

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Keys Gate Charter School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Keys Gate Charter School

2000 SE 28TH AVE, Homestead, FL 33035

<http://www.keyscharter.org/>

Demographics

Principal: Corinne Armstrong

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	79%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (50%) 2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

N/A

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.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Keys Gate Charter School

2000 SE 28TH AVE, Homestead, FL 33035

<http://www.keyscharter.org/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	Yes	79%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	97%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		B	B

School Board Approval

N/A

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.

We, the Knights, are empowered to choose our own personalized college and career pathway.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Keys Gate Knights will have access and opportunity to become locally engaged and globally connected. Our Knights will be prepared to thrive in a diverse and ever-changing 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
Baez, Corinne	Principal	
Veras, Yudibeth	Assistant Principal	
Barroso, Yadira	Assistant Principal	
Beltran, Sandra	Dean	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 6/1/2014, Corinne Armstrong

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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

120

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,978

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

26

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

26

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	187	223	206	226	200	242	231	231	232	0	0	0	0	1978
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	3	4	5	3	7	8	9	0	0	0	0	40
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	1	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	7	11	6	49	22	22	6	44	3	0	0	0	0	170
Course failure in Math	7	9	4	33	38	22	39	35	76	0	0	0	0	263
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	55	62	59	50	72	75	0	0	0	0	373
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	56	68	82	55	72	72	0	0	0	0	405
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	7	11	6	37	6	6	2	6	17	0	0	0	0	98

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	7	9	4	38	41	22	46	48	50	0	0	0	0	265

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	7	11	6	37	6	6	2	6	17	0	0	0	0	98
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	2	2	3	4	7	0	0	0	0	21

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/28/2022

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	186	187	189	208	223	223	240	228	221	0	0	0	0	1905
Attendance below 90 percent	4	2	1	1	3	2	4	7	11	0	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	1	3	2	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	5	2	4	18	7	4	7	16	10	0	0	0	0	73
Course failure in Math	5	6	7	13	7	10	4	19	27	0	0	0	0	98
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	46	88	48	62	50	57	0	0	0	0	351
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	69	92	72	102	69	109	0	0	0	0	513
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	5	3	8	18	17	16	21	15	7	0	0	0	0	110

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	6	4	10	22	15	17	25	23	28	0	0	0	0	150

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		5	2	4	18	7	4	7	8	27	0	0	0	82
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	2	3	1	5	3	7	0	0	0	21

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	186	187	189	208	223	223	240	228	221	0	0	0	0	1905
Attendance below 90 percent	4	2	1	1	3	2	4	7	11	0	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	1	3	2	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	5	2	4	18	7	4	7	16	10	0	0	0	0	73
Course failure in Math	5	6	7	13	7	10	4	19	27	0	0	0	0	98
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	46	88	48	62	50	57	0	0	0	0	351
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	69	92	72	102	69	109	0	0	0	0	513
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	5	3	8	18	17	16	21	15	7	0	0	0	0	110

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	6	4	10	22	15	17	25	23	28	0	0	0	0	150

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	5	2	4	18	7	4	7	8	27	0	0	0	0	82
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	3	1	5	3	7	0	0	0	0	21

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	42%	62%	55%				54%	63%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	46%						53%	61%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						47%	57%	54%
Math Achievement	45%	51%	42%				65%	67%	62%
Math Learning Gains	59%						64%	63%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%						53%	56%	52%
Science Achievement	33%	60%	54%				45%	56%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	61%	68%	59%				64%	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	58%	60%	-2%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	53%	64%	-11%	58%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	59%	60%	-1%	56%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
06	2022					
	2019	62%	58%	4%	54%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
07	2022					
	2019	45%	56%	-11%	52%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
08	2022					
	2019	43%	60%	-17%	56%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

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	64%	67%	-3%	62%	2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	58%	69%	-11%	64%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2022					
	2019	71%	65%	6%	60%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
06	2022					
	2019	62%	58%	4%	55%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
07	2022					
	2019	51%	53%	-2%	54%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
08	2022					
	2019	57%	40%	17%	46%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	54%	53%	1%	53%	1%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	27%	43%	-16%	48%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	97%	68%	29%	67%	30%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	64%	73%	-9%	71%	-7%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	99%	63%	36%	61%	38%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	54%	46%	57%	43%

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	15	37	36	19	45	42	16	33			
ELL	35	46	46	39	57	51	16	53	67		
ASN	33			67							
BLK	37	43	38	37	58	55	26	67	50		
HSP	43	47	47	46	59	52	33	59	61		
MUL	29	17		50	83						
WHT	52	53		60	64	60	63	79	92		
FRL	40	45	45	43	58	52	31	59	61		
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	15	32	28	13	16	18	20	32			
ELL	36	46	38	25	23	30	24	41	29		
ASN	64			18							
BLK	43	36	21	30	22	13	25	42	35		
HSP	47	43	37	36	22	23	34	55	42		
MUL	38	21		27	7						
WHT	68	56	10	59	31	20	48	85	80		
FRL	45	41	31	33	21	22	32	52	42		
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	16	38	42	24	42	40	19	50			
ELL	44	50	42	52	61	50	34	44	50		
BLK	48	49	39	58	56	43	34	65	35		
HSP	54	53	48	65	65	53	45	65	67		
MUL	54	30		77	60						
WHT	65	61	60	76	77	71	63	65	71		
FRL	51	52	47	62	63	52	42	64	60		

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	50
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	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	502

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	47
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	50
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
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	50
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	45
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	65
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	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 trends that emerged across core content areas were a decrease in ELA achievement (specifically grades 3, 6, 7, and 8) and no growth in Science achievement. This same trend was also evident on our SWD subgroup.

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

Based off progress monitoring and prior year assessments, the greatest need for improvement are in the subjects of English Language Arts and Science. Based off 2022 subgroup data, the greatest need for improvement is our SWD student population.

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 contributing factors to this need for improvement were:

- Lack of certified teachers in our ELA classes
- Hold on new curriculum used for ELA courses
- Lack of engagement in Science courses.

The new actions that would need to be taken to address this need for improvement are:

- Conducting hiring fairs throughout the year that will attract certified and qualified teachers.
- Providing teachers with ongoing professional development on ELA curriculum and ensuring that they receive their resources in a timely manner.
- Supporting new teachers with effective instructional strategies and pedagogy via walkthrough/ observation feedback and coaching cycles.
- Providing and restructuring our Science minute-by-minute plans to ensure that the 5Es and engaging labs are at the forefront of every Science lesson taught.

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

Based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, the data components that showed the most improvement were our lowest 25th percentile in Mathematics which went up from a 21% to a 53% and our Social Studies achievement which increased from a 54% to a 61%.

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

The contributing factors to our improvements in Mathematics were focusing on our Success Block which concentrated on analyzing data to inform small group instruction and provide students with differentiation in Mathematics. The contributing factors to our improvements in Social Science were a focus in backwards planning, academic vocabulary, analyzing data to differentiate instruction, and integrating a new curriculum for our Civics course.

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

Some strategies that will need to be implemented to accelerate learning are a focus on Response to Intervention services, SWD data analysis to drive instruction in ELA and Science courses, and professional development on small group instruction for novice teachers.

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 professional development that will be offered to teachers to prepared them with the tools needed to accelerate learning are:

- Differentiation
- Small Groups/Centers
- Instructional Software
- TLC
- Data Dives and action plans

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

Additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement are:

- Hiring of external tutoring company
- Continuous implementation of Reading Intervention
- Tiered Differentiated Instruction
- Continuous Professional Development
- Continuous collaborative planning and PLCs with Curriculum Resource Teachers to build on collective teacher efficacy

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

ELA achievement went from a 47% in 2021 to a 42% in 2022 and was identified as a critical area of need.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our data based objective is to increase our ELA achievement and reach our overall ELA school wide goal of 47%.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored by:

- Continuing to follow our RTI Process and analyzing data to assess effectiveness
- Focus on instructional minutes via walkthroughs/ teacher observations
- Rigorous lesson planning with standards alignment and a focus on tiered differentiated instruction
- Analyzing data during data dives and PLCs

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Corinne Baez (921387@dadeschools.net)

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

Tiered differentiated instruction targets specific student needs allowing teachers to close the learning gap and students achieving learning gains. Nordlund, M. (2003). Differentiated instruction: Meeting the educational needs of all students in your classroom. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Students will be tiered and grouped based on ability level (standards based) achieved in monthly assessments. Teacher will see students on teacher led daily where instruction will take place based on the students ability (remediation or enrichment can be taking place depending on student need).

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.

- Teacher will provide Tier 2 intervention.
- Intervention teachers will pull Tier 3 students for them to receive T3 intervention.
- Pre and Post assessments will be created by Curriculum Resource Teachers.
- Pre and Post assessments will be tracked by teachers.
- Teachers will group students based on ability level.
- Curriculum resource teachers will guide teachers in the lesson planning process for teacher lead and differentiated instruction process.
- Groups will change monthly based on students scores on the monthly assessments.

Person Responsible

Corinne Baez (921387@dadeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

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

Social Science achievement remained at 33% from to 2022 and was identified as a critical area of need.

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

Our data based objective is to increase our Social Science achievement and reach our overall Social Science school wide goal of 70%.

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

This area of focus will be monitored by:
-Focus on instructional minutes via walkthroughs/ teacher observations
-Rigorous lesson planning with standards alignment and a focus on tiered differentiated instruction
-Analyzing data during data dives and PLCs
-Planning for and checking student interactive notebooks

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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

Tiered differentiated instruction targets specific student needs allowing teachers to close the learning gap and students achieving learning gains.
Nordlund, M. (2003). Differentiated instruction: Meeting the educational needs of all students in your classroom.
Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press

Research shows a positive correlation between standards tracking and proficiency.
Mohamud A. & Fleck D. (2010) Alignment of Standards, Assessment and Instruction: Implications for English Language Learners in Ohio, Theory Into Practice, 49(2), 129-136,
<https://doi.org.10.1080/00405841003626643>

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

Students will be tiered and grouped based on ability level (standards based) achieved in monthly assessment. Students will travel to a teacher where instruction will take place based on the students ability (remediation or enrichment can be taking place depending on student need). A pre and post assessment will be taking place to ensure students are mastering the standard. Teachers will also backwards plan their lessons and track student progress through ongoing data chats with the curriculum resource teachers.

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.

- Pre and Post assessments will be created by Curriculum Resource Teachers.
- Pre and Post assessments will be tracked by teachers.
- Analyze data to inform upcoming instruction.

- Teachers will group students based on ability level.
- Curriculum resource teachers will guide teachers in the lesson planning and instruction process.
- Groups will change monthly based on students scores on the monthly assessments.

Person Responsible

Corinne Baez (921387@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

Our area of focus for Reading/ELA will be focusing on implementing an effective RTI program, honing in on small group and differentiation during ELA block, and providing teachers with professional development on instructional strategies, curriculum, and the BEST standards. This will affect student literacy as it will help close the learning gap and provide teachers with the tools needed to teach reading effectively. Lastly, these instructional practices were selected based on the 2022 SAT and NWEA results where 66% of second graders were at or above average in Reading and 61% were at or above average in Mathematics.

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

Our area of focus for Reading/ELA will be focusing on implementing an effective RTI program, honing in on small group and differentiation during ELA block, and providing teachers with professional development on instructional strategies, curriculum, and BEST standards. This will affect student literacy as it will help close the learning gap and provide teachers with the tools needed to teach reading effectively. Lastly, these instructional practices were selected based on the 2022 FSA Results and NWEA data.

Grade 3 FSA ELA Proficiency: 39%

Grade 4 FSA ELA Proficiency: 45%

Grade 5 FSA ELA Proficiency: 46%

Grade 6 FSA ELA Proficiency: 47%

Grade 7 FSA ELA Proficiency: 35%

Grade 8 FSA ELA Proficiency: 34%

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)

- K-2 data will increase to 70 % students reading at or above grade level.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

- Grades 3-5 data will increase by 4 percentage points per grade level.

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.

- Small Group instruction will occur daily from the general education teacher.
- RTI groups will be pulled on a weekly basis by the RTI teacher. Data will be analyzed and drive grouping on a quarterly basis.
- Professional development on instructional strategies will occur on a quarterly basis.
- Professional development on curriculum and BEST standards will occur on a biweekly basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Baez, Corinne, 921387@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?

Data from the following programs:

- iReady
- NWEA
- SAT/ FSA
- MyView
- Lexia
- Fountas and Pinnell

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The evidence based programs address the identified needs and are aligned to our reading plan and the BEST ELA standards.

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
1. Implement effective RTI program by meeting on a quarterly basis to review student data and action plan for RTI groups. 2. Small Group Instruction/ Differentiation by holding biweekly collaborative planning and focusing on student data to drive instruction in literacy and reading comprehension. 3. Ongoing professional development for instructional strategies and BEST ELA standards where teachers will learn how to dissect standard(s) and the content limits.	Baez, Corinne, 921387@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 builds a positive relationships with parents, families, and stakeholders by having an open door policy, encouraging parents to learn about their child's success through parent informational PD sessions, and a Parent & Family Engagement Plan through Title I.

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

The school is encouraging parental involvement and training by holding "Parent University" sessions at least once a month. The sessions will teach parents how to support their child academically, emotionally and other areas.