

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# Norma Butler Bossard Elementary School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

| Table of Contents              |    |
|--------------------------------|----|
| School Demographics            | 3  |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
| School Information             | 7  |
| Needs Assessment               | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 15 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 0  |

# Norma Butler Bossard Elementary School

15950 SW 144TH ST, Miami, FL 33196

<http://bossard.dadeschools.net>

## Demographics

Principal: Concepcion Santana C

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | No  |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 84%   |
| <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>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: A (66%)<br>2018-19: A (70%)<br>2017-18: A (64%)  |
| <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              |    |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
| School Information             | 7  |
| Needs Assessment               | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 15 |
| Title I Requirements           | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 0  |

## Norma Butler Bossard Elementary School

15950 SW 144TH ST, Miami, FL 33196

<http://bossard.dadeschools.net>

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | No                     | 84%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 97%  |

### School Grades History

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

Recognizing the uniqueness of every child, we will maintain high expectations for all, to foster success, respect, honesty, and trust. We will collaborate to provide a creative, high quality, child-centered education, empowering our future leaders to believe and achieve their dreams.

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

To create a positive, focused, and nurturing environment where dreams are only the beginning.

### 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  |
|---------------------|---------------------|--|
| Santana, Concepcion | Principal           | As a principal, she will lead teachers and staff to help set goals that will ensure students meet their learning objectives. They will oversee the school's day-to-day operations and will handle disciplinary matters, manage the budget and hiring teachers and other personnel. As the school's leader, she will ensure that the school's action steps are understood by all teachers and successfully executed to help improve students' academic and social emotional development.  |
| Castro, Rachael     | Teacher, K-12       | As a member of the School Leadership Team, she will attend district meetings and trainings relating to the new ELA series and disseminate information with all instructional staff members.  |
| Ramos, Jessica      | Teacher, K-12       | As a member of the School Leadership Team, she will attend professional development focused on developing student's social emotional learning. They will provide teachers with a variety of strategies they can use in the classroom with their students during faculty and grade level meetings to help create a nurturing learning environment.  |
| Parker, Heather     | Assistant Principal | As the assistant principal, she will assist the principal, in leading teachers and staff to accomplish goals set by the principal that will ensure students meet their learning objectives. She will assist in overseeing the school's day-to-day operations and will handle disciplinary and attendance matters and will oversee the school's assessment program. She will support teachers in the understanding and implementation of the school's action steps to help improve students' academic and social emotional development. |

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Concepcion Santana C

**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.*

25

**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**

60

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

970

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

3

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

3

### Demographic Data

### Early Warning Systems

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

| Indicator  | Grade Level |     |     |     |     |     |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|  | K           | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 142         | 139 | 187 | 157 | 167 | 197 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 989   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 9   | 9   | 10  | 8   | 16  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 52    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 3   | 7   | 11  | 11  | 13  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 45    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 2   | 3   | 4   | 6   | 8   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 23    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0   | 0   | 8   | 8   | 23  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 39    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0   | 2   | 8   | 31  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 41    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 3   | 8   | 20  | 16  | 36  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 83    |

**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           | 3 | 5 | 12 | 11 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 54    |

**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           | 5 | 5 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 20    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

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

Thursday 8/11/2022

**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                              | 81          | 145 | 137 | 157 | 168 | 174 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 862   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 5           | 7   | 10  | 8   | 17  | 11  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 58    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 1   | 2   | 9   | 9   | 4   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 25    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0   | 0   | 3   | 7   | 10  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 20    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 2   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 3           | 8   | 31  | 34  | 35  | 18  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 129   |

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

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

**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     | 4           | 1 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 17    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |

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

| Indicator  | Grade Level |     |     |     |     |     |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|  | K           | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 117         | 156 | 140 | 159 | 184 | 180 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 936   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 11          | 8   | 13  | 8   | 17  | 13  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 70    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 6   | 10  | 15  | 14  | 3   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 48    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 2   | 5   | 6   | 11  | 4   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 28    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0   | 0   | 13  | 24  | 19  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 56    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0   | 8   | 32  | 36  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 76    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 1           | 7   | 16  | 19  | 38  | 32  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 113   |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 3 | 9 | 16 | 25 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 73    |

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

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 4 | 6 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 20    |
| 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 | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 76%    | 62%      | 56%   |        |          |       | 79%    | 62%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 74%    |          |       |        |          |       | 66%    | 62%      | 58%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 60%    |          |       |        |          |       | 54%    | 58%      | 53%   |
| Math Achievement            | 70%    | 58%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 86%    | 69%      | 63%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 62%    |          |       |        |          |       | 75%    | 66%      | 62%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 55%    |          |       |        |          |       | 71%    | 55%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 62%    | 64%      | 59%   |        |          |       | 61%    | 55%      | 53%   |

### Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

| ELA               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 02                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 03                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 78%    | 60%      | 18%                        | 58%   | 20%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 81%    | 64%      | 17%                        | 58%   | 23%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -78%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 73%    | 60%      | 13%                        | 56%   | 17%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -81%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| 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 | 90%    | 67%      | 23%                        | 62%   | 28%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 89%    | 69%      | 20%                        | 64%   | 25%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -90%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 76%    | 65%      | 11%                        | 60%   | 16%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -89%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 58%    | 53%      | 5%                         | 53%   | 5%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

### Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| SWD                                       | 46       | 58     | 53          | 48        | 61      | 57           | 30       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 70       | 68     | 56          | 72        | 64      | 60           | 50       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 86       |        |             | 71        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 76       | 74     | 61          | 70        | 63      | 56           | 63       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 79       | 64     |             | 74        | 57      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 74       | 71     | 62          | 67        | 59      | 56           | 57       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 38       | 50     | 40          | 39        | 21      | 33           | 36       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 67       | 61     | 48          | 64        | 42      | 50           | 44       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 75       | 64     | 50          | 67        | 43      | 51           | 55       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 68       |        |             | 73        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 69       | 63     | 49          | 64        | 41      | 46           | 52       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 50       | 54     | 45          | 76        | 69      | 69           | 22       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 79       | 70     | 61          | 86        | 74      | 73           | 60       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 83       |        |             | 100       |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 68       | 60     |             | 84        | 80      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 80       | 66     | 55          | 86        | 74      | 70           | 62       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 69       | 50     |             | 81        | 77      |              | 45       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 77       | 69     | 59          | 84        | 73      | 70           | 56       |         |           |                   |                     |

### ESSA Data Review

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

| ESSA Federal Index  |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | N/A  |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 65   |
| 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 | 59   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 518  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |
| Subgroup Data   |      |

| Students With Disabilities   |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     | 52  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?             | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%      | 0   |
| English Language Learners  |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      | 62  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%       | 0   |
| Native American Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Native American Students                                       |     |
| Native American Students 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                                | 79  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 65  |
| 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   | 69 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      | 0  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |    |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 64 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0  |

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### Data Analysis

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

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

2022 findings:

ELA proficiency is 76%, an increase of two percentage points from 74% in 2021.

ELA overall learning gains is 74%, an increase of ten percentage points from 64% in 2021.

Lowest 25% learning gains in ELA is 60%, an increase of twenty percentage points from 40% in 2021.

Math proficiency is 70%, an increase of three percentage points from 67% in 2021.

Lowest 25% learning gains in Math is 55%, an increase of six percentage points from 49% in 2021.

Science proficiency is 62%, an increase of seven percentage points from 55% in 2021.

Trends emerging across grade levels and subgroups display an increase across all tested subjects.

2021 data findings:

The school to district comparison shows an increase in Achievement gap widening from 3rd to 5th grade in both ELA and Math.

All ELA Subgroups Achievement increased with SWD having the greatest increase of 5 percentage points.

ALL ELA Subgroups Learning Gains increased with SWD having the greatest increase of 8 percentage points.

ALL ELA Subgroups Learning Gains L25 increased by 13 percentage.

ALL Math Subgroups Achievement increased with SWD having the greatest increase of 9 percentage points.

ALL Math Subgroups Learning Gains increased with SWD having the greatest increase of 40 percentage points.

ALL Math Subgroups Learning Gains L25 increased with SWD having the greatest increase of 24 percentage points.

Science Subgroups Achievement levels showing a decrease in SWD by 6 percentage points but an increase in

ELL by 6 percentage points.

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

**2022 data findings:**

FSA Math proficiency is 70% which indicates an increase of 3 percentage points from 2021. In addition, the majority of our fifth-grade students did not demonstrate learning gains from third to fifth grade in 2022. The percentage of students with learning gains among students in the lower quartile both showed a significant decrease.

Although data indicates an overall increase in FSA Math, our L25 and overall learning gains continue to demonstrate the greatest need for improvement. FSA Math Learning Gains of the L25 increased from 49 percentage points in 2021 to 55 percentage points in 2022. Our overall learning gains increased from 42 percentage points to 62 percentage points. Although the school experienced an improvement in Math Learning Gains and Math Learning Gains of the L25, the scores are not as high as the ELA Learning Gains. Therefore, Math Learning Gains and L25 represent the greatest need for improvement.

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

**2022 data findings:**

While our focus for the 2021-2022 school year focused on implementing standards-aligned and data driven instruction in all classrooms, the data findings varied greatly from grade levels. We attribute these factors due to the fact that many of the students showing deficiency may have resulted from the previous years instruction which was predominantly virtual versus traditional brick and mortar. We have struggled to accelerate learning in the area of math in the upper grades due to a lack of pre-requisite knowledge in a majority of the learners. As a district, we will implement a new math adoption series this year and incorporate new development opportunities per grade level to unwrap the standards and align appropriate resources and instructional activities to accelerate instead of remediate.

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

**2022 data findings:**

Math proficiency in iReady from AP1 to AP3 increased for all students. In Grade 3, it increased by 54 percentage points, in Grade 4 by 49 percentage points, and Grades 5 increased by at 33 percentage points. In ELA, students showed a growth of 29 percentage points in Grade 3, 18 percentage points in Grade 4, and 20 percentage points in Grade 5 when comparing iReady AP1 to AP3 data.

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

One key component that impacted student achievement was the use of technology-based learning tools for differentiated instruction. Such programs as i-Ready, Reflex Math, and IXL allowed students to access materials and lessons that were geared towards their specific learning needs. In addition our school implemented the Talents program after school for 3 hours each day, which targeted the L25 and teacher recommendations. Lastly, our focused Professional Development sessions during faculty meetings helped to ensure teachers were able to use all resources effectively with their students.

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

Targeted instruction and intervention will be needed to accelerate learning. Teachers will use data from a variety of assessments to identify areas of proficiency and areas for growth for each student. Data will be used to target instruction during differentiated instruction and intervention.

**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.**



Teachers will be provided with PD's on best practices related to the B.E.S.T standards and creating targeted lessons in ELA and in Mathematics. Select teachers will attend monthly ICAD sessions and share best practices during monthly ELA and Math Department meetings. Additionally, an emphasis how to effectively use data from the new Cambium Assessment in grades 3-5. Furthermore, Renaissance Learning STAR Assessments in grades VPK- 2nd in Reading and in Math will be infused in professional developments as well.

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

Weekly scheduled common planning time for each grade level will be built into master schedules to facilitate collaborative planning. A member of the leadership team will attend to ensure strategies are being implemented with fidelity and lessons are standards-aligned. Extended learning opportunities will be provided with the Talents Grant Program and interventions and STEAM-based clubs.

**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 B.E.S.T. Standards****Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

Based on the data review from the 2022 FSA Assessments in both ELA and Mathematics, our school will implement the Targeted Element of B.E.S.T Standards. We selected this Instructional Practice based on our findings that the achievement gap is widening specially in math across grades levels and the percentage of students earning a level three or above decreased from fourth to fifth grade. This 2022-2023 school year will serve as a full implementation of the B.E.S.T standards in grades K-5.

**Measurable****Outcome:**

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

If we successfully implement the B.E.S.T standards, then our overall student proficiency will increase by a minimum of 5 percentage points as evidenced by the 2023 F.A.S.T Assessment.

**Monitoring:**

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

Teachers will utilize the K-5 B.E.S.T handbook and pacing guides to plan and drive instruction. Teachers will share best practices during their collaborative grade level meetings. Administrators will review student work samples as an indication that the B.E.S.T standards are being implemented.

**Person**

**responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Concepcion Santana (csantana@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Within the Targeted Element of B.E.S.T standards, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of Standards-Based Collaborative Planning. Teachers will have a collaborative time frame built in to their schedule to strategically plan. This strategy will assist teachers in understanding how to unwrap the standards through effective conversations including data chats and shared best practices that will lead to improvements in standard-aligned lessons, effectiveness, and student achievement.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Standards-Based Collaborative Planning will ensure that teachers are strategically planning lessons that are aligned to the B.E.S.T standards 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.

08/22-10/14 - The PLST team will provide professional development courses for teachers on B.E.S.T standards shared at ICAD meetings through a designated facilitator to ensure teachers have a clear understanding of the standards.

**Person Responsible** Concepcion Santana (csantana@dadeschools.net)

08/22- 10/14 - As a result of the built-in collaborative meetings, teachers will have the opportunity to collaborate and brainstorm challenges, needs and shared best practices as evidence by planning protocols and sign in sheets.

**Person Responsible** Concepcion Santana (csantana@dadeschools.net)

08/22- 10/14 - As a result of teachers utilizing district-provided pacing guides during grade level or subject area planning this will ensure that the B.E.S.T standards are effectively incorporated into their instruction.

**Person Responsible** Concepcion Santana (csantana@dadeschools.net)

08/14- 10/14 - To ensure that students are demonstrating mastery of the standards, teachers will utilize and analyze standard-aligned formative assessments and student work samples.

**Person Responsible** Concepcion Santana (csantana@dadeschools.net)

10/31-12/16- The appointed teachers who attend the monthly professional development ICAD meetings will visit their corresponding grade level meetings to disseminate information, and clarify standards, and/or benchmarks. As a result, this will ensure that teachers are covering all standards and benchmarks, especially those that are not fully addressed through the core curriculum.

**Person Responsible** Concepcion Santana (csantana@dadeschools.net)

10/31-12/16- To ensure that E.L.A teachers understand the B.E.S.T standards, monthly trainings will be conducted using the B.E.S.T handbook including clarifications and appendices, to understand the complexity of the benchmarks and determine the sequence of instruction.

**Person Responsible** Heather Parker (hparker@dadeschools.net)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Area of Focus</b><br><b>Description and Rationale:</b><br><b>Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.</b> | <p>Based on the data review from the 2022 FSA Assessments in Math, our school will implement the Targeted Element of Math. The schools math proficiency for 2022 demonstrated an overall increase compared to the 2021 data. However, the percentage of students achieving a level three or above decreased from fourth to fifth grade by 12 percentage points. The 2021 school year proficiency in math for fifth grade was at 67% compared to the 2022 school year at 55%. As result, we selected this Instructional Practice based on our findings that the achievement gap in math is widening across grade levels, and we are not meeting the unique needs of all learners so we must work to accelerate student achievement.</p> |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b><br><b>State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.</b>                | <p>If we successfully focus on Math, then proficiency levels in all our subgroups will increase by a minimum of 5 percentage points as evidenced by the 2023 F.A.S.T Assessments.</p>  |
| <b>Monitoring:</b><br><b>Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.</b>  | <p>Teachers will implement a variety of Math strategies to determine whether students have met the lesson objectives. The area of focus will be monitored through i-Ready data, IXL, formative assessments and check for understanding strategies (i.e. exit slips, Thumbs Up, Kahoot) to determine whether students have met the lesson objectives. Administrators will review lesson plans for indication of these strategies and grade levels will discuss current data during weekly grade-level meetings.</p>   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>  | <p>Concepcion Santana (csantana@dadeschools.net)</p>   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b><br><b>Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.</b>   | <p>Within the Targeted Element of Math, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of Gradual Release. of Responsibilities (GRRM). This strategy will assist teachers in explicitly executing lessons that follow a systematic approach.</p>   |

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

The Gradual Release Model (GRM) will ensure that teachers are explicitly guiding students through the learning process allowing for the transfer of conceptual understanding to the procedural understanding of math concepts. The GRM guarantees that students are supported in their acquisition of the skills and strategies necessary for success.

### 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.

08/22- 10/14 - Teachers will implement the newly adopted math series with fidelity resulting in the standards being addressed in a sequential format.

**Person Responsible** Concepcion Santana (csantana@dadeschools.net)

08/22- 10/14 - During weekly collaborative planning, teachers will brainstorm challenges, and needs, and share best practices. Teachers will take turns, taking the lead and modeling explicit gradual release lessons for math concepts. This will result in teachers sharing a wealth of knowledge and building capacity.

**Person Responsible** Concepcion Santana (csantana@dadeschools.net)

08/22- 10/14 - Teachers will assign Personalized Instruction lessons from IXL or I-Ready that target students' weakest domains. As a result, students will receive individualized targeted remediation. Resources from Tools for Instruction will be utilized to provide additional support during small group instruction using the GRM allowing students to practice the skills.

**Person Responsible** Concepcion Santana (csantana@dadeschools.net)

08/22- 10/14 - Teachers will monitor topic assessments to ensure mastery of skills and concepts presented. As a result, the teacher will be able to identify key areas of strength, or areas in need of acceleration based on the data provided by the progress monitoring assessment.

**Person Responsible** Concepcion Santana (csantana@dadeschools.net)

10/31-12/16- To ensure that student skills are being reviewed daily, teachers will incorporate a daily math spiral review and as a result students will reinforce previous skills throughout the school year.

**Person Responsible** Concepcion Santana (csantana@dadeschools.net)

10/31-12/16- After analyzing topic assessments, teachers will use the data to create differentiated instructional groups. Teachers will accelerate their instruction through targeted, small group lessons and utilize additional resources such as the "reteach" page in Big Ideas Math, manipulatives etc. to help close any gaps between chapters.

**Person Responsible** Concepcion Santana (csantana@dadeschools.net)

**#3. 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.**

Based on the data from the School Climate survey and the end of year SIP reflection indicated, 42% of our staff believe the principal is supportive of teachers. To increase this percentage, we selected Specific Teacher Feedback because teachers in the building feel that they are overwhelmed. Teachers feel that staff morale is low at the school. This data indicates that there is a critical need to increase staff morale.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

If we successfully implement the Targeted Element of Specific Teacher Feedback, the teacher's perspective of the principal's support role and our staff morale will increase by 15 percentage points as evidenced by the end-of-year School Climate Survey for the 2022- 2023 school year.

**Monitoring:**

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

With the implementation of Specific Teacher Feedback, an additional 10% of the staff will agree with the statement that the principal is supportive of teachers by the mid-year point of the school year.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Concepcion Santana (csantana@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based****Strategy:**

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

Within the Targeted Element of Specific Teacher Feedback, we will focus on the evidence- based strategy of Promoting the Morale and Performance of the Team. By implementing this strategy, it will ensure that leaders check in with staff members regularly and identify needs by boosting morale through incentive programs, rewards, and positive reinforcement.

**Rationale for Evidence-based****Strategy:**

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

Promoting the Morale and Performance of the Team will assist in making teachers feel like their time is valued, thus increasing their engagement during weekly/monthly meetings. Throughout the process, the leadership team will create ways to recognize teacher achievements and make them feel appreciated.

**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.

08/22- 10/14 - In order to boost staff morale, and create an environment where teachers feel their efforts in the classroom are validated and are supported by the administrators, teachers will be treated to a monthly Mobile Treat Cart that contains edible treats delivered to their classroom.

**Person Responsible**

Concepcion Santana (csantana@dadeschools.net)

08/22- 10/14 - In order to recognize teacher successes in the classroom noted during daily walkthroughs, one teacher will be featured each month on Instagram and Twitter as part of the Social Media Spotlight at NBB and highlighted during that month's faculty meeting.

**Person Responsible** Concepcion Santana (csantana@dadeschools.net)

08/22- 10/14 - The administrative team will develop a schedule to engage in daily connections with selective teachers on a rotational basis. As a result, administrators can provide feedback, support, and address any concerns that may result in problem-solving in relation to the classroom environment.

**Person Responsible** Concepcion Santana (csantana@dadeschools.net)

08/22- 10/14 - In order to promote positive relationships, the school's social committee will plan activities outside of school so that staff members meet with one another. Every staff meeting will begin an opportunity for connections amongst colleagues.

**Person Responsible** Concepcion Santana (csantana@dadeschools.net)

10/16-12/16- Leadership team meeting agendas will be distributed prior to the meeting date so grade level and department chairs can gather feedback from teachers before the meeting. As a result, chairs can share their grade level concerns with the team and the decision-making process will allow for all teachers to have a voice in final outcomes.

**Person Responsible** Heather Parker (hparker@dadeschools.net)

10/16-12/16- - Faculty meetings will focus on pertinent school wide topics limiting grade level specific information which will be disseminated through grade level meeting instead. As a result, making faculty meetings intentional and focus driven.

**Person Responsible** Concepcion Santana (csantana@dadeschools.net)



**#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning****Area of Focus  
Description  
and Rationale:****Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Based on the data review, our school will implement the Targeted Element of Social Emotional Learning. We selected this Area of Focus based on an increased need for students to access services from the School Counselor and Mental Health Coordinator. We recognize the need to tailor our SEL initiatives and improve on making connections with students in and outside the classroom.

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

If we successfully implement the Targeted Element of Social Emotional Learning, our students will acquire and effectively apply the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to understand and manage their emotions. By bringing increased awareness to SEL and mindfulness practices, the student's mental health will have beneficial results on their emotional well-being, mental health, ability to learn, and physical health of students. These practices will help them focus in the classroom and increase their academic performance. With consistent focus on SEL practices, the frequency of repetitive students visiting the counselor or Mental Health Coordinator will decrease by 5%.

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

The Counselors and Mental Health Coordinator will mentor individual students who have consistent behavioral, social emotional or mental health issues so they can develop coping mechanisms to deal with their emotions. Administrators will review counselor and coordinator service logs.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Concepcion Santana (csantana@dadeschools.net)

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

Within the Targeted Element of Social Emotional Learning, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of Character Education/ Values Matter. Character Education will support the social-emotional and ethical development of students. The proactive effort to instill core values and provide long term solutions to moral and ethical issues and teach students to be their best self.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Character Education/ Values Matter will foster ethical and responsible individuals by teaching them about the good values that people should possess. By implementing the SEL practices, students' academic achievements will increase.



**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.

08/22- 10/14 - Teachers will select one student from their classroom to represent that month's core value as part of the Values Matter initiative and school counselors will create a classroom visitation schedule to introduce the Core Value of the Month to students to increase awareness of character education.

**Person Responsible** Concepcion Santana (csantana@dadeschools.net)

8/22-10/14-.Counselors will create a visitation schedule that targets the most at-risk students or classrooms to facilitate growth mindset activities. Focus groups will be created as a result of these visitations to address repetitive or concerning behaviors.

**Person Responsible** Janette Puig (heredia.ariana2@gmail.com)

8/22-10/14-.As part of morning announcements, each Friday will feature a designated segment that focuses on Mental Health Awareness. Teachers and students will be introduced to one mindfulness practice that can be implemented throughout the week as part of brain breaks each school day. As a result, students will learn to process their mistakes and correct them so they can learn how to effectively problem solve.

**Person Responsible** Concepcion Santana (csantana@dadeschools.net)

8/22-10/14-In order to promote school-wide positive behaviors bi-weekly on Wednesday morning announcements, the school counselors will work with selected groups of students to create skits through dramatic role-play of expected school behaviors, resulting in promoting a positive behavior support environment.

i.e: Hallway behaviors

Classroom behaviors

Expected Bathroom behaviors

Expected Lunch behaviors

Peer interaction strategies

Problem/Conflict Resolution strategies

**Person Responsible** Janette Puig (heredia.ariana2@gmail.com)

As part of our school-wide SEL initiative, we will offer support and informational parent workshops on various topics through the "Parent Academy. As a result, students, teachers, and administration will work together to continue to increase social-emotional learning and mental health awareness which in turn may affect and limit the number of students being referred to the mental health counselor, behavior issues, and/or referrals.

**Person Responsible** Janette Puig (heredia.ariana2@gmail.com)

ELA teachers will implement the SEL component from the McGraw Wonders series with fidelity, thus tying literacy to social-emotional learning. As result, students can make personal connections and help students with reading and writing, as well as, build skills to manage their emotions, decision-making, and achieve personal goals.

**Person Responsible** Heather Parker (hparker@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 Relationships, Physical and Emotional Safety and Support, and Care and Connections. Our school promotes positive relationships that helps create a social support system for students and an environment that fosters the development of trust among staff members. Team-Building activities are provided for the staff allowing them opportunities to come together and share celebrations of success during informal gatherings. Teachers create a positive mindset to start their day through the use of SEL lessons in the classroom. Physical and emotional safety is met by setting clear expectations between all stakeholders. Our school creates an environment where everyone feels safe and comfortable sharing thoughts and ideas. Teachers and staff members are provided with ample opportunities to be part of the decision-making process. We also create an engaging learning environment by fostering high expectations and maintaining a clean and orderly physical surrounding.

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

The stakeholders involved in building positive school culture and environment are the Principal, Assistant Principals, Teacher Leaders, and Counselors (our School Leadership Team). Teacher leaders and counselors gather feedback from stakeholders and make an effort to connect and build relationships with our students and parents and community members. The Assistant Principals help to create protocols that ensure all information and feedback is shared in a timely manner. The Principal's role is to monitor and oversee all the school's initiatives and respond to concerns with morale by planning Team-building and morale-boosting activities.