**Miami-Dade County Public Schools** 

# Kensington Park 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  |

# **Kensington Park Elementary School**

711 NW 30TH AVE, Miami, FL 33125

http://kpe.dadeschools.net

## **Demographics**

**Principal: Michelle Fernandez M** 

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2022

| 2019-20 Status<br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2021-22 Title I School  | Yes   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)   | 92%   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| School Grades History   | 2021-22: C (51%)<br>2018-19: C (51%)<br>2017-18: B (57%)  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info  | ormation*   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SI Region   | Southeast   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Regional Executive Director   | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle   | N/A   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Support Tier  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ESSA Status   | ATSI  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. Fo  | or more information, <u>click here</u> .  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# **School Board Approval**

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

Last Modified: 4/9/2024 https://www.floridacims.org Page 3 of 30

#### **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 <a href="https://www.floridacims.org">www.floridacims.org</a>.

#### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

#### **Table of Contents**

| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
|--------------------------------|----|
|                                |    |
| School Information             | 6  |
| Needs Assessment               | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 15 |
| Title I Requirements           | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 0  |

# **Kensington Park Elementary School**

711 NW 30TH AVE, Miami, FL 33125

http://kpe.dadeschools.net

#### **School Demographics**

| School Type and Gi<br>(per MSID I |          | 2021-22 Title I School | Disadvant | Economically<br>taged (FRL) Rate<br>ted on Survey 3) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----------------------------------|----------|------------------------|-----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Elementary S<br>PK-5              | school   | Yes                    | 92%       |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary Servio<br>(per MSID I     | • •      | Charter School         | (Reporte  | Minority Rate<br>ed as Non-white<br>Survey 2)        |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| K-12 General E                    | ducation | No                     |           | 99%  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| School Grades Histo               | ry       |                        |           |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year                              | 2021-22  | 2020-21                | 2019-20   | 2018-19  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade                             | С        |                        | С         | С  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

#### **School Board Approval**

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

#### **SIP Authority**

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

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

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

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

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

#### School Mission and Vision

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

The students, staff, parents and community of Kensington Park Elementary School are dedicated to maximizing the potential of its learners. Achievement will be enhanced through high expectations, critical thinking skills and cooperative learning strategies as we emphasize literacy throughout the curriculum. Kensington Park Elementary will continue to uphold standards of educational excellence in a collegian learning environment.

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

All students at Kensington Park Elementary will meet, or exceed grade level expectations as set by State Standards. The staff, students and community of KPE have a commitment to the following values: COLLABORATION: working together towards a common goal COOPERATION: assisting each other to reach a goal TRUST: building confidence through honest, ethical and equitable actions PROFESSIONALISM: adhering to the highest of work standards through respectful and responsible actions. PRIDE: developing positive attitudes about ourselves and our school's achievements COMMUNICATION: sharing needs, ideas and beliefs about our mission. All students at Kensington Park Elementary will meet, or exceed grade level expectations as set by State Standards. The staff, students and community of KPE have a commitment to the following values: COLLABORATION: working together towards a common goal COOPERATION: assisting each other to reach a goal TRUST: building confidence through honest, ethical and equitable actions PROFESSIONALISM: adhering to the highest of work standards through respectful and responsible actions. PRIDE: developing positive attitudes about ourselves and our school's achievements COMMUNICATION: sharing needs, ideas and beliefs about our mission.

#### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

| Name                          | Position<br>Title               | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Fernandez,<br>Michelle        | Principal                       |  |
| Mauri,<br>Johnny              | Assistant<br>Principal          | Develops, leads, and evaluates our school data, supports MTSS through team collaboration while leading teachers to a common goal of student achievement. Conducts focused classroom walk-throughs, determines areas of support, provides feedback and opportunities to enhance instructional practices   |
| Aspillaga,<br>Karina          | School<br>Counselor             | Implements the Values Matters Initiative, along with other programs designed to prevent abuse, bullying, drug use, and social/emotional wellbeing. Provides quality services and expertise on intervention with at-risk students. Links child serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success. Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data. Facilitates development of intervention plans and provides support for documentation. Provides counseling for struggling students.                                |
| Pesi, Irilis                  | Instructional<br>Coach          | The Reading Coach works collaborative with the leadership team and all teachers to ensure that the Reading Program is being implemented with fidelity. The Reading Coach spearheads professional development initiatives and provide in-class assistance on an individual basis. The Reading Coach leads collaborative planning sessions to ensure that ELA lessons are standards-based and aligned to District Pacing Guides. In addition, the Reading Coach oversees intervention programs and assists with collecting and disaggregating progress monitoring data to ensure that intervention programs are effective. |
| Colunga,<br>Amarilys          | Instructional<br>Coach          | The Math Coach works with teachers/students on standard-based aligned curriculum. She works with teachers to maximize differentiated instruction, and provides training when necessary to ensure quality instruction. She also plans, develops, and manages intervention schedules and implementation. She pulls data reports, to conduct data chats, from multiple sources such as iReady and Performance Matters to analyze data and plan for instruction to meet students needs   |
| Roche-<br>chavarria,<br>Dania | ELL<br>Compliance<br>Specialist | Assists in developing language acquisition support plans (ELL plans) for all ELL students and work with classroom teachers to implement plans. Participates in Instructional Leaderships Team Meetings and contributes productively to the school as a whole. Oversee Wida 2.o Testing for all ELL students.   |
| Anderson,<br>Deetra           | Assistant<br>Principal          | Assist principal with upholding the school's vision and mission, as well as the execution of tasks to ensure day to day operations run smoothly. Support principal with data-based decision making and ensure systems,   |

| Name | Position<br>Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|-------------------|---------------------------------|
|      |                   |                                 |

such as the implementation of the MTSS model and scheduling of students in intervention. Assist principal with additional duties assigned, as appropriate, including school operations and curriculum.

#### **Demographic Information**

#### Principal start date

Friday 7/15/2022, Michelle Fernandez M

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.

2

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.

20

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

72

Total number of students enrolled at the school

920

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

11

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

**Demographic Data** 

#### **Early Warning Systems**

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator  |     |     |     |     | Grad | e Lev | /el |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-------|-----|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator  | K   | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4    | 5     | 6   | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 118 | 151 | 141 | 170 | 154  | 120   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 854   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0   | 24  | 25  | 36  | 22   | 14    | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 121   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0    | 0     | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0   | 2   | 11  | 36  | 17   | 6     | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 72    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0   | 4   | 4   | 22  | 7    | 4     | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 41    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0   | 0   | 0   | 27  | 32   | 33    | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 92    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0   | 0   | 0   | 22  | 32   | 36    | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 90    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0   | 5   | 22  | 86  | 55   | 43    | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 211   |

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                            |   |   |   |    | (  | Grad | le L | _ev | el |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|----|----|------|------|-----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator                            | K | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4  | 5    | 6    | 7   | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAT |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 6 | 6 | 40 | 30 | 32   | 0    | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 114   |

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

| Indicator                           |   | Grade Level |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |  |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| Indicator                           | K | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |  |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0 | 0           | 7 | 4 | 22 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 34    |  |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0           | 0 | 4 | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6     |  |

#### Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 7/15/2022

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

| Indicator  |    |     |     |     | Grad | de Le | vel |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|----|-----|-----|-----|------|-------|-----|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator  | K  | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4    | 5     | 6   | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 73 | 117 | 132 | 178 | 109  | 163   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 772   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 9  | 23  | 27  | 55  | 13   | 28    | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 155   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0    | 0     | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0  | 5   | 8   | 27  | 5    | 18    | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 63    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0  | 8   | 12  | 16  | 12   | 26    | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 74    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0    | 16    | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0    | 14    | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 3  | 38  | 73  | 114 | 36   | 73    | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 337   |

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

| Indicator                            |   | Grade Level |   |    |   |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |  |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|----|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| mulcator                             | K | 1           | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |  |
| Students with two or more indicators | 1 | 10          | 9 | 28 | 6 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 79    |  |

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           |   | Grade Level |   |    |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |  |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| indicator                           | K | 1           | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |  |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 4 | 10          | 3 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 34    |  |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |  |

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

| Indicator  |    |     |     |     | Grad | le Le | vel |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|----|-----|-----|-----|------|-------|-----|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator  | K  | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4    | 5     | 6   | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 73 | 117 | 132 | 178 | 109  | 163   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 772   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 9  | 23  | 27  | 55  | 13   | 28    | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 155   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0    | 0     | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0  | 5   | 8   | 27  | 5    | 18    | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 63    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0  | 8   | 12  | 16  | 12   | 26    | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 74    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0    | 16    | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0    | 14    | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 3  | 38  | 73  | 114 | 36   | 73    | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 337   |

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

| Indicator                            |   | Grade Level |   |    |   |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|----|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                            | K | 1           | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAT |
| Students with two or more indicators | 1 | 10          | 9 | 28 | 6 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 79    |

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |    |   |    |   |   |   |   |   |   |    | Total |    |       |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|----|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|-------|----|-------|
| indicator                           | K           | 1  | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11    | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 4           | 10 | 3 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 34    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  |       |

# 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 Grade Component      | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 46%    | 62%      | 56%   |        |          |       | 53%    | 62%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 61%    |          |       |        |          |       | 53%    | 62%      | 58%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 45%    |          |       |        |          |       | 42%    | 58%      | 53%   |
| Math Achievement            | 48%    | 58%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 58%    | 69%      | 63%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 65%    |          |       |        |          |       | 62%    | 66%      | 62%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 66%    |          |       |        |          |       | 42%    | 55%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 28%    | 64%      | 59%   |        |          |       | 48%    | 55%      | 53%   |

#### **Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

|            |          |        | ELA      |                                   |       |                                |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade      | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 01         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Con | nparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 02         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Con | nparison | 0%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 03         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 41%    | 60%      | -19%                              | 58%   | -17%                           |
| Cohort Con | nparison | 0%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 04         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 52%    | 64%      | -12%                              | 58%   | -6%                            |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -41%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 05         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |

|                   | ELA  |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                   | 2019 | 45%    | 60%      | -15%                              | 56%   | -11%                           |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -52%   |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|            |          |        | MATH     | I                                 |       |                                |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade      | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 01         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Con | nparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 02         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Con | nparison | 0%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 03         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 45%    | 67%      | -22%                              | 62%   | -17%                           |
| Cohort Con | nparison | 0%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 04         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 58%    | 69%      | -11%                              | 64%   | -6%                            |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -45%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 05         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 60%    | 65%      | -5%                               | 60%   | 0%                             |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -58%   |          |                                   | •     |                                |

|            |         |        | SCIEN    | CE                                |       |                                |
|------------|---------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade      | Year    | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 05         | 2022    |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019    | 45%    | 53%      | -8%                               | 53%   | -8%                            |
| Cohort Com | parison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |

# Subgroup Data Review

|           |             | 2022      | SCHO              | DL GRAD      | E COMF     | PONENT             | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2020-21 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2020-21 |
| SWD       | 23          | 33        | 28                | 35           | 56         | 59                 | 9           |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 44          | 58        | 41                | 46           | 67         | 72                 | 24          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 46          | 61        | 44                | 48           | 65         | 66                 | 27          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 45          | 60        | 47                | 48           | 65         | 67                 | 26          |            |              |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2021      | SCHOO             | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | ONENT              | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 |
| SWD       | 25          | 44        | 48                | 27           | 24         | 19                 | 19          |            |              |                         |                           |

|           |             | 2021      | SCHOO             | DL GRAD      | E COMP     | PONENT             | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 |
| ELL       | 37          | 48        | 52                | 38           | 33         | 26                 | 21          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 41          | 50        | 51                | 40           | 31         | 26                 | 29          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 40          | 50        | 52                | 39           | 31         | 27                 | 27          |            |              |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2019      | SCHO              | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | ONENT              | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2017-18 |
| SWD       | 41          | 47        | 42                | 48           | 53         | 44                 | 27          |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 47          | 53        | 44                | 54           | 58         | 41                 | 46          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 52          | 53        | 43                | 59           | 63         | 43                 | 48          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 51          | 54        | 44                | 58           | 61         | 42                 | 45          |            |              |                         |                           |

## **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)  | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 53   |
| 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 | 67   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 426  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 38   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 0    |
| English Language Learners   |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 52   |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%        | 0    |
| Native American Students  |      |
| Federal Index - Native American Students  |      |

| Native American Students   |     |
|--|-----|
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%        | 0   |
| Asian Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Asian Students   |     |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                  | 0   |
| Black/African American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                |     |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 53  |
| 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                            | 53  |
|  |     |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?    | NO  |

## 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 three-year trend on the FSA proficiency report, the data indicates an increase in grades (3) through five (5) English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics proficiency. When analyzing the data trends, the school leadership team noticed an (5) percentage point increase from 41 percentage points in 2021 to 46 percentage points in 2022. There is also an upward trend in Math proficiency, with a (9) percentage point increase, from 39 percentage points in 2021 to 48 percentage points in 2022. Science proficiency had a slight decrease of (1) percentage point from 29 percentage points in 2021 to 28 percentage points in 2022.

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

Based on the progress monitoring and state assessment, it is evident that proficiency in all core areas across grade levels will be the targeted focus. ELA proficiency increased from 41 percentage point in 2021 to 46 percentage points in 2022 on the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA). Math proficiency increased from 39 percentage points in 2021 to 48 percentage points in 2022. Although there has been significant growth in proficiency data, when compared to Miami Dade County Public Schools, this is below the average proficiency rate in the district.

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

Students in the lowest quartile need more intensive and focused Intervention in order to increase learning and achieve proficiency. This drop indicates we are not presently addressing their needs. A restructured approach is necessary. Implementing Inclusion rather than Resource classes will address the need for improvement for our lowest 25% population.

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

The area with the most improvement was Math. The percentage of students that achieved proficiency was as follows: 39% (2021) and 48% (2022), which indicates a 9 percentage point increase.

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

Our students showed growth because we used our data to drive instruction within the Reading block and during Differentiated Instruction/Intervention. Using extended learning opportunities where activities are designed to provide learning opportunities for students beyond the school day as well as enrichment opportunities for students.

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

During Collaborative Data Chats, teachers, support staff, and administration analyze student performance data and determine how that information will be used to drive future instruction. Corrective Feedback for Students allows the intentional constructive verbal or written feedback provided to assist students in understanding their areas of success and areas of development. Data-Driven Instruction

allows teachers to use student performance data to inform their instructional planning and delivery in order to meet student needs.

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

Collaborating with Miami Learns will provide teachers with professional development activities that align to staff and student needs to accelerate learning. Miami Learns provides professional development to increase student achievement and create highly effective teachers.

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

We will continue our intervention program by using data to identify and track our lowest 25%. We will implement the use of student data trackers to facilitate this process. Members of the leadership team will meet monthly with selected students from target group. Additional time will be provided for differentiated instruction to students at risk. Data Chats with coaches and grade levels discussing best practices and to engage in goal-oriented learning.

#### **Areas of Focus**

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

:

#### **#1. 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.

The 2021 - 2022 state assessment scores show that only 23% of the SWD student population demonstrated proficiency as compared to other peer demographic groups. A focus will be placed on differentiated instruction to address this critical need. Based on the data we will focus on differentiated instruction to address the needs of students.

Measurable
Outcome:
State the specific
measurable
outcome the school
plans to achieve.

This should be a

objective outcome.

data based.

For the 2022-2023 school year, the school's goal is to successfully implement datadriven instruction with fidelity, then ELA scores for students in grades K-5 will demonstrate measurable increases on the 2023 assessments.

For K-2, an increase of 5% of "on or Above" grade level performance in iReady ELA AP3

For 3-5, an increase of 3% of students meeting reading proficiency

The area of focus will be monitored by: Bi-weekly collaborative planning sessions Analyzing student data with teachers

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

Identifying students in need, lowest 25%, and targeting for T2, T3 Intervention

Tier 1, Tier 2 Data Trackers (monitored by Reading Coach)

Faculty participation in District training on reading Horizons (Module support)

Reading Horizons Discovery & Elevate Reports

Monitoring implementation of of ELA Intervention Calendar, lessons and progress

monitoring assessments.

Monitor students' progress in intervention through RH Discover/Elevate Reports

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Johnny Mauri (258658@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. Within the Targeted Element of ELA, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of Data-Driven Instruction. Data-Driven Instruction will assist in accelerating the percent proficiency in third to fifth grades as it is a systematic approach to instruction that uses assessment, analysis, and actions to meet students' needs. Data-Driven Instruction will be monitored through the use of data trackers to drive instructional planning and data-driven conversations to include OPMs.

Rationale for Evidence-based

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

Data driven instruction provides the framework for teachers to:

- 1. assess student mastery of the state standards
- 2. ensure student progress is monitored at pre-designated points
- 3. gather multiple data points and modify instruction to address specific deficiencies

This will prove to be most be necessary and beneficial this 2022-2023 school year with the introduction of Reading horizons and all of the new data points 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.

8/31-10/14 Teachers will be asked to identify their SWDs group by reviewing state assessment scores and utilize on going progress monitoring data to monitor student progression and proficiency and modify instruction to meet student needs. As a result, teachers will develop targeted focused lessons to meet the needs of their SWD learners.

Person

Responsible Deetra Anderson (danderson@dadeschools.net)

8/31-10/14 Bi-weekly meeting with chairpersons to review progress on implementation of strategies identified through data chats, particularly in the areas of ELA with an increased focus on SWDs. As a result, teachers will be able to identify and address misunderstandings.

Person

Responsible Irilis Pesi (lilypesi@dadeschools.net)

8/31-10/14 The SLT will examine both aggregated data and overall student performance data for all SWD students in order to set yearly learning goals and make decisions on effective curriculum resources that will

target remediation and provide enhancement. As a result, teachers will be able to determine student understanding and provide immediate feedback.

Person Responsible

Johnny Mauri (258658@dadeschools.net)

8/31-10/14 Teachers will use AP1 assessment data to group students accordingly for D.I. giving precedence to SWD students who originally lacked proficiency by placing them in the intensive group that receives teacher led activities. As a result, these students will receive individualized attention, instruction, and scaffolding to help them reach proficiency.

Person

Responsible

Irilis Pesi (lilypesi@dadeschools.net)

10/31 - 12/16 Administration will conduct data chats with teachers to analyze SWD data in order to plan and deliver data driven Differentiated Instruction and adjust as needed to group students according to specific learning need.

Person

Responsible

Johnny Mauri (258658@dadeschools.net)

10/31-12/16 Teachers will conduct data chats with their SWD students. Teachers can guide students' towards understanding their academic standing and help them strategize potential ways for improving their course grades and performance.

Person

Responsible

Johnny Mauri (258658@dadeschools.net)

#### #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

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

Based on the 2020-2021 data review, FSA ELA results indicate that 45% of students in the lowest quartile showed learning gains and FSA Math results indicate that 66% of students in the lowest quartile showed learning gains. Based on this data our school will implement the Targeted Element of Differentiation. We selected the overarching area of Differentiation based on our findings that demonstrated Learning Gains for the lowest 25% subgroup were decreasing as identified above. We are not meeting the unique needs of all learners therefore it is evident that we must improve our ability to differentiate instruction based on the levels of the students we serve. We will provide the scaffolding necessary for the lowest 25% subgroup to access grade-level content in order to make learning gains and move towards proficiency. Additionally, we will provide extended learning opportunities and inclusion settings throughout all grade levels.

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

reviewed.

If we successfully implement Differentiation, then our lowest 25% students will increase by a minimum of 10 percentage points as evidenced by the 2022 State Assessments.

#### **Monitoring:**

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. 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 quality instruction is taking place. Administrators will review lesson plans for indication of differentiation for lowest 25% students, in particular. Data Analysis of formative assessments of lowest 25% students will be reviewed monthly to observe progress. Teachers and coaches will review data to plan accordingly. Students will own their data by using data binders on a bi-weekly basis for goal oriented learning. Extended learning opportunities will be provided to those students who are not showing growth in any of the core classes.

# Person responsible

for monitoring outcome:

Johnny Mauri (258658@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-

based
Strategy:
Describe the
evidencebased
strategy
being

Within the Targeted Element of Differentiation, our school will focus on using the evidence-based strategy of: Data-Driven Instruction in order to facilitate the process of differentiation. Data-Driven instruction will assist in accelerating the learning gains of our lowest 25% as it is a systematic approach of data disaggregation that allows us to meet the students' needs. Differentiation will be monitored through the use of data binders for teachers and students to drive instructional planning and data driven conversations.

implemented for this Area of Focus.

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

this strategy.

Data-Driven Instruction for the purpose of differentiation will 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.

8/31-10/14 Facilitate grade level data chats after the completion of each iREADY diagnostic creating opportunities to analyze data, improve instruction, identify next steps and implement instructional decisions to impact student learning. As a result, teachers will be able to identify resources to meet their students individual needs.

#### Person Responsible

Irilis Pesi (lilypesi@dadeschools.net)

8/31-10/14 Teachers will provide skill-specific small group instruction within their classrooms on a daily basis. Data from Power BI will be used continually as a tool for ongoing progress monitoring to make decisions for small group instruction and to identify targeted skills that need remediation . The lowest 25% and 35% will be identified for intervention and will be offered extended learning opportunities for further support. As a result, teachers and administrators will collaborate to ensure student samples/resources are aligned to their needs.

#### Person Responsible

Irilis Pesi (lilypesi@dadeschools.net)

8/31-10/14 Conduct quarterly reviews of progress monitoring and MTSS/RtI data to asses the fidelity of implementation of interventions, documentation, and compliance with expectation of 100% compliance, as well as to determine potential opportunities for improvement in the area of focus, as appropriate. As a result, teachers will be able to decipher their students data and plan for their students individual needs.

#### Person Responsible

Johnny Mauri (258658@dadeschools.net)

8/31-10/14 Conduct walkthroughs to monitor implementation and delivery of identified strategies, interventions, and supports, based on the content of data chats, on a monthly basis. As a result, teachers will make adjustments and strengthen DI instruction.

#### Person Responsible

Johnny Mauri (258658@dadeschools.net)

10/31-12/16 During collaborative planning teachers will utilize student data in order to align scaffolded resources to support DI instruction. As a result, students will complete DI student work based on their individual needs.

Person

Irilis Pesi (lilypesi@dadeschools.net)

Responsible

10/31-12/16 The SLT will schedule ongoing product review meetings to monitor student progress and implementation of DI resources. As a result, students DI will target student's needs.

Person

Responsible

Johnny Mauri (258658@dadeschools.net)

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

Area of **Focus** Description

and

Rationale: Include a rationale how it was identified as

According to the 2021-2022 Student Attendance-Three Year Comparison dashboard, 27% of the students had 0-5 absences, 25% had 6-10 absences, 17% had 11-15 absences and 21% had 16-30 absences. In the 2020-2021 Student Attendance-Three Year Comparison that explains dashboard, 42% of the students had 0-5 absences, 25% had 6-10 absences, 9% had 11-15 absences and 14% had 16-30 absences. This data indicates the need to decrease students' absences, specifically 11 - 15 and 16-30 absences.

a critical need from the data reviewed.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific

measurable

to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

outcome the If we successfully implement the Targeted Element of Student Attendance, our students school plans will receive quality instruction that will contribute to improved student outcomes. By providing students with attendance incentives we will increase our attendance by 2%.

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

The Leadership Team will work to connect with families who struggle with attendance and identify the root cause for absences and create a plan of action to ensure students are able to be present daily. The Leadership Team will mentor individual students who have consistent truancy and connect with them bi-weekly to reward or encourage attendance efforts. The Leadership Team will plan regular student incentives to promote consistent student attendance. Teachers will monitor their daily attendance and submit that data to the leadership team on a weekly basis with emphasis on attendance trends. To ensure we are on track to meeting the outcome above, this data will be discussed during data chats with teachers and students and parental contact will be made when necessary.

Person responsible for

Karina Aspillaga (kaspillaga1@dadeschools.net)

monitoring outcome:

Evidencebased

Strategy: Describe the evidencebased strategy

being

Within the Targeted Element of Student Attendance, our school will focus on the evidencebased strategy of: Attendance Initiatives. Attendance Initiatives will assist in narrowing the absence gap amongst our students. Student absences will be monitored on a weekly basis to prevent a pattern of excessive absences.

Attendance Initiatives will assist in decreasing the number of student absences. The

implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy: Explain the rationale for

selecting this specific strategy. Describe the

resources/ criteria used initiatives will provide the leadership team with a systematic approach to identify attendance issues, remediation, and rewards.

for selecting this strategy.

#### **Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

8/31-10/14 Coordinate the development and implementation of the School Attendance Action Plan. As a result, students will be identified and targeted as appropriate.

#### Person Responsible

Deetra Anderson (danderson@dadeschools.net)

8/31-10/14 Attendance will be monitored on a daily basis by teachers and on a weekly basis by the school CIS to identify truant students and the accuracy of daily attendance bulletin. Students that have displayed a truancy trend will be identified and monitored and appropriate action will be taken to ensure that the parents are notified and that the truancy process will be implemented with fidelity. As a result, interventions will reduce chronic absenteeism.

#### Person Responsible

Karina Aspillaga (kaspillaga1@dadeschools.net)

8/31-10/14 Monthly recognition for students with perfect attendance will be held during morning announcements to promote good attendance. As a result, we expect an increase in student attendance school-wide.

#### Person

Responsible

Karina Aspillaga (kaspillaga1@dadeschools.net)

8/31-10/14 Facilitate Leadership Team meetings to review the implementation of Plan and Process, attendance data, stakeholder feedback, and identify necessary adjustments to improve process. As a result, interventions will reduce chronic absenteeism.

#### Person Responsible

Deetra Anderson (danderson@dadeschools.net)

10/31 - 12/6 Homerooms with the most 100% attendance days quarterly will receive a certificate, be recognized at a Perfect Attendance celebration and have a party pizza this will result in an increase of student attendance.

#### Person Responsible

Karina Aspillaga (kaspillaga1@dadeschools.net)

10/31-12/16 KPE is implementing "Glad Your Here" initiative. The counselor will hold a daily attendance lottery during morning announcements that will provide a more frequent incentive in promoting daily attendance

Person Responsible

Karina Aspillaga (kaspillaga1@dadeschools.net)

#### #4. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback/Walkthroughs

Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:

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

The purpose of specific teacher feedback should be to enhance or change teacher behavior and ultimately impact student learning. The power of feedback to teachers on what is happening in their classroom cannot be overestimated. Feedback (data collected on teacher performance) is used to reflect and identify discrepancies between actual outcomes and intended outcomes.

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

The specific teacher feedback will aid in changing teachers behavior and increase teacher effectiveness. Student learning outcomes are the measurable knowledge or skills that students will walk away with improved teacher feedback.

# outcome. Monitoring:

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored via continuous walkthroughs and student data while looking for improvement. Teacher direct observations (TDO) will be implemented throughout the school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Deetra Anderson (danderson@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based** 

Strategy:

Describe the evidencebased strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. Giving teachers feedback involves letting the teachers know how they have performed on a particular task along with ways that they can improve. Feedback provides teachers with a tangible understanding of what they did well, of where they are at, and of how they can improve.

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

Implement a range of practices and strategies that ensure feedback to teachers is deliberate, planned and focused on learning intentions and success criteria. Effective feedback directs attention to the intended learning and/or success criteria, pointing out strengths and offering specific information to guide improvement

#### **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.

8/31-10/14 Review results of faculty and staff Professional Development Surveys, as a result this will identify training content and potential presenters aligned with identified need areas.

Person Responsible Johnny Mauri (258658@dadeschools.net)

8/31-10/14 The School Improvement Plan will be shared with teachers during the September faculty staff meeting. As a result, teachers will collaborate within their grade levels and subject areas to identify their academic expectations for the school year.

Person Responsible Johnny Mauri (258658@dadeschools.net)

8/31-10/14 Allow opportunities for peer observations and collaboration to support best practices and build stronger instructional strategies. As a result, teachers will enhance instructional effectiveness and rigor leading to improved student achievement.

Person Responsible Johnny Mauri (258658@dadeschools.net)

8/31-10/14 PLST will establish informal activities during facility meetings where teachers can share best practices, request support, and collaborate. As a result, teachers will have the opportunity to develop their skills and gather feedback.

Person Responsible Deetra Anderson (danderson@dadeschools.net)

10/31 - 12/16 After conducting instructional walkthroughs, administration will provide feedback through email,

notes, and formal/informal conversations. As a result, this gives concrete guidance to teachers on analyzing their practice to better support student learning outcomes.

Person Responsible Johnny Mauri (258658@dadeschools.net)

10/31-12/16 The SLT will identify one model classroom in each grade level that highlights best practices correlated to the targeted instructional practices. As a result, visitation opportunities will be provided to other teachers who will gain a better understanding of how to implement the instructional practices observed in their classroom

Person Responsible Johnny Mauri (258658@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 iReady AP3 Diagnostic Data, 50% of the Kindergarten students are proficient in vocabulary 36% of the 1st-grade students are proficient in vocabulary and 25% of the 2nd grade students are proficient in vocabulary. Vocabulary plays a fundamental role in reading comprehension.

Therefore the implementation of vocabulary strategies and practices will be integrated to instruction in order to increase the number of students meeting proficiency in reading.

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

According to the 2022 iReady AP3 Diagnostic Data, 38% of the 3rd grade students are proficient in vocabulary 22% of the 4th- grade students are proficient in vocabulary and 35% of the 5th grade students are proficient in vocabulary. Vocabulary plays a fundamental role in reading comprehension. Therefore the implementation of vocabulary strategies and practices will be integrated to instruction in order to increase the number of students meeting proficiency in reading.

#### 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 vocabulary strategies and best practices, an additional 10% of the K-2 student population will score at grade level or above in area of ELA by 2022-2023 state assessment.

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

With the implementation of vocabulary strategies and best practices, an additional 10% of the 3-5 student population will score at grade level or above in area of ELA by 2022-2023 state assessment.

#### **Monitoring:**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

The leadership team will conduct quarterly data chats, adjust group based on current data in real time, and follow-up with regular walkthroughs to ensure that vocabulary instruction is aligned to current data. Administrators will review bi-weekly lesson plans for indication of explicit instruction aligned to vocabulary. We will track and monitor iReady Diagnostic Data. This data will be analyzed during leadership team meetings to ensure students are demonstrating growth. Extended learning opportunities will be provided to those students who are not showing growth on each iReady Diagnostic Assessment.

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Fernandez, Michelle, mfernandez5@dadeschools.net

#### **Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidencebased Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Within the targeted element of vocabulary, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of: Explicit Vocabulary Instruction aligned with before, during and after reading strategies. Differentiation will assist in accelerating student understanding of the use of context clues. Data-Driven instruction will be monitored through the use of bi-weekly assessments and data trackers to drive instructional planning and plan for next steps.

#### 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?

Explicit Vocabulary Instruction aligned, along with differentiated instruction, will ensure that teachers are using data to plan lessons that are customized to student needs. Teachers will continually make adjustments to instruction as needed. This strategy will support students in learning how to use context clues when identifying vocabulary within a text.

#### **Action Steps to Implement:**

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

| Action Step  | Person Responsible for<br>Monitoring                |
|--|---|
| 8/31-10/14 Teachers will create visual aids and anchor charts to engage the learners. As a result, students will be encouraged to make associations, and be able to contribute to discussions using academic vocabulary.                                 | Fernandez, Michelle,<br>mfernandez5@dadeschools.net |
| 8/31-10/14 During collaborative planning teachers will utilize the gradual release of responsibility model in their lessons and instruction. As a result, students will develop he skills they need to become independent learners                       | Fernandez, Michelle,<br>mfernandez5@dadeschools.net |
| 8/22-10/14 Data chats with individual teachers will be conducted upon completion of the FAST PM1, as a result this will support small instruction.   | Fernandez, Michelle, mfernandez5@dadeschools.net    |
| 8/22-10/14 Reading coach will facilitate the use of ELA resources during grade level meetings, as a result this will further classroom instruction targeting Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.   | Fernandez, Michelle,<br>mfernandez5@dadeschools.net |
| The leadership team will conduct focused walkthroughs to ensure teaching techniques align with the GRRM. As a result, teachers will be able to determine if students are moving towards instructional independence.                                      | Fernandez, Michelle,<br>mfernandez5@dadeschools.net |
| The administration will participate in planning sessions, to ensure collaboration, effective use of resources, and that planning aligns with the GRRM. As a result, teachers will be able to plan effective lessons that meet the needs of the students. | Fernandez, Michelle,<br>mfernandez5@dadeschools.net |

#### **Positive Culture & Environment**

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

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

Our Strengths within School Culture are in Support, Care and Connections, and Physical and Emotional Safety. Our school creates positive physical and emotional safety by creating norms, values, and expectations that support social, emotional, and physical safety. We celebrate students monthly that exhibit core values with Values Matter. We also create an environment where all stakeholders feel safe and comfortable sharing thoughts, ideas and concerns. We do this by fostering positive relationships amongst students and staff.

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

The stakeholders involved in promoting a positive culture and environment at our school are the Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coaches, Teachers and Counselors. The Principal's role is to provide ongoing support for the development of a safe and supportive school environment. The Assistant Principal's role is to encourage family and community participation and engagement with the school. The Instructional Coaches role is to ensure teachers are modeling expected behaviors as well as integrating social emotional learning into academic instruction. The Teacher's role is to establish an environment where students feel safe from physical or emotional harm. Students will be comfortable sharing thoughts, ideas and concerns. The Counselor's role is to assist students in connecting with resources available to support their physical and emotional challenges.