |
|------------------------|---------------------|---|
| Mourino, Leonardo      | Principal           | School Operations, School Based-Budget, Curriculum, Internal Funds, Educational Leadership, Educational Excellence School Advisory Committee (EESAC), Dade Partners |
| Dorvily, Nicole        | Assistant Principal | School Operations, Curriculum, Test Chairperson, Master Schedule, Exceptional Student Education, English Language Learners, LEA, Student Services                   |
| Carrington, Juliet     | Teacher, K-12       | Grade 3 Chairperson, KAPOW Program Liaison, Sunshine Committee, PTSA Member   |
| Abou-Assali, Mona      | Teacher, K-12       | PRE-K Synergy Member  |
| Asencio, Monica        | Teacher, K-12       | Grade 5 Grade Teacher & Chairperson, ELA Liaison, O'Miami Liaison   |
| Southwood-smith, Tammy | Teacher, K-12       | Algebra 1 Teacher, Teacher Leader, Technology Liaison, Intramural Sports  |
| Mariano-Rosete, Marice | Teacher, K-12       | 4th Grade Teacher & Chairperson, Math Liaison, EESAC Member (Secretary), Gifted Program Chairperson   |
| Marks, Kevin           | Teacher, K-12       | Upper Academy Teacher & Chairperson, Social Studies Liaison, EESAC Member   |
| Forero, Veronica       | Teacher, K-12       | Kindergarten Teacher & Chairperson, EESAC Chair   |
| Rivero, Mercedes       | Teacher, K-12       | Pre K Teacher and Chairperson   |
| Woodley, Yulanda       | Teacher, ESE        | ESE Teacher, ELL Program Chairperson  |
| Blot, Rose             | Magnet Coordinator  | Media Specialist, Lead Teacher, Special Area Chairperson, PLST Member, EESAC, After School Teacher, African American Advocate Member                                |
| Okany, Obiageli        | School Counselor    | Elementary School Counselor, Student Services Liaison, Safety Patrol Sponsor  |
| Soriano, Silvana       | Other               | Art Teacher, Digital Innovator, PLST Member, Schoology LMS, Art Club Sponsor  |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Monday 7/20/2020, Leonardo Mourino

**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.*

6

**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.*

35

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

42

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

427

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

1

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

2

**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                              | 57          | 55 | 38 | 45 | 46 | 53 | 47 | 29 | 26 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 396   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0  | 6  | 3  | 4  | 3  | 5  | 2  | 2  | 3 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 28    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 3  | 8  | 5  | 2  | 5  | 3  | 1  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 27    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 6  | 5  | 2  | 2  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 8  | 5  | 12 | 9  | 5  | 1  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 40    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 5  | 11 | 10 | 13 | 8  | 7  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 54    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 3  | 9  | 11 | 5  | 13 | 9  | 9  | 6  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 65    |

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



| Indicator | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-----------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|           | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |

|                                      |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |   |   |   |   |   |    |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 6 | 12 | 10 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|----|

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 | 5 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|

|                                     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/29/2022

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 | 42 | 43 | 47 | 65 | 52 | 49 | 27 | 34 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 389 |
|-----------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|-----|

|                             |   |   |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |
|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| Attendance below 90 percent | 4 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 12 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |
|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|

|                         |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |
|-------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|-------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|

|                       |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |
|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|

|                        |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |
|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|

|  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|

|  |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |   |   |   |   |   |     |
|--|---|----|----|----|----|----|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 3 | 16 | 12 | 25 | 13 | 13 | 4 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 |
|--|---|----|----|----|----|----|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-----|

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

| Indicator | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-----------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|           | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |

|                                      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| Students with two or more indicators | 2 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|

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 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|

|                                     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

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

| Indicator  | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
|  | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 42          | 43 | 47 | 65 | 52 | 49 | 27 | 34 | 30 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 389   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 4           | 9  | 8  | 9  | 12 | 1  | 1  | 2  | 1  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 47    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 4  | 4  | 6  | 8  | 2  | 2  | 6  | 4  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 36    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 6  | 4  | 5  | 3  | 5  | 8  | 7  | 2  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 40    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7  | 2  | 0  | 4  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 13    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4  | 2  | 7  | 7  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 20    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 3           | 16 | 12 | 25 | 13 | 13 | 4  | 10 | 8  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 104   |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 2           | 6 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 43    |

**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     | 6           | 6 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data Review**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component      | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 58%    | 62%      | 55%   |        |          |       | 62%    | 63%      | 61%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 57%    |          |       |        |          |       | 62%    | 61%      | 59%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 60%    |          |       |        |          |       | 54%    | 57%      | 54%   |
| Math Achievement            | 55%    | 51%      | 42%   |        |          |       | 55%    | 67%      | 62%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 70%    |          |       |        |          |       | 46%    | 63%      | 59%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 64%    |          |       |        |          |       | 40%    | 56%      | 52%   |
| Science Achievement         | 59%    | 60%      | 54%   |        |          |       | 61%    | 56%      | 56%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 100%   | 68%      | 59%   |        |          |       | 100%   | 80%      | 78%   |

**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 | 60%    | 60%      | 0%                         | 58%   | 2%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 57%    | 64%      | -7%                        | 58%   | -1%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -60%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 64%    | 60%      | 4%                         | 56%   | 8%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -57%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 51%    | 58%      | -7%                        | 54%   | -3%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -64%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 69%    | 56%      | 13%                        | 52%   | 17%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -51%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 63%    | 60%      | 3%                         | 56%   | 7%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -69%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| 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 | 68%    | 67%      | 1%                         | 62%   | 6%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 41%    | 69%      | -28%                       | 64%   | -23%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -68%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| <b>MATH</b>       |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Grade</b>      | <b>Year</b> | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School-District Comparison</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School-State Comparison</b> |
|                   | 2019        | 55%           | 65%             | -10%                              | 60%          | -5%                            |
| Cohort Comparison |             | -41%          |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 06                | 2022        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        | 44%           | 58%             | -14%                              | 55%          | -11%                           |
| Cohort Comparison |             | -55%          |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 07                | 2022        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        | 61%           | 53%             | 8%                                | 54%          | 7%                             |
| Cohort Comparison |             | -44%          |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 08                | 2022        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        | 33%           | 40%             | -7%                               | 46%          | -13%                           |
| Cohort Comparison |             | -61%          |                 |                                   |              |                                |

| <b>SCIENCE</b>    |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Grade</b>      | <b>Year</b> | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School-District Comparison</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School-State Comparison</b> |
| 05                | 2022        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        | 46%           | 53%             | -7%                               | 53%          | -7%                            |
| Cohort Comparison |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 06                | 2022        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison |             | -46%          |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 07                | 2022        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison |             | 0%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 08                | 2022        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        | 87%           | 43%             | 44%                               | 48%          | 39%                            |
| Cohort Comparison |             | 0%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |

| <b>BIOLOGY EOC</b> |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Year</b>        | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2022               |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| 2019               |               |                 |                              |              |                           |

| <b>CIVICS EOC</b> |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
|-------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Year</b>       | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2022              |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| 2019              | 100%          | 73%             | 27%                          | 71%          | 29%                       |

| <b>HISTORY EOC</b> |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Year</b>        | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2022               |               |                 |                              |              |                           |

| HISTORY EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| ALGEBRA EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 80%    | 63%      | 17%                   | 61%   | 19%                |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         |        |          |                       |       |                    |

**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                                       | 48       | 55     | 60          | 39        | 68      | 64           | 50       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 50       | 45     | 44          | 47        | 63      | 65           | 43       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 56       | 53     | 63          | 49        | 71      | 65           | 52       | 100     |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 59       | 61     | 45          | 63        | 67      |              | 70       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 56       | 56     | 61          | 53        | 70      | 65           | 58       | 100     | 100       |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 31       | 37     |             | 17        | 19      | 25           | 14       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 49       | 61     | 57          | 29        | 33      | 29           | 48       | 64      |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 49       | 49     | 59          | 34        | 29      | 26           | 35       | 83      |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 60       | 60     |             | 45        | 38      |              | 70       | 93      |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 51       | 50     | 51          | 35        | 29      | 31           | 39       | 87      |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 42       | 46     | 39          | 34        | 39      | 21           | 50       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 55       | 63     | 61          | 39        | 52      | 54           | 71       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 60       | 62     | 52          | 49        | 45      | 42           | 56       | 100     | 52        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 64       | 60     | 58          | 67        | 49      | 33           | 71       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 61       | 62     | 54          | 54        | 47      | 40           | 58       | 100     | 56        |                   |                     |

**ESSA Data Review**

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

| <b>ESSA Federal Index</b>   |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | N/A  |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 70   |
| 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 | 72   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 695  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 10   |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |
| <b>Subgroup Data</b>  |      |
| <b>Students With Disabilities</b>   |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 55   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 0    |
| <b>English Language Learners</b>  |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 54   |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%        | 0    |
| <b>Native American Students</b>   |      |
| 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    |
| <b>Asian Students</b>   |      |
| 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    |
| <b>Black/African American Students</b>  |      |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                 | 64   |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?         | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%  | 0    |
| <b>Hispanic Students</b>  |      |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students   | 63   |

| Hispanic Students  |     |
|--|-----|
| 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                                | 69  |
| 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?

According to the 2022 FSA proficiency data, 64% of the students in 3rd grade, 47 % in 4th, 60 % in 5th, 55 % in 6th, 53 % in 7th, and 63 % in 8th are proficient in ELA. 52% of the students in 3rd, 58% in 4th, 57% in 5th, 42% in 6th, 43 % in 7th, and 31% in 8th are proficient in Mathematics. 51% of the students in 5th and 68% in 8th are proficient in Science. 100% of the students in 7th and in 8th scored at proficiency levels in Civics and Algebra 1, respectively.

In comparison, 2021 FSA proficiency data indicated that 39% of the students in 3rd grade, 60% in 4th, 48 % in 5th, 59% in 6th, 50% in 7th, and 66% in 8th were proficient in ELA. 27% of the students in 3rd, 63% in 4th, 28% in 5th, 24% in 6th, 38% in 7th, and 42% in 8th were proficient in Mathematics. 44% of the students in 5th and 62% in 8th were proficient in Science. 88% of the students in 7th grade and 80% of the students in 8th scored proficient in Civics and Algebra 1, respectively.

Based on the data, differentiation has proven to be an effective tool at both the elementary and secondary levels. Continued differentiated instruction will help ensure improved academic performance during the 2022-2023 school year.

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

According to the 2021-2022 FSA ELA Assessment results, only 47% of rising 5th grade ELA students performed proficiently. According to the 2021-2022 SAT-10 ELA Assessment, 47% of rising 3rd grade students are performing below proficiency. According to i-Ready AP3 data, 42% of rising 7th graders performed at grade level, indicating 58% of students below proficiency.

Because of these findings, these groups of students are in need of remediation and targeted support.

Based on i-Ready AP3 data, 41% of rising third graders performed at grade level proficiency. Continuing with i-Ready AP3 data, 36% of rising 7th grade students were at grade level proficiency, while rising 37% of rising 8th graders were at grade level proficiency.

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

The data findings demonstrate significant loss occurred during the 2020-2021 academic school year. A combination of low enrollment and FTE impacted teacher allocations and class sizes. Consistent interventions and progress monitoring must be implemented with fidelity.

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

Based on the data reviewed, 4th grade students achieved an 8 percentage point gain on the FSA ELA Assessment from 39% to 47%, as well as a 31 percentage point gain on the FSA Math Assessment from 27% to 58%.

6th grade students achieved a 7 percentage point gain on the FSA ELA Assessment 48% to 55% proficient, as well as also achieving a 14 percentage point gain from 28% to 42% proficient on the FSA Math Assessment.

7th grade students also achieved a 19 percentage point gain achieving 24% to 43% proficiency on the FSA Math Assessment.

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

Returning to in person instruction, as well as consistent differentiated instruction made a positive impact on student learning and gains. We also offered various tutoring opportunities that included Before School, After School, Saturday Academy, and Spring Break Academy.

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

We will continue to offer to consistent differentiated instruction and technology integration throughout whole group and small group instruction. Data driven instruction and enrichment will help target accelerated learning.

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



Professional development regarding the B.E.S.T. Benchmarks will be offered so that teachers can learn and master these new benchmarks. Technology course offerings will also be provided so that teachers can become knowledgeable and proficient in new technological platforms. We will also work towards improving our MTSS/RTI process.

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

In order to ensure sustainability of improvement in the upcoming year and beyond, administration will continue to monitor student attendance and provide incentives to students and families. Before and after school tutoring, as well as Saturday Academy, will continue to be offered, in addition to clubs that support various academic content areas.

**Areas of Focus**

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

:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

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

According to the 2021-2022 FSA ELA Assessment results, only 47% of rising 5th grade ELA students performed proficiently.

Because of these findings, this grade group is therefore in need of remediation and targeted support.

Compared to other grade levels, our 5th grade students continue to perform below grade and proficiency level. These students have also experienced disruptions that have impacted their learning environment and access to consistent reading intervention.

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

With the implementation of student-centered instruction, targeted interventions, and ongoing progress monitoring, the measurable outcome of the 5th grade ELA proficiency scores will increase by 3 percentage points to 50% proficiency.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through i-Ready, Progress Monitoring/Biweekly Assessments, and Formative Assessments. Teacher observation and intervention groups will also guide and inform instructional implications.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Leonardo Mourino (pr3501@dadeschools.net)

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

Differentiated instruction will be used to drive learning and assess students' academic performance. RTI will also be utilized to monitor students' response to intervention.

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

The selected strategy is both research based and a proven best practice that will help to increase students' reading comprehension and fluency. These practices have proven, through research and implementation, to improve and bridge learning gaps.

**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.

8/31/22-10/14/22

During grade-level common planning, teachers and interventionists will be given the opportunity to plan for rigorous differentiated instruction. As a result, teachers will be ready to deliver explicit instruction and provide practice for mastery.

**Person Responsible**

Nicole Dorvily (ndorvily@dadeschools.net)

8/31/22-10/14/22

Working with the administration, lesson plans will be developed for small group differentiated instruction. As a result, student deficiencies will be targeted.

**Person Responsible**

Nicole Dorvily (ndorvily@dadeschools.net)

8/31/22-10/14/22

We will continue to implement the effective use of data to create flexible student groups and plan for differentiated instruction (DI) as discussed during grade level planning meetings. As a result, students will know the area where they need to show improvement.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Dorvily (ndorvily@dadeschools.net)

8/31/22-10/14/22

Tier 1 and 2 students will be identified, and resources will be selected for targeted instruction. As a result, resources will be available to address individual student needs.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Dorvily (ndorvily@dadeschools.net)

10/31/22-12/16/22

Teachers will review students' data from performance assessments during the first quarter of school to target their ELA differentiated instruction lessons.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Dorvily (ndorvily@dadeschools.net)

10/31/22-12/16/22

Teachers will review students' data from performance assessments during the first quarter of school to target their ELA differentiated instruction lessons.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Dorvily (ndorvily@dadeschools.net)

10/31/22-12/16/22

Teachers will review students' data from performance assessments during the first quarter of school to target their ELA differentiated instruction lessons.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Dorvily (ndorvily@dadeschools.net)

Provide meaningful learning opportunities that increase ELLs/ESE learners' access to the general curriculum through whole group instruction, scaffolded instruction, and differentiated activities.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Dorvily (ndorvily@dadeschools.net)

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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

63% of rising 3rd grade students performed below proficiency level on the SAT-10 Math, compared to 49% of 3rd graders who were not proficient on the FSA. This demonstrates an urgent need for remediation and targeted support for the current 3rd grade class.

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

With the interventions and support in place, 52% of 3rd grade students should score as proficient regarding Math with an increase of 2% of percentage points.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through i-Ready, Progress Monitoring/Biweekly Assessments, and Formative Assessments. Teacher observation and intervention groups will also guide and inform instructional implications.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Nicole Dorvily (ndorvily@dadeschools.net)

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

Differentiated instruction based on data analysis, will be used to monitor and analyze student performance. RTI will also be utilized to assess students' response to intervention.

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

The selected strategy is both research based a proven best practice that will help teachers address students' deficiencies. This practice has proven, through research and implementation, to improve and bridge learning gaps.

### 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.

8/31/22-10/14/22

During grade-level common planning, teachers and interventionists will be given the opportunity to plan for rigorous differentiated instruction. As a result, tier 1 and tier 2 students will be identified, and resources will be selected for differentiated instruction.

**Person Responsible**

Tammy Southwood-smith (tsouthwood@dadeschools.net)

8/31/22-10/14/22

Working with the math coach, lesson plans will be developed for small group differentiated instruction. As a result, materials will be pre-identified to provide remediation.

**Person Responsible**

Tammy Southwood-smith (tsouthwood@dadeschools.net)

8/31/22-10/14/22

After participating in grade level and/or subject area planning meetings, teachers will provide students with targeted lessons within the Florida BEST Standards. This will in turn help us bridge the achievement gap.

**Person Responsible**

Tammy Southwood-smith (tsouthwood@dadeschools.net)

8/31/22-10/14/22

We will continue to implement the effective use of data to create flexible student groups and plan for

differentiated instruction (DI) as discussed during grade level planning meetings. As a result, individual student deficiencies will be addressed.

**Person Responsible** Tammy Southwood-smith (tsouthwood@dadeschools.net)

8/31/22-10/14/22

Teachers will deliver ongoing rigorous Mathematics instruction with fidelity. As a result, students will be well prepared and performance on topic assessments will improve.

**Person Responsible** Tammy Southwood-smith (tsouthwood@dadeschools.net)

10/31/22-12/16/22

Ensure that DI routines and centers have been established and are actively occurring in grades 6-8 Math classes.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Dorvily (ndorvily@dadeschools.net)

10/31/22-12/16/22

Teachers will develop standards-aligned lessons and activities that ensure student learning is occurring with or without technology in grades 6-8 Math classes.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Dorvily (ndorvily@dadeschools.net)

**#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to School Culture and Morale**

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:** Based on the school climate survey, 34% of faculty agreed that staff morale is high as compared to 84% in 2019-2020. 75% of staff members also expressed that they feel overloaded and overwhelmed, as compared to less than 15% in 2019-2020.  
**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** Due to these findings and teacher feedback, this is an area of concern that needs to be addressed to ensure teacher satisfaction and retention. A staff that feels celebrated and supported will also be reflected in student academic performance.

**Measurable Outcome:**  
**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, 54% of faculty and staff will agree that staff morale is high with an increase of 20% points.

**Monitoring:**  
**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** The leadership team will work to create a staff survey to be administered three times throughout the school year to determine if efforts to improve staff morale are working or where revisions are needed. The final survey will be the school climate survey. The leadership team and grade level chairs will have monthly informal meetings to gain insight and share information regarding school culture and morale.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Leonardo Mourino (pr3501@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** The evidence-based strategy used to improve staff morale will be to be more intentional in empowering teachers and staff to be educational stakeholders within our school site. At Morningside, all teachers will have the opportunity for cooperative involvement and participation in planning and decision making. Collaboration will be encouraged and support amongst administration, faculty and staff, and the PTSA to promote community.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.** By providing authentic and meaningful opportunities for involvement and participation, faculty and staff will develop or further cultivate their investment within our school site. If faculty and staff are given opportunities for their voices to be heard, contribute their ideas, and collaborate with others, this will only promote community and a high-performing workforce.

**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.

8/18/22-10/14/22

In order to maintain a healthy school environment, a Sunshine Committee will be created with the intent to help improve school culture. As a result, staff morale will improve.

**Person Responsible** Juliet Carrington (312150@dadeschools.net)

8/31/22-10/14/22

To create a collaborative atmosphere, a needs assessment survey will be shared with all staff. As a result, the Sunshine Committee will be able to draft a plan of action to address all concerns.

**Person Responsible** Juliet Carrington (312150@dadeschools.net)

8/31/22-10/14/22

Data will be collected to help identify areas of concern and in need of improvement. As a result, the committee will be able to make informed decisions.

**Person Responsible** Juliet Carrington (312150@dadeschools.net)

8/31/22-10/14/22

Welcoming spaces will be identified to create a sense of belonging. As a result, employees will feel valued.

**Person Responsible** Juliet Carrington (312150@dadeschools.net)

10/31-12/16/22

Administration will initiate meaningful and consistent staff recognition and appreciation efforts that include: personalized notes and schoolwide shout outs, recognition at faculty meetings, and immediate, constructive feedback from classroom observations.

**Person Responsible** Leonardo Mourino (pr3501@dadeschools.net)

10/31/22/12/16/22

Administration will develop a calendar to host meaningful teambuilding and collaborative activities amongst teachers.

**Person Responsible** Leonardo Mourino (pr3501@dadeschools.net)

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

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:** According to the 2021-2022 School Climate Survey, there was an 18% decrease in teachers feeling satisfied in their career at our school site. There was also a 32% decrease in teachers feeling that their ideas are listened to and considered. Because of these findings, leadership responsibilities will be delegated, as well as providing the opportunities to develop and enhance leadership skills of all faculty and staff.  
**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

**Measurable Outcome:**  
**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** At the end of the 2022-2023 school year, 75% of faculty and staff will feel that their ideas are listened to and considered. 85% of faculty and staff will also feel satisfied in their career at our school site.

**Monitoring:**  
**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** The leadership team will work to create a staff survey to be administered three times throughout the school year. The final survey administered will be the school climate survey. The leadership team and grade level chairs will have monthly meetings with fidelity to gain insight and share information regarding leadership and collaboration.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Leonardo Mourino (pr3501@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** Leadership roles as well as decision making opportunities will be assigned to teacher leaders in order to help build capacity.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.** By providing leadership and decision-making opportunities, teachers will feel more empowered and invested in our school. Teachers will have the opportunity to develop and implement action plans, to see their ideas come to fruition.

**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.

8/20/22 -10/14/22  
 Staff will be given the opportunity to participate in important decisions that affect the school. As a result, we will all feel a sense of ownership.

**Person Responsible** Leonardo Mourino (pr3501@dadeschools.net)



8/20/22 -10/14/22

Mentorship will be created by pairing new teachers with seasoned veterans. As a result, teachers will know that their administrators care about their professional advancement.

**Person Responsible** Leonardo Mourino (pr3501@dadeschools.net)

8/20/22 -10/14/22

Master teachers' capacity will be enhanced through shared leadership. As a result, all members of the faculty will be given the opportunity to enhance their capability.

**Person Responsible** Leonardo Mourino (pr3501@dadeschools.net)

8/20/22 -10/14/22

The strategies discussed above will empower all faculty and staff. As a result, our focus will be on improving and developing others.

**Person Responsible** Leonardo Mourino (pr3501@dadeschools.net)

10/31/22-12/16/22

Administration will schedule opportunities for teachers to visit and observe other classrooms that are implementing highly effective DI instructional practices that inform and improve best practices and teacher agency.

**Person Responsible** Leonardo Mourino (pr3501@dadeschools.net)

10/31/22-12/16/22

Administration will respond to teachers' individual needs that will empower and motivate them to become innovative teacher leaders.

**Person Responsible** Leonardo Mourino (pr3501@dadeschools.net)

**#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

**Monitoring:**

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

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being 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.**

**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.

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

## 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 2021-2022 SAT-10 ELA Assessment results, 92% of the students in kindergarten; 72% in first grade; and, 79% in second grade were proficient in ELA, respectively. Because of these findings, only 8% of the students kindergarten, 27% in first grade, and 22% in second grade are in need of remediation and targeted support. These students have also experienced disruptions that have impacted the learning environment and access to consistent reading intervention.

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

According to the 2021-2022 FSA ELA Assessment results, only 47% of 4th grade ELA students performed proficiently. Because of these findings, this group of students are in need of remediation and targeted support.

Compared to other grade levels, a large portion of 4th grade students continue to perform below grade and proficiency level. These students have also experienced disruptions that have impacted the learning environment and access to consistent reading intervention.

### 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 student-centered instruction, targeted interventions, and ongoing progress monitoring, the measurable outcomes of the K-2 ELA proficiency scores will increase by 5 percentage points on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) from PM1 to PM3.

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

With the implementation of student-centered instruction, targeted interventions, and ongoing progress monitoring, the measurable outcome of the 5th grade ELA proficiency scores will increase by 3 percentage points to 50% proficiency.

#### **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.

This area of focus will be monitored through the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST), i-Ready, Progress Monitoring/Biweekly Assessments, and Formative Assessments. Teacher observations and intervention groups will also guide and inform instructional implications.

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

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Mourino, Leonardo, pr3501@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?

Differentiated instruction based on data analysis will be used to monitor and analyze student performance. RTI will also be utilized to determine student response to interventions in place.

#### **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?

The selected strategy is both research based and a proven best practice that will help increase student reading comprehension and fluency. This practice has proven, through research and implementation, to improve and bridge learning gaps.

**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>8/31/22-10/14/22<br/>We will consistently analyze schoolwide data in order to provide differentiated instruction across the board. As a result, students' needs will be met on an individual basis.</p>   | <p>Mourino, Leonardo,<br/>pr3501@dadeschools.net</p> |
| <p>8/31/22-10/14/22<br/>Reading intervention will be provided to all Tier 2 and 3 students. As a result, students will receive instruction that will target their deficiencies.</p>  | <p>Mourino, Leonardo,<br/>pr3501@dadeschools.net</p> |
| <p>8/31/22-10/14/22<br/>Extended learning opportunities will be offered through before/after school tutoring and Saturday Academy. As a result, in addition to remediation, an opening for enrichment will be created.</p>   | <p>Mourino, Leonardo,<br/>pr3501@dadeschools.net</p> |
| <p>8/31/22-10/14/22<br/>Administration will conduct regular classroom walkthroughs to ensure all action steps are being implemented with fidelity. This will create an opportunity for administration to provide constructive feedback to the teachers.</p>  | <p>Mourino, Leonardo,<br/>pr3501@dadeschools.net</p> |
| <p>10/31/22-12/16/22<br/>The fifth grade ELA teacher will create a calendar to host monthly vertical planning sessions for ELA teachers that will promote highly effective instruction and interactive instructional practices.</p>  | <p>Dorvily, Nicole,<br/>ndorvily@dadeschools.net</p> |
| <p>10/31/22-12/16/22<br/>The fifth grade ELA teacher will host a weekly "girls' club" meetings to address the social-emotional needs of her students, allowing them to develop strategies and skills to cope with their emotions, helping them to be more receptive to learning and engagement in the classroom.</p> | <p>Dorvily, Nicole,<br/>ndorvily@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.

We will provide opportunities for both staff and students to give ongoing feedback and suggestions to school leaders. Informal conferences with staff and students will be scheduled to garner information about their educational/professional experience at our school. We will also ensure information is provided to all stakeholders through various platforms including but not limited to parent meetings, the school calendar, school website, and school social media.

Faculty and staff will connect with one another consistently through monthly faculty meetings, committee meetings, and grade level chair meetings to share best practices, provide support, and help foster the highest levels of engagement and learning for all diverse learners. Meaningful enrichment and team-building opportunities will be offered to foster community. We will provide consistent, positive incentives for students.

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

Administrators- Principal: Will monitor and oversee all the school incentives and respond to concerns with morale by planning team building and morale boosting activities; Assistant Principal: Will monitor mentorship program and assist in ensuring all information is shared with stakeholders in a timely manner.

Teacher Leaders, Instructional Coaches, and Counselors: Will assist in providing and responding to feedback from stakeholders. All stakeholders will be responsible for making specific efforts to connect and build relationships with students, parents, and families. All information received will be shared with stakeholders in a timely manner as well as collaborating across curriculum, content, and grade levels.