

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# Arcola Lake Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# Arcola Lake Elementary School

1037 NW 81ST ST, Miami, FL 33150

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Yolanda Ellis L**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2020

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: C (48%)<br>2018-19: C (48%)<br>2017-18: A (68%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | N/A   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |   |

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

# Arcola Lake Elementary School

1037 NW 81ST ST, Miami, FL 33150

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

## School Demographics

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School<br/>PK-5</p> | <p><b>2021-22 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p> | <p><b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br/>(as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p> |
| <p><b>Primary Service Type</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>              | <p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>          | <p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br/>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">99%</p>                |

## School Grades History

|              |                |                |                |                |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <b>Year</b>  | <b>2021-22</b> | <b>2020-21</b> | <b>2019-20</b> | <b>2018-19</b> |
| <b>Grade</b> | C              | C              | C              | C              |

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

Our mission is to be the beacon of educational excellence. We empower our diverse student population to become effective leaders within the global 21st century. Through equitable access of technology and education, we encourage a positive blended learning climate. Teachers and students are encouraged to reach their full potential in the learning process with reliable solutions by providing a multi-tiered education, we are committed to the growth of all stakeholders through educating our students, families and community members.

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

We aim to provide the highest quality education to become accomplished individuals and exemplary citizens.

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

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

| Name                | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|---------------------|---------------------|---|
| Ellis, Yolanda      | Principal           | The principal provides a mission and shapes a vision for academic success for all students. Data is utilized to drive decision-making, cultivate leadership in others, and provide the appropriate curriculum offerings. Ms. Ellis establishes high expectations for all students, and ensures that the school-based team is implementing Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS). |
| Hill, Leasha        | Assistant Principal | The Assistant Principal works in collaboration with the principal in implementing the vision and mission for the school. Ms. Hill ensures fidelity of the MTSS monitoring by evaluating the following: instructional staff's implementation of tiered instruction, process of administering assessments, and the alignment of professional development with faculty needs.        |
| Clarke, Ginger      | School Counselor    | The counselor is an integral part of the MTSS team that uses data-based problem-solving to integrate academic and behavioral instruction and intervention. She provides support to individuals and small groups of students.  |
| Hill, Kennise       | Reading Coach       | The Reading Coach provides direct instructional services related to improving and supporting classroom instruction. The Reading Coach utilizes the coaching model to support teachers in effective evidenced-based instructional strategies that will improve students' academic success.   |
| McClaude, Francesca | Math Coach          | The Math Coach provides direct instructional services related to improving and supporting classroom instruction. The Math Coach utilizes the coaching model to support teachers in effective evidenced-based instructional strategies that will improve students' academic success.   |
| Rutledge, Adriana   | Other               | The ESE teacher provides support to teachers to ensure that students with disabilities demonstrate increased participation and performance in the standard or access curriculum statewide assessments and school site accountability systems.   |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Wednesday 7/15/2020, Yolanda Ellis L

**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.*

1

**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.*

8

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

40

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

505

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

2

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

6

**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                              | 83          | 83 | 94 | 67 | 67 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 483   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 29          | 21 | 20 | 16 | 22 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 135   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 25 | 11 | 23 | 0  | 8  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 67    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 16 | 9  | 5  | 0  | 8  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 38    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 27 | 18 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 86    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 20 | 29 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 99    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 30 | 41 | 42 | 19 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 173   |

**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           | 18 | 10 | 29 | 22 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 116   |

**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 | 6 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 22    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 2  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |



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

Wednesday 8/24/2022

**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                              | 44          | 68 | 79 | 86 | 67 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 427   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 17          | 26 | 31 | 33 | 27 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 159   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 6  | 13 | 7  | 2  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 29    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 1  | 5  | 7  | 3  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7     |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 28 | 54 | 50 | 17 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 184   |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 2           | 10 | 16 | 19 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 60    |

**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     | 2           | 12 | 12 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 43    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0  | 0  | 4  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |

**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                              | 44          | 68 | 79 | 86 | 67 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 427   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 17          | 26 | 31 | 33 | 27 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 159   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 6  | 13 | 7  | 2  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 29    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 1  | 5  | 7  | 3  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7     |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 28 | 54 | 50 | 17 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 184   |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 2           | 10 | 16 | 19 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 60    |

**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     | 2           | 12 | 12 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 43    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0  | 0  | 4  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |

**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             | 43%    | 62%      | 56%   |        |          |       | 42%    | 62%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 52%    |          |       |        |          |       | 51%    | 62%      | 58%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 57%    |          |       |        |          |       | 48%    | 58%      | 53%   |
| Math Achievement            | 48%    | 58%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 56%    | 69%      | 63%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 47%    |          |       |        |          |       | 55%    | 66%      | 62%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 63%    |          |       |        |          |       | 44%    | 55%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 27%    | 64%      | 59%   |        |          |       | 38%    | 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 | 37%    | 60%      | -23%                       | 58%   | -21%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 41%    | 64%      | -23%                       | 58%   | -17%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -37%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 40%    | 60%      | -20%                       | 56%   | -16%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -41%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| 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 | 52%    | 67%      | -15%                       | 62%   | -10%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 49%    | 69%      | -20%                       | 64%   | -15%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -52%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 54%    | 65%      | -11%                       | 60%   | -6%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -49%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 35%    | 53%      | -18%                       | 53%   | -18%                    |
| 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                                       | 39       | 47     | 47          | 56        | 61      | 58           | 44       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 36       | 42     | 43          | 39        | 56      | 63           | 27       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 44       | 55     | 57          | 51        | 45      | 63           | 29       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 43       | 46     | 56          | 42        | 51      | 63           | 24       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 44       | 52     | 56          | 48        | 47      | 62           | 28       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 27       | 55     | 60          | 42        | 45      |              | 14       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 36       | 57     | 55          | 39        | 43      |              | 33       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 39       | 51     |             | 39        | 33      |              | 27       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 38       | 64     | 67          | 46        | 57      |              | 45       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 38       | 55     | 65          | 41        | 43      | 59           | 32       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 28       | 44     | 38          | 36        | 40      | 21           | 30       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 43       | 43     |             | 57        | 53      |              | 64       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 40       | 50     | 50          | 53        | 53      | 48           | 29       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 45       | 47     |             | 62        | 59      |              | 63       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 41       | 51     | 48          | 55        | 55      | 44           | 38       |         |           |                   |                     |

**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  | 49  |
| 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 | 53  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 390 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8   |
| Percent Tested  | 99% |
| Subgroup Data   |     |
| Students With Disabilities  |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 49  |

| <b>Students With Disabilities</b>  |     |
|--|-----|
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?             | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%      | 0   |
| <b>English Language Learners</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      | 45  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%       | 0   |
| <b>Native American Students</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - Native American Students                                       |     |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%        | 0   |
| <b>Asian Students</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - Asian Students   |     |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                  | 0   |
| <b>Black/African American Students</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                | 49  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |
| <b>Hispanic Students</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 47  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               | 0   |
| <b>Multiracial Students</b>  |     |
| 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   |
| <b>Pacific Islander Students</b>   |     |
| 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                                | 49  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Data Analysis

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

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

The school to District comparison shows an increase in the Achievement gap widening from 3rd to 5th grade in both ELA and Math. In addition, proficiency in ELA and Mathematics increased by 5 percentage points and 7 percentage points respectively. However, Science Achievement levels decreased by 6 percentage points.

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

Two ELA subgroups' Proficiency decreased by a total of 9 percentage points. ELL decreased by 7 percentage points and Hispanic students decreased by 2 percentage points. Two Math subgroups' proficiency decreased by a total of 38 percentage points. ELL decreased by 18 percentage points and Hispanic students by 20 percentage points.

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

For the last 3 years, we have been focusing on implementing standards-based instruction in all classrooms. We have struggled with consistency of standards-based instruction across all classrooms and grade levels. In some of our classrooms, instruction does not meet the depth of the standard or access pre-requisite knowledge. In addition, teachers changed grade levels and must now learn a new set of standards and their content limits. We will begin to incorporate professional development opportunities by grade level and content area to unwrap the standards and align appropriate resources and instructional activities. In addition, collaborative planning will support these efforts and will incorporate a greater focus on the standards and standards-based resources provided by the District.

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

ELA FSA increased by 5 percentage points and Math FSA increased by 7 percentage points. Math FSA proficiency increased from 41 percentage points in 2021 to 48 percentage points on the 2022 FSA. In

2021, students in the L25 subgroup in Math showed a growth of 4 points when comparing I-Ready AP1 to AP3 data.

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

Contributing factors to the improvement noted on our FSA results were Data-Chats, Data-Driven Instruction, Collaborative Planning for whole group and differentiated instruction, Differentiated Instruction, Extended Learning Opportunities, and ELA Intervention.

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

In order to accelerate learning the following strategies will be implemented: Data-driven Instruction, Collaborative Planning, Differentiated Instruction, Extended Learning Opportunities, Standards-Based Collaborative Planning, Math and ELA Interventions, job-embedded professional development, technology integration, Gradual Release of Responsibility Model (GRRM), Hands-On Learning, English Language Learner Strategies, Collaborative Data Chats, Instructional Frameworks, Corrective Feedback for Students, Goal Oriented Learning, Anchor Charts, Interactive Journals, Ongoing Progress Monitoring, Engagement, effectively implementing MTSS process and procedures.

**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.**

To support teachers and leaders the PLST will develop whole group and job-embedded professional development sessions on using data resources to drive instruction, Intervention, STEAM, Math B.E.S.T. PD (September/22), Aligning resources to small group instruction (October/22), Tackling OPM Data (November/December/22), making adjustments to groups as data becomes available (2/22), I-Ready data analysis post-AP1, and continuous data chats with individualized feedback and next steps (ongoing). Coaching cycles will also be implemented individually with teachers to support specific needs (ongoing).

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

To ensure sustainability of improvement, extended learning opportunities will be provided such as Saturday Academies, Spring Break Academy, Winter Academy, Dibia DREAM (STEAM driven), TALENTS tutoring, and Robotics. Additionally, ELA Intervention will be conducted daily, with fidelity utilizing explicit instruction.

**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 Standards-aligned Instruction**

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

The area of focus was selected as a critical need because according to the 2022 FSA proficiency data, 20% of the 5th grade students are proficient in ELA, 35% of the 4th grade students are proficient in Math, and 27% of the 5th grade students are proficient in Science. The 2021 FSA proficiency data shows 38% of the 5th grade students are proficient in ELA, 30% of the 4th grade students are proficient in Math, and 33% of the 5th grade students are proficient in Science. Based on the data we will focus on standard-aligned instruction to increase proficiency.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is improved academic performance of statewide assessments. If we successfully provide Standard-Aligned instructional practices in the classroom, then on the 2022-2023 FAST statewide standardized assessments we will meet our goal of 50% or more 5th grade students proficient in Reading, 50% or more 4th grade students will be proficient in Math and 40% or more of the 5th grade students will be proficient in Science.

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

The Leadership Team will conduct quarterly data chats following I-Ready and State Assessments. Weekly Wednesday walkthroughs to ensure that explicit standard-aligned instruction is implemented daily with fidelity in whole group and differentiated instruction with a focus on Standard-Aligned explicit instruction.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Leasha Hill (leahill@dadeschools.net)

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

Our school will focus on the evidenced based strategy of Standards-Aligned Instruction. Teachers will execute lessons based on the standards/learning targets and ensure that all student products and teaching techniques are aligned to the intended standards. Teachers will deliver planned lessons to guide students through the demands of the standards/learning targets. Students will show evidence of mastering the lesson objective through their work samples/tasks.

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

The implementation of the evidence based strategy Standard-Aligned Instruction provide lessons based on the standards/learning targets. All student work products and teaching techniques are aligned effectively to the intended standard(s). Teachers will explicitly deliver planned lesson(s) to guide students through the requirement of the standards/learning targets. Students will show evidence of mastering the lesson objective/s through their work samples/tasks, which will assist in accelerating all students to their full academic potential.



**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.

8/16-10/14 Provide Job-Embedded Professional Development for teachers on effective implementation on Standard-Aligned Instruction. As a result, teachers will provide focused instruction to meet students' needs.

**Person Responsible** Francesca McClaude (322262@dadeschools.net)

8/16-10/14 Teachers will develop weekly lesson plans that are inclusive of Standard-Aligned Instruction. As a result teachers will be able to correlate lessons with standards/learning targets. Students will show evidence of mastering the lesson objective/s through their work samples/tasks.

**Person Responsible** Francesca McClaude (322262@dadeschools.net)

8/16-10/14 Coaches will facilitate weekly collaborative planning to provide teachers with an opportunity to brainstorm challenges, identify misconceptions, and share best practices to address misconceptions and promote student engagement.

**Person Responsible** Francesca McClaude (322262@dadeschools.net)

8/16-10/14 Teachers will use school-wide data trackers to chart on-going progress monitoring in ELA. Teachers will use school-wide data trackers to chart Topic Assessments in Math and Science. Teachers will use data trackers to modify lesson delivery of instruction based on student performance.

**Person Responsible** Leasha Hill (leahill@dadeschools.net)

10/31-12/16 Job-Embedded professional development on standard aligned Differentiated Instruction in Math and ELA.

**Person Responsible** Francesca McClaude (322262@dadeschools.net)

10/31-12/16 Coaches will facilitate collaborative planning to provide teachers with an opportunity to develop Differentiated Instruction lesson plans for Math and ELA. As a result teachers will be able to adequately align differentiated lessons with a focus on students work product as evidence of mastering the lesson objective/s.

**Person Responsible** Francesca McClaude (322262@dadeschools.net)

**#2. 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.**

Our area of focus will be specific teacher feedback and classroom walkthroughs. The data revealed that 84 percent of teachers feel that the evaluation process is used to improve teacher performance. Therefore, to increase this percentage point we selected specific teacher feedback and walkthroughs.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

If we successfully implement Consistent Developmental Feedback through weekly walkthroughs, then the percentage points for teachers feeling that the evaluation process is used to improve teacher performance will continue to increase 11 percentage points to our goal of 95 percent on the 2023 school climate survey.

**Monitoring:**

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

The weekly implementation of Consistent Developmental Feedback through walkthroughs with Instructional Staff will increase staff morale whom feel that teacher evaluations are used to improve teacher performance by 11 percentage points. Weekly developmental feedback with a focus on standard-aligned instruction will continuously build teacher performance by October 2022.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Yolanda Ellis (pr0101@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 and walkthrough we will focus on the evidence-based strategy of Consistent, Developmental Feedback. This strategy involves providing a clear expectation, progress towards that goal, and a description of the behavior and support that will be provided. Feedback will be provided weekly as a means of professional growth.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

The data revealed that 84 percent of teachers feel that the evaluation process is used to improve teacher performance, therefore implementing the evidence based strategy Consistent, Developmental Feedback, teachers will continue to build upon their capacity to address their students' needs.

**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.

9/1 - 10/14 The leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs with a focus on standard aligned instruction in ELA, Math, and Science. As a result of implementing weekly walkthroughs teachers will continue to build upon their capacity to address their students' needs.

**Person Responsible**

Leasha Hill (leahill@dadeschools.net)

9/1 - 10/14 The leadership team and instructional coaches will analyze and monitor ongoing-progress monitoring assessment data and topic assessment data in order to inform and/or assist teachers in adjusting instruction for students .

**Person Responsible**

Yolanda Ellis (pr0101@dadeschools.net)

9/1 - 10/14 Instructors will complete school-wide data chart with students' results to easily track progress.

**Person Responsible** Leasha Hill (leahill@dadeschools.net)

9/1 - 10/14 Teachers will conduct data chats with students following progress monitoring and assessments, so that students are also aware of their personal progress. School-wide data chats with leadership and teachers following district and state assessments.

**Person Responsible** Yolanda Ellis (pr0101@dadeschools.net)

10/31-12/16 School-wide data chats with leadership and teachers following district and state assessments.

**Person Responsible** Yolanda Ellis (pr0101@dadeschools.net)

10/31-12/16 The leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs with a focus on Differentiated Instruction in ELA and Math. As a result of implementing weekly walkthroughs teachers will continue to build upon their capacity to address their students' needs.

**Person Responsible** Leasha Hill (leahill@dadeschools.net)

10/31-12/16 Leadership Team will send staff members a Professional Development needs survey.

**Person Responsible** Leasha Hill (leahill@dadeschools.net)

**#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Staff Involvement and Attendance**

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

Research has shown that when a staff works together collectively to accomplish a goal , the likelihood for success increases. Our school experienced a decrease in the number of staff members that feel as though we work together as a team. According to the 2020-2021 School Climate Survey feedback in the area of School Personnel working together as a team 96% of the staff agreed. The 2021-2022 School Climate Survey revealed that only 80% of the staff members agreed that we work together as a team. This area decreased by 16 percentage points. When staff are frequently absent students don't receive the same quality of instruction they normally receive resulting in a decrease in student gains, which also lowers staff morale. During the 2020-2021 school year 32 percent of staff members were absent 5 or more days . In the 2021-2022 school year 56 percent of staff were absent 5 or more days, which is a 24 percentage point increase. Historically students that are habitually absent from school do not perform as well as those who are regularly in attendance. During the 2021 school year 61 percent of students were absent 6 or more days. In the 2021-2022 school year 81 percent of students were absent 6 or more days, which is a 20 percentage point increase.

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

If we successfully implement Celebrate Successes of Instructional and Non-Instructional staff, our morale for working together will increase by 20 percentage points on the 2022-2023 Climate Survey by June 2023. In addition, if we successfully implement school-wide attendance initiatives the percentage points of students who missed more than 10 days will decrease.

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

Staff meetings will begin with an opportunity for connection and teachers will have designated speaking time during every meeting to ensure that all input is considered. The leadership team will survey teachers to garner ideas on initiatives/strategies/systems they would like to have implemented in our school. Based on the survey teachers will volunteer to lead different initiatives and showcase their leadership. In addition, a Strategic Attendance Initiatives will involve close monitoring and reporting of student absences, calls to parents, and more direct measures including home visits, counseling and referrals to outside agencies as well as incentives for students with perfect attendance.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Ginger Clarke (gmclarke@dadeschools.net)

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

Within the Area of Focus of Positive Culture and Environment, we will focus on implementing the evidence based strategy Celebrate Successes. Consistently acknowledging and celebrating staff and student success will promote a positive school culture and increase staff and student morale. When school culture is positive and morale is high, staff and students are more likely to be present and put forth maximum effort.

**for this Area of Focus.**

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

The 2021 - 2022 SIP identified a decrease of 16 percentage points in the area of working together as a team. This data indicates that there is a critical need to provide teachers with opportunities to lead initiatives/strategies/systems they would like to have implemented in our school. By leading different initiatives teachers will feel empowered and connected to the school's overall mission.

**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.

8/22 - 10/14 We will implement a Staff of the Month Celebration that highlights a Staff member and celebrates their success in and out of the classroom. We will also celebrate staff and students birthdays. As a result of implementing Staff of the Month Celebration and celebration of birthdays, the staff's teamwork, cohesiveness, and collaboration will increase.

**Person Responsible** Ginger Clarke (gmclarke@dadeschools.net)

8/16 - 10/14 We will organize an attendance review committee to address students with attendance issues exceeding 5 or more tardies and absences.

**Person Responsible** Leasha Hill (leahill@dadeschools.net)

8/16 - 10/14 Attendance Review Committee will contact parents of students tardy or absent 3 or more days to explain MDCPS Attendance Policies, the importance of students attending school daily, and how it contributes to learning loss.

**Person Responsible** Leasha Hill (leahill@dadeschools.net)

9/1 - 10/14 Staff and students with 100% attendance per month, will be able to enter a drawing for a prize and participate in a PTA led breakfast. Staff and students with 100% attendance at the end of the school year will be celebrated and entered for the Grand Finale Drawing for their accomplishments. There will be a Principal's 100% Attendance 10 Day Challenge, the class with 100% attendance will be entered into a drawing to receive a \$25 class gift card.

**Person Responsible** Ginger Clarke (gmclarke@dadeschools.net)

10/31-12/16 Staff/Student of the Month Celebration that highlights a Staff member and celebrates their success in and out of the classroom. We will also celebrate staff and students birthdays. As a result of implementing Staff/Student of the Month Celebration and celebration of birthdays, the staff's teamwork, cohesiveness, and collaboration will increase.

**Person Responsible** Ginger Clarke (gmclarke@dadeschools.net)

10/31-12/16 Staff and students with 100% attendance per month, will be able to enter a drawing for a prize and participate in a PTA led breakfast. Staff and students with 100% attendance at the end of the marking period will be celebrated and entered for the Grand Finale Drawing for their accomplishments.

**Person Responsible** Ginger Clarke (gmclarke@dadeschools.net)

**#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction**

**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 comparison of the 2021 Early Warning System data and 2022 Early Warning System data, there was a significant increase in the amount of students that failed ELA (+23) and Math (+19). Therefore, we selected the overarching area of Small Group Instruction.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

If we successfully implement and consistently monitor Small Group Instruction with a focus on differentiated lesson to master standard-aligned goal/target, then there will be a overall decrease of students failing ELA and Math.

**Monitoring:**

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

On a weekly basis the leadership team will conduct walk throughs to ensure that DI is being implemented with fidelity. Students will maintain a DI Folder/Journal with evidence of differentiated activities by standards which will enhance their identified areas of weakness.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kennise Hill (khill@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based**

**Strategy:**

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

The evidence based strategy of Differentiated Instruction is a framework for effective teaching that involves providing students with innovative educational opportunities for acceleration based on their identified area of weakness.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

The evidence based strategy of Differentiated Instruction will be utilized to mitigate learning loss and meet students' individual needs through small group instruction. This strategy will focus on the students' areas of weakness that were evident during the 2021-2022 school year and based on the decreasing amount of proficient students on the AP3 I-Ready data.

**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.

9/1-10/14 Implementation of Instructional Support/Coaching to provide the opportunity for teachers and coaches to collaborate and set a measurable goal to improve instructional outcomes during Differentiated instruction.

**Person Responsible**

Yolanda Ellis (pr0101@dadeschools.net)

9/1-10/14 During collaborative planning Coaches and instructors will analyze assessment 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**

Francesca McClaude (322262@dadeschools.net)

9/1-10/14 The leadership team and Instructors will utilize the baseline data, Iready data and previous statewide assessments data to create DI Instruction groups.

**Person Responsible** Leasha Hill (leahill@dadeschools.net)

9/1-10/14 The instructor and leadership team will monitor the ongoing progress monitoring data and topic assessments data and revamp groups based on current data. The instructional math coach will develop their schedule to provide for additional assistance in DI.

**Person Responsible** Kennise Hill (khill@dadeschools.net)

10/31-12/16 Job-Embedded professional development on incorporating effective Differentiated Instruction in Math and ELA.

**Person Responsible** Francesca McClaude (322262@dadeschools.net)

10/31-12/16 Coaches will facilitate collaborative planning to provide teachers with an opportunity to develop Differentiated Instruction lesson plans for Math and ELA. As a result teachers will be able to adequately align differentiated lessons with a focus on students work product as evidence of mastering the lesson objective/s.

**Person Responsible** Francesca McClaude (322262@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 I-Ready AP3 data 55 percent of current 1st grade students are one or more grade levels below in ELA. Seventy-nine percent of current 2nd grade students are one or more grade levels below in the area of ELA.

As a result, we will implement the evidence based strategy of utilizing anchor charts. Anchor charts will serve as artifacts of classroom learning. Like an anchor, they holds students' and teachers' thoughts, in alignment to standards and skills, as well as ideas and processes in place. Anchor charts can be



displayed as reminders of prior learning and built upon over multiple lessons.

In addition, the evidence based strategy of utilizing graphic organizers. Students will learn how, when, and why to use the strategy of Graphic Organizers to enhance their ability to comprehend various types of text. A graphic organizer is a visual display that organizes ideas and shows the relationships between concepts or information. Graphic organizers guide students' thinking and help them to comprehend what they read. Graphic organizers are also an important tool for guiding student writing.

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

According to the 2022 I-Ready AP3 data 67 percent of current 3rd grade students are one or more grade levels below in ELA. Forty-four percent of current 3rd grade students are one or more grade levels below in the area of ELA. Sixty percent of our current 5th grade students are one or more grade levels below in the area of ELA.

As a result, we will implement the evidence based strategy of utilizing SQ3R. SQ3R is a reading comprehension method named for its five steps: survey, question, read, recite, and review. Follow these steps to learn how to glean as much information as possible.

In addition, the evidence based strategy of utilizing anchor charts serve as artifacts of classroom learning. Like an anchor, they holds students' and teachers' thoughts, in alignment to standards and skills, as well as ideas and processes in place. Anchor charts can be displayed as reminders of prior learning and built upon over multiple lessons.

### **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 goal oriented learning through the utilization of anchor charts and graphic organizers in ELA there will be a decrease in the amount of Tier 3 students in Reading I-Ready in primary grades. Currently, based on AP3 data in first grade 26 out of the 91 students are tier 3 in I-Ready and 37 out of 88 2nd grade students are on Tier 3 in I-Ready.

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

With the implementation of goal oriented learning through the utilization of anchor charts and SQ3R 50% or more of the 3-5 population will score at grade level or above on the 2023 FAST Reading 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 weekly walkthroughs with a focus on the RAISE instructional practices. The leadership team will review ongoing progress monitoring in the area of ELA.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Hill, Kennise, khill@dadeschools.net

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

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

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

In grades K-2 we will implement goal oriented learning by utilizing two evidenced based strategies Anchor Charts and Graphic Organizers. In grades 3-5 we will implement goal oriented learning by utilizing two evidenced based strategies Anchor Charts and SQ3R.

Anchor Chart will holds students' and teachers' thoughts, in alignment to standards and skills, as well as ideas and processes in place. Anchor charts can be displayed as reminders of prior learning and built upon over multiple lessons.

Students will learn how, when, and why to use the strategy of Graphic Organizers to enhance their ability to comprehend various types of text. A graphic organizer is a visual display that organizes ideas and shows the relationships between concepts or information.

SQ3R is a reading comprehension method named for its five steps: survey, question, read, recite, and review.

**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?

In grades K-2 we will implement goal oriented learning by utilizing two evidenced based strategies Anchor Charts and Graphic Organizers. In grades 3-5 we will implement goal oriented learning by utilizing two evidenced based strategies Anchor Charts and SQ3R. Each evidenced based strategy will ensure that teachers are effectively implementing appropriate ELA instruction and enrichment opportunities to meet the needs of all students.

**Action Steps to Implement:**

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

| Action Step  | Person Responsible for Monitoring    |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| 8/14 - 9/1 Literacy Coach will provide a job-embedded PD on creating relevant anchor charts and graphic organizers for current standard/learning target being taught.                  | Hill, Kennise, khill@dadeschools.net |
| 8/14 - 9/1 Literacy Coach will assist teachers in creating anchor charts, SQ3R (when applicable), and graphic organizers during collaborative planning session.                        | Hill, Kennise, khill@dadeschools.net |
| 8/14 - 10/14 Literacy coach will collaboratively plan on a weekly basis with K-5 teachers with a focus on student work products related to anchor charts, SQ3R and graphic organizers. | Hill, Kennise, khill@dadeschools.net |
| 8/14 - 10/14 Literacy coach and teachers will reflect on how anchor charts, SQ3R and graphic organizers contributed to student growth in ELA .   | Hill, Kennise, khill@dadeschools.net |
| In-house Job-Embedded Professional Development on effectively implementing Intervention K-5.   | Hill, Kennise, khill@dadeschools.net |
| In-house Job-Embedded Professional Development on student Engagement Strategies K-5.   | Hill, Kennise, khill@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.**

The school communicates with all stakeholders via School-wide Class Dojo, social media, and Connect-Ed messenger to promote and disseminate important information as well as new opportunities for parents to engage in students' learning.

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

The role of the teacher is to communicate student progress routinely to all stakeholders. The role of the guardian is to maintain open communication by providing adequate contact information. The role of the school administration is to effectively communicate with all stakeholders as well as provide new and research-based strategies that enhance learning opportunities for students and staff members.