

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# Frank Crawford Martin K 8 Center



## 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>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

## Frank Crawford Martin K 8 Center

14250 BOGGS DR, Miami, FL 33176

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

### Demographics

Principal: Elianeys Basulto

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2022

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Combination School<br>PK-8  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | No  |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 91%   |
| <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>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: A (67%)<br>2018-19: A (66%)<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>   | ATSI  |
| * 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>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

## Frank Crawford Martin K 8 Center

14250 BOGGS DR, Miami, FL 33176

<http://fcmartin.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) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Combination School<br>PK-8                       | No                     | 91%  |
| 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.**

All stakeholders are committed to the advancement of students' academic, emotional, social and physical well being within a supportive, creative and flexible environment in which children learn to think globally and act compassionately.

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

Frank C. Martin International K-8 Center provides students with an internationally recognized curriculum. This challenging curriculum incorporates world-class standards that empower students to actively participate in the learning process and acquire and exhibit positive attitudes. Students strive to become model citizens of our diverse world.

### 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  |
|-----------------------|---------------------|--|
| Basulto, Elianeys     | Principal           | Oversee all aspects of the school curriculum. Guides the leadership team in curricular decisions and areas of focus. Leads school leader instructional walk throughs and identifies areas of need for the teachers and students. Leads data discussions and assist teachers develop strategies to address the needs of the learners. |
| Hoel, Robert          | Assistant Principal | Supports the principal in all aspects of curriculum. Conducts walkthroughs with the leadership team to help identify areas of academic need. Assists the principal develop strategies to address learner needs and provide guidance to teachers.   |
| Capodiferro, Katheryn | Magnet Coordinator  | Supports the administrative team with all aspects of the International Baccalaureate Curriculum. Works with the leadership team in supporting teachers with instructional strategies and the development of cross curricular IB Unit Planners.   |
| Almagro, Tania        | School Counselor    | Supports the administrative team with the MTSS process and all Social and Emotional Learning of the students.  |
| Rackley, Chale        | School Counselor    | Supports the administrative team with the MTSS process and all Social and Emotional Learning of the students.  |
| Labadie, Annika       | Teacher, K-12       | Supports the leadership as the Schoology and Gradebook manager. Identifies areas of need and relays information to the administration when necessary.  |

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Friday 7/29/2022, Elianeys Basulto

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

5

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

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

47



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

710

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

9

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

7

**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                              | 52          | 66 | 66 | 101 | 69 | 77 | 100 | 77 | 84 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 692 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 5           | 12 | 5  | 11  | 3  | 6  | 6   | 4  | 9  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 61  |       |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0  | 0  | 1   | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1   |       |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 1   | 1  | 1  | 5   | 0  | 15 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 23  |       |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 17  | 9  | 5  | 11  | 13 | 16 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 71  |       |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 17  | 14 | 9  | 17  | 15 | 24 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 96  |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |
|  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |
|  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |    |   |   |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |    |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 14 | 9 | 7 | 10 | 15 | 14 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 69 |       |

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     | 4           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 18    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |

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

Friday 7/29/2022

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

| Indicator  | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |     |    |    |     |   |    |    |    |     | Total |
|--|-------------|----|----|----|----|-----|----|----|-----|---|----|----|----|-----|-------|
|  | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5   | 6  | 7  | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |     |       |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 53          | 67 | 89 | 91 | 81 | 101 | 91 | 95 | 112 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 780 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 10          | 5  | 8  | 5  | 7  | 6   | 5  | 14 | 9   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 69  |       |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 1  | 0  | 1  | 8  | 5   | 0  | 5  | 2   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 22  |       |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 1  | 1  | 2  | 8  | 6   | 2  | 3  | 15  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 38  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1   | 4  | 3  | 4   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2   | 6  | 8  | 3   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19  |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 4           | 6  | 24 | 21 | 23 | 14  | 25 | 41 | 29  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 187 |       |

**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 | 5           | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 7 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 42 |

**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     | 8           | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 23 |       |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 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                              | 72          | 59 | 83 | 88 | 82 | 106 | 82 | 89 | 118 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 779   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 13          | 4  | 7  | 6  | 5  | 6   | 5  | 8  | 11  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 65    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1   | 1  | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 2  | 1  | 4   | 1  | 15 | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 23    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1   | 4  | 3  | 4   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2   | 6  | 8  | 3   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 4           | 6  | 24 | 21 | 23 | 14  | 25 | 41 | 29  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 187   |

#### 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 | 5           | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 7 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 42    |

#### 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     | 8           | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 23    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |

## 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             | 62%    | 62%      | 55%   |        |          |       | 75%    | 63%      | 61%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 59%    |          |       |        |          |       | 58%    | 61%      | 59%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 52%    |          |       |        |          |       | 43%    | 57%      | 54%   |
| Math Achievement            | 59%    | 51%      | 42%   |        |          |       | 71%    | 67%      | 62%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 71%    |          |       |        |          |       | 60%    | 63%      | 59%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 68%    |          |       |        |          |       | 51%    | 56%      | 52%   |
| Science Achievement         | 58%    | 60%      | 54%   |        |          |       | 68%    | 56%      | 56%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 89%    | 68%      | 59%   |        |          |       | 79%    | 80%      | 78%   |

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

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

| ELA               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 02                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 03                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 79%    | 60%      | 19%                        | 58%   | 21%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 81%    | 64%      | 17%                        | 58%   | 23%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -79%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 85%    | 60%      | 25%                        | 56%   | 29%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -81%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 67%    | 58%      | 9%                         | 54%   | 13%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -85%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 68%    | 56%      | 12%                        | 52%   | 16%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -67%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 72%    | 60%      | 12%                        | 56%   | 16%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -68%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| 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 | 76%    | 67%      | 9%                         | 62%   | 14%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 80%    | 69%      | 11%                        | 64%   | 16%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -76%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|                   | 2019 | 90%    | 65%      | 25%                        | 60%   | 30%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -80%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 44%    | 58%      | -14%                       | 55%   | -11%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -90%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 55%    | 53%      | 2%                         | 54%   | 1%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -44%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 33%    | 40%      | -7%                        | 46%   | -13%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -55%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 75%    | 53%      | 22%                        | 53%   | 22%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -75%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 46%    | 43%      | 3%                         | 48%   | -2%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| BIOLOGY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019        | 93%    | 68%      | 25%                   | 67%   | 26%                |
| CIVICS EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019        | 79%    | 73%      | 6%                    | 71%   | 8%                 |
| HISTORY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022        |        |          |                       |       |                    |

| HISTORY EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| ALGEBRA EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 96%    | 63%      | 33%                   | 61%   | 35%                |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 89%    | 54%      | 35%                   | 57%   | 32%                |

### 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                                       | 21       | 32     | 33          | 25        | 58      | 50           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 56       | 46     |             | 63        | 73      |              | 43       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 57       | 56     | 53          | 53        | 69      | 70           | 52       | 91      | 83        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 65       | 61     | 46          | 66        | 74      | 62           | 62       | 86      | 76        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 88       | 83     |             | 75        | 75      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 88       | 75     |             | 87        | 71      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 57       | 59     | 52          | 53        | 69      | 68           | 50       | 90      | 84        |                   |                     |
| 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       | 41     | 42          | 22        | 12      | 20           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 45       | 54     | 50          | 45        | 18      |              | 38       | 30      |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 87       | 67     |             | 73        | 42      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 58       | 53     | 42          | 40        | 28      | 28           | 40       | 60      | 70        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 65       | 53     | 37          | 49        | 20      | 9            | 52       | 68      | 66        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 60       | 40     |             | 53        | 20      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 83       | 52     |             | 91        | 45      |              | 82       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 55       | 50     | 38          | 39        | 24      | 21           | 39       | 59      | 64        |                   |                     |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD                                       | 42       | 41     | 30          | 58        | 71      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 77       | 64     | 60          | 71        | 68      |              | 54       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 100      | 74     |             | 86        | 63      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 70       | 52     | 39          | 65        | 56      | 49           | 61       | 66      | 75        |                   |                     |

| 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 |
| HSP                                       | 81       | 64     | 53          | 76        | 64      | 63           | 75       | 94      | 96        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 71       | 59     |             | 63        | 57      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 95       | 66     |             | 95        | 72      |              | 91       | 91      | 100       |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 70       | 55     | 40          | 66        | 57      | 54           | 61       | 72      | 83        |                   |                     |

### ESSA Data Review

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

| ESSA Federal Index  |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 67   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 1    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 69   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 669  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 10   |
| Percent Tested  | 99%  |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 37   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 0    |
| English Language Learners   |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 58   |
| 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   |     |
|--|-----|
| 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                                    | 65  |
| 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  | 67  |
| 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   | 80  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                       | NO  |
| 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   | 80  |
| 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                                | 65  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### Data Analysis

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



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

According to the 2022 FSA Assessments, Frank C. Martin experience growth in all areas. 62% of students in ELA scored proficient, in Math 53% of students scored proficient, and science 51% of the students that participated in the science assessment scored proficient. In Social Studies, 88% of the 7th grade students demonstrated proficiency.

All ELA Subgroups Achievement increased except for Black students which decreased by 1% point, and SWD students which decreased by 6%

All ELA Subgroups Learning Gains increased except for SWD who decreased by 9% and ELL students who decreased by 8%.

All ELA Subgroups Learning Gains L25 increased except for SWD who decreased by 9%.

All Math Subgroups Achievement increased except for White students who decreased by 4%.

All Math Subgroup in both Learning Gains and L25 Learning Increased.

All Science Subgroups increased in achievement.

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

Math data represents the greatest need for the 2022 school year. According to the progress monitoring that occurred during the 2021-2022 school year, students demonstrated growth throughout the school year. For students that participated in iReady AP1, only 24% demonstrated proficiency whereas AP3, 61% of students demonstrated proficiency. Grades 6-8 represented the greatest area of need as only 41% of 6th grade students, 45% of 7th grade students, and 43% of 8th grade students scored proficient on iReady AP3. The 2022 FSA Math assessment verified the iReady data throughout the school year. Overall only 53% of the students scored proficient on the 2022 Spring assessment. This is below both the District Average of 55% and below the Tier 1 school average of 60%. The greatest need is in the Middle School. According to the 2022 FSA, Grades 6 students scored 37% proficient, in Grade 7- 54% of students scored proficient, and in 8th grade 28% of the students scored proficient. In Algebra I, 100% of the 7th grade students who participated in the 2022 EOC scored proficient, whereas 80% of the 8th graders scored proficient. In Geometry, 82% of the students scored proficient.

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

The decline in math scores across all grade levels data support the need for greater need for differentiated instruction and strategic use of programmatic resources. Teachers need to consistently monitor student data and adjust the instruction accordingly. In addition, consistent tutoring attendance with students scoring in the Red and Yellow on iReady AP1 will provide students with foundational skill practiced needed to be successful on the FAST assessments.

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

During the initial diagnostic assessment, 46% of the students scored proficient in Reading. By the end of the school year, 71% of the students scored proficient on the AP3. All grade levels demonstrated growth throughout the school year. Learning gains in ELA were at 65% and 62% scored proficient.

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

Grades K-5 schedules includes a common planning time for all members of the grade level. The common planning times allow teachers to develop solutions to curricular issues and assist the team members to develop strategies to address student needs. In Grades 6-8, all subject area groups have common planning times built into the master schedule.

Grade K-5 teachers schedule contains intervention time in addition to the regular class time for

differentiated instruction. Grade 3-5 teachers utilized the iReady platform for home learning assignments as well as to assigned specific lessons to students. Any student that received intervention also participated in the growth monitoring assessments to track progress toward goals.

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

A greater emphasis will be place on Data Driven Instruction and Differentiated Instruction for all grade levels. The instructional staff members will utilize all district provided resources including District created topic assessments, District Mid-Year Assessments, iReady Diagnostic Assessments and FAST Progress Monitoring to guide curricular decisions throughout the school year.

**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.**

The School Leadership Team (SLT) will identify subject area liaisons (August) to attend monthly District meetings and share with teachers during faculty meetings. IB Trainings (August/Sept/Oct) will occur to assist teachers develop

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

Regular meeting schedules will be placed on a calendar to develop consistent routines for reviewing student data and developing strategies to address the needs of the learners.

**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 Differentiation**

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

According to the 2022 FSA proficiency data, students 62% of students score proficient in ELA, on par with the Tier 1 schools that averaged 62% proficiency. This was a 1% increase over the 2021 statewide assessment however a 13% decrease from the 2019 state assessment. Overall, 4 grade levels scores below the 62% average. 4th grade scored a 60% proficiency, 5th grade 59% proficiency, 7th grade 58% proficient, and 8th grade 55 proficient. This indicates a need for differentiation across all grade levels in order to develop the number of students scoring proficient in Reading.

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

With the implementation of Differentiation across all grade levels, the proficiency rate for each grade level will increase by 5% in Reading on the 2023 school with Reading assessment.

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

Differentiated instruction will be monitored during the formal observation cycle with the teacher by reviewing lesson plans and intervention folders. The administration will also look for differentiated instruction during informal walkthroughs and discuss DI strategies during data chats after each progress monitoring assessment.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Elianeys Basulto (pr3101@dadeschools.net)

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

Within the instructional practice of differentiation, Frank C. Martin K-8 center will focus on the evidence based strategy of Differentiated Instruction. Teachers will utilize current student data to determine the needs of the students and provide different avenues of instruction to assist students with the targeted standard. During intervention time, the students will maintain Differentiated Instruction folders to document strategies implemented with the students

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

During the 2021-2022 school year, students were still developing school routines after 2 years of interrupted schooling. As evident by the growth monitoring during the school year, the students make progress, however, the proficiency rate remains 13% lower than the 2019 school year. Differentiated Instruction takes into account student needs and learning style to assist with reaching their potential and mastering the grade level standards.

**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.

8/17/22 - The master schedule in the Elementary will have regular Differentiated Instruction built in to the schedule during Foreign Language time. The Foreign Language classes will be held regularly to allow a consistent DI time.

**Person Responsible** Robert Hoel (rhoel1@dadeschools.net)

10/5/22 - Identify the Elementary intervention students through Power BI reports and place them in the Intervention Course.

**Person Responsible** Robert Hoel (rhoel1@dadeschools.net)

10/4/22 - During the second faculty meeting, instruct the faculty to bring a sample of a DI folder to the meeting and in small groups share the process they are implementing in their classroom.

**Person Responsible** Robert Hoel (rhoel1@dadeschools.net)

10/10/22- Conduct data chats with teachers using the PM1 and iReady AP1 data. Make adjustments to students in intervention as needed.

**Person Responsible** Elianeys Basulto (pr3101@dadeschools.net)

10/31/22 - Administration will hire an additional interventionist to work with targeted elementary grade students.

**Person Responsible** Robert Hoel (rhoel1@dadeschools.net)

11/2/22- A local Reading coach will demonstrate how to use the Reading Horizon program and how to implement the program with fidelity.

**Person Responsible** Robert Hoel (rhoel1@dadeschools.net)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math****Area of Focus**

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

According to the 2022 FSA proficiency data 53% of students scored proficient in Math. Frank C. Martin K-8 Center proficiency data is 3% lower than the district average and 7% lower than the Tier 1 school average of 60%. Although Frank C. Martin Math increased by 13% from 2021 FSA scores, the school decreased from the 2019 proficiency rate of 64%. According to the 2022 assessment, 73% of the students scored a learning gain in math, which was 7% higher than the District average of 66% and 5% higher than the Tier 1 school average. The area of focus remains in the middle school as Grade 6 math proficiency was 37%, 7th Grade proficiency 61% and 8th grade proficiency 55%. 100% of 7th grade students pass the Algebra I EOC and 80% of 8th Grade students passed Algebra I EOC.

**Measurable Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve.

This should be a data based, objective outcome.

With the implantation of data-driven decision making, the math proficiency rate will increase by 5% for grade 6 (63%), grade 7 (59%) , and grade 8 (51%) on the 2022 Math PM3 FAST assessment.

This should be a data based, objective outcome.

This should be a data based, objective outcome.

**Monitoring:**

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

After each administration of the Progress Monitoring of FAST assessment and iReady diagnostic assessments, members of the school leadership team will meet with MYP Math teachers to analyze the current data, and assist with Data-Driven Decisions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elianays Basulto (pr3101@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being

Within the targeted element of standards aligned instruction, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of Data-Driven Decision Making. The teachers will use the variety of data available during the 2022 school year, PM1, iReady Assessments, and District Topic assessments, to guide instruction and identify students for tutoring opportunities.

**implemented  
for this Area  
of Focus.**

**Rationale for  
Evidence-  
based**

**Strategy:**

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

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

Frank C. Martin K-8 Center scored 3% lower than the District Average in Math proficiency and SWD score 25% proficiency overall on the 2022 FSA Math Assessment. This indicates a need to monitor student progress throughout the school year, identify student area of needs early, and provide strategies in the classroom. The evidence based strategy of Data Decision Decision making takes into account student performance with a particular skill or standard, and identifies the specific area of need. With that information, teachers can develop curricular solutions to build student skills.

### **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.

8-22-22 The master schedule includes common planning for the MYP math teachers to allow for subject area collaboration, problem solving, and a common time for data chats.

**Person  
Responsible** Robert Hoel (rhoel1@dadeschools.net)

9-1-22 Students will participate in the FAST Math Progress Monitoring 1 assessment providind beginning of year data.

**Person  
Responsible** Robert Hoel (rhoel1@dadeschools.net)

9-26-22 Students will participate in iReady AP1 data to compare with FAST AP1 data.

**Person  
Responsible** Robert Hoel (rhoel1@dadeschools.net)

10-10-22 Administration will begin data chats with MYP Math department to develop a plan of action for math instruction.

**Person  
Responsible** Elianeys Basulto (pr3101@dadeschools.net)

12-5-22 The students will participate in the FAST PM2 Assessment.

**Person  
Responsible** Robert Hoel (rhoel1@dadeschools.net)

12-5-22 Identify students not meeting Algebra I standards through recent data and teacher recommendation and reassign to a current grade level course.

**Person  
Responsible** Elianeys Basulto (pr3101@dadeschools.net)

### #3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Creating a positive student experience

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

According to the 2021-2022 School Climate Survey feedback from students indicate that 25% of students strongly agreed or agreed that students in my school usually follow the rules. Lack of understanding of the rules progressive discipline plan and may result in students feeling that they are not following the rules.

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

If we successfully implement a series of positive behavior incentives and a progressive discipline plan, the number of students that agreed that usually follow the rules will increase by 10%, from 25% to 35%, on the 2023 School Climate Survey.

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

A disciplinary committee will develop a school wide behavior continuum to address both positive and undesired behaviors with the emphasis on incentivizing positive targeted behaviors. Monthly scheduled leadership meetings will occur to discuss discipline issues and develop upcoming activities.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Robert Hoel (rhoel1@dadeschools.net)

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

The leadership team will develop rewards/incentives to reward students that model student behavior. The rewards/incentives will be developed during leadership team meetings and presented to students through morning announcements.

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

On the 2022 school climate survey, only 25% of surveyed students agreed with "students in my school usually follow the school rules." This indicates a need for greater rewards and incentives to increase the number of students complying with school site expectations.

#### 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.

8/26/22- MYP students participate in a orientation designed to review expectations for the 2022-2023 school year.

**Person Responsible**

Robert Hoel (rhoel1@dadeschools.net)

8/28/22- The MYP orientation will be communicated to all MYP parents through the school messenger.

**Person Responsible**

Robert Hoel (rhoel1@dadeschools.net)

10-5-22 The leadership team will develop a list of incentives, timeline for those incentives, and criteria for participation in the incentives.

**Person Responsible**

Katheryn Capodiferro (kcapodiferro@dadeschools.net)

8/31/22 (Monthly) Teachers will choose a student of the month that will be recognized for modeling IB learner profiles.

**Person Responsible** Chale Rackley (chalerackley@dadeschools.net)

10-31-22 A second nine weeks incentive calendar will be presented to the MYP students.

**Person Responsible** Robert Hoel (rhoel1@dadeschools.net)

11-2022 Counselor will identify students using the grade threshold report and meet with them individually to create an academic improvement plan.

**Person Responsible** Chale Rackley (chalerackley@dadeschools.net)



**#4. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team****Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

During the 2022-2023 school year, 2 new counselors, 1 new mental health counselor, and 1 media specialist were added to the faculty and leadership team. As key members of the leadership team, the new staff members will work alongside the leadership team to guide school site decisions that impact student achievement and work with all stakeholders.

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

If we successfully include the new members of the school based leadership team into the daily operational tasks, administration will increase classroom visitation by 20% over the 2021-2022 school year. In addition, for the school climate survey question, "administrators solve problems effectively," will increase from 44% strongly agree and 37% agree to 50% strongly agree and 40% agree.

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

During the scheduled leadership team meetings, team leaders will share grade level or subject area concerns with the leadership team. At the meeting, the team will develop solutions to address issues. Administration will develop a system to document the teacher concerns, solution implemented, and further follow up that may be needed.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Robert Hoel (rhoel1@dadeschools.net)

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

The evidence based strategy used for this Area of Focus will be Shared Leadership. Under the guidance of the principal, the individual members of the leadership team will provide input into solutions and share responsibility for implementing those solutions. The shared responsibility will allow a decrease in the number of task among all members providing greater focus when providing support.

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

In order to increase the effectiveness of the leadership team, each member of the team needs very specific tasks they can become experts in as oppose to a small group of individuals attempting to implement several tasks.

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

8-17-22 A leadership meeting schedule is created and distributed to all members of the leadership team.

**Person Responsible** Elianeys Basulto (pr3101@dadeschools.net)

8-29-22 The leadership team will meet with the school resource officer to review school based crisis plan to ensure all members understand their roles.

**Person Responsible** Elianeys Basulto (pr3101@dadeschools.net)

10-18-22 The leadership team will meet with the grade level and department chairpersons to discuss specific issues and develop solutions.

**Person Responsible** Elianeys Basulto (pr3101@dadeschools.net)

8-17-22 The lead teacher will send out IB checkpoints to MYP teachers. During those meetings, the leadership team will assist teachers with any IB related challenges related to implementation of the program.

**Person Responsible** Katheryn Capodiferro (kcapodiferro@dadeschools.net)

11-3-22 The leadership team will meet weekly to discuss ongoing programs, events, and student concerns and develop action steps to address any issues.

**Person Responsible** Elianeys Basulto (pr3101@dadeschools.net)

11-30-22 Meet with PYP teachers to begin the Self Study Process and assign tasks to grade levels to meet the IB requirements.

**Person Responsible** Katheryn Capodiferro (kcapodiferro@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

NA

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

NA

**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)**

NA

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

NA

**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.

NA

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

**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?

NA

**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?

NA

**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**

NA

**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.**

Frank C. Martin K-8 Center creates a positive school culture by providing a variety of activities to celebrate and recognize students socially and academically. Throughout the school year, the school recognizes Hispanic Heritage and African American Heritage through school site programs involving both parents and members of the community. Students are also provided an opportunity to share their own cultural heritage by dressing in traditional clothing in lieu of Halloween costumes in October. Frank C. Martin K-8 Center will also begin the Student of the Month program during the 2022-2023 school year. Grade level chairs will submit nominations of students going above and beyond in the classroom and demonstrate the learner profiles core to the International Baccalaureate program. Introduced this school year, the Positive Behavior Support plan will incentivize positive actions among the students hereby creating a better school climate among the students. The principal will build community partnerships through monthly EESAC meetings and

quarterly Principal coffee meetings as well as leading volunteer opportunities on campus. Monthly calendars, backpack mailers, and social media post will help stakeholders stay connected to school events. To maintain the positive relationships with faculty members, the administration will maintain an open door policy with the teachers and value feedback and ideas. Information will be collected via surveys and hallway conversations.

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

The administration will develop an inclusive environment by maintaining positive relationships with all stakeholders by participating in all school wide events and maintaining a constant presence in the hallways during the school day.

The teachers will build a positive school culture by providing the students with meaningful experiences and recognizing those students contributing to the school community.

The student services team will assist teachers with recognizing student achievements and responding to the needs of the students.

The PTSA will sponsor activities and support administration with a variety of positive school site programs that bring various stakeholders together.