

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Miami Beach Feinberg/ Fisher K 8



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	23
Positive Culture & Environment	32
Budget to Support Goals	0

Miami Beach Feinberg/Fisher K 8

1420 WASHINGTON AVE, Miami Beach, FL 33139

<http://fienberg.dadeschools.net>

Demographics

Principal: Maria Costa P

Start Date for this Principal: 8/10/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (45%)
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	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Miami Beach Feinberg/Fisher K8, in partnership with our families and diverse community, is to develop healthy, civic minded, innovative individuals. It is our goal to empower students to reach their maximum potential and becoming caring, reflective, life-long learners with a balanced international perspective and sense of social responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empowering and nurturing internationally minded life-long learners.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Costa, Maria	Principal	Principal provides direction and support as she oversees the effective planning and implementation of schoolwide decision making related to school operations and curriculum involving all stakeholders and alignment with the school vision and district directives.
Fuentes, Georgina	Reading Coach	Reading Content Coach provides support to teachers in data-analysis, integration of technology, best practices for instruction, intervention, cross-curricular instruction, professional development, assessment, and ELA curriculum resources.
Jeanbaptiste, Pierrela	Instructional Coach	International Baccalaureate (IB) Content Coach provides support to teachers in data-analysis, integration of technology, best practices for instruction, cross-curricular instruction, professional development, instructional planning, and Primary Years Programme (PYP)/ Middle Years Programme (MYP) planner projects and reflection. Testing Coordinator manages administration of, operations relating to, and professional development involved in district and state testing for grades K-8.
Carrillo, Renee	Science Coach	STEAM and Science Content Coach provides support to teachers in data-analysis, integration of technology, best practices for instruction, cross-curricular instruction, professional development, assessment, instructional planning, Science curriculum resources, and STEAM designation requirements.
Klian, Annie	Math Coach	Math Content Coach provides support to teachers in data-analysis, integration of technology, best practices for instruction, intervention, instructional planning, cross-curricular instruction, professional development, assessment, and Math curriculum resources.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hart, David	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal provides assistance to the principal in managing the school.
Pena, Zuleica	Guidance Counselor	School counselor who encourages and supports a positive academic, social, and personal development for students through a comprehensive school counseling program. She collaborates with educators in PreK-8 classrooms to present and integrate the student development curriculum, which includes lessons centered on anti-bullying, mindfulness, and social-emotional learning, to help students achieve the desired competencies appropriate to their developmental level.
Pearson, Philip	Other	Media Specialist who takes on many delegated tasks from administration, including managing school social media accounts and email groupings, managing and promoting physical and digital libraries, morning announcements, school events and activities relating to literacy, promoting a positive school culture, and school safety directives (i.e. ID cards for staff and students).
Yanes, Veronica	Teacher, ESE	Chair of the ESE and LEA department for exceptional education who takes on all responsibilities relating to ESE screening, requirements, and students.
Cid, Danae	Reading Coach	TBD: Reading Content Coach provides support to teachers in data-analysis, integration of technology, best practices for instruction, intervention, cross-curricular instruction, professional development, assessment, and ELA curriculum resources.
Borrego, Nelson	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal provides assistance to the principal in managing the school.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/10/2015, Maria Costa P

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*

19

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*

27

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

59

Total number of students enrolled at the school

699

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

16

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

0

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by 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	66	73	70	87	77	77	76	87	86	0	0	0	0	699
Attendance below 90 percent	15	13	11	19	6	15	13	18	19	0	0	0	0	129
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	10	7	5	6	8	28	0	0	0	0	64
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	7	2	15	10	16	21	0	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	11	18	34	38	0	0	0	0	101
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	20	38	31	0	0	0	0	98
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	20	39	66	26	32	50	49	55	0	0	0	0	339

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	0	17	1	14	18	29	44	0	0	0	0	124

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	3	0	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/29/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Number of students enrolled		
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

2020-21 - Updated

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	85	85	77	105	92	85	92	105	86	0	0	0	0	812
Attendance below 90 percent	13	11	12	13	14	11	18	20	11	0	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	14	5	6	9	30	12	0	0	0	0	78
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	7	15	10	16	22	6	0	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	11	16	34	38	24	0	0	0	0	123
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	18	38	32	18	0	0	0	0	115

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators		1	0	2	16	14	17	30	45	21	0	0	0	0	146

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		3	1	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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).

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
03	2021					
	2019	38%	60%	-22%	58%	-20%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	26%	64%	-38%	58%	-32%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
05	2021					
	2019	29%	60%	-31%	56%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-26%				
06	2021					
	2019	42%	58%	-16%	54%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-29%				
07	2021					
	2019	39%	56%	-17%	52%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
08	2021					
	2019	40%	60%	-20%	56%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	33%	67%	-34%	62%	-29%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	37%	69%	-32%	64%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
05	2021					
	2019	39%	65%	-26%	60%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
06	2021					
	2019	51%	58%	-7%	55%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
07	2021					
	2019	51%	53%	-2%	54%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
08	2021					
	2019	33%	40%	-7%	46%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	31%	53%	-22%	53%	-22%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	10%	43%	-33%	48%	-38%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	93%	68%	25%	67%	26%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	69%	73%	-4%	71%	-2%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	80%	63%	17%	61%	19%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

The values displayed are the percent of students expected to be proficient based on iReady Diagnostic Results and Mid-Year assessments. For grades K-8, iReady Data AP1 for Fall, AP2 for Winter, and AP3 for Spring.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	13.4	26.9	44.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	13.4	26.9	44.8
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	6.7	10.0	30.0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15.2	20.9	49.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	15.2	20.9	49.3
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	10.0	10.0	33.3

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	21.6	21.2	25.0
	Economically Disadvantaged	18.4	18.0	22.0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	18.0	13.5	25.0
	Economically Disadvantaged	14.6	10.0	22.0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	9.1	0	18.2

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34.1	48.8	52.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	34.2	50.0	52.5
	Students With Disabilities	20.0	21.1	21.1
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11.5	29.1	45.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	11.1	28.8	46.3
	Students With Disabilities	5.0	10.5	15.8
	English Language Learners	0	0	11.1
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	20.3	29.2	40.9
	Economically Disadvantaged	19.4	28.6	39.1
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	20.0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	27.7	34.4	51.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	25.4	32.2	50.0
	Students With Disabilities	10.0	20.0	30.0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	14.9	23.1	15.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	12.7	21.3	11.3
	Students With Disabilities	7.7	25.0	8.3
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	16.7	20.0	30.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	16.1	16.4	26.2
	Students With Disabilities	7.7	8.3	16.7
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	0	3.0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	3.0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0.0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0.0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	23.0	27.8	38.0
	Economically Disadvantaged	21.1	26.1	36.8
	Students With Disabilities	6.3	0	16.7
	English Language Learners	4.2	0	12.0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13.2	23.6	42.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	9.7	21.7	39.1
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	16.7
	English Language Learners	0	4.0	20.0

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	26.9	34.7	36.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	27.0	33.8	35.8
	Students With Disabilities	10.0	25.0	37.5
	English Language Learners	0	4.8	4.8
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	23.3	37.0	52.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	22.1	34.8	51.6
	Students With Disabilities	11.1	12.5	14.3
	English Language Learners	0	9.5	25.0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	0	64.0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	64.0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	67.0	0
	English Language Learners	0	30.0	0

Grade 8					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		32.1	36.0	39.2
	Economically Disadvantaged		30.7	36.1	38.0
	Students With Disabilities		25.0	30.0	20.0
	English Language Learners		0	0	4.2
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		26.7	44.0	43.8
	Economically Disadvantaged		25.0	41.7	42.9
	Students With Disabilities		18.2	10.0	30.0
	English Language Learners		0	25.0	8.3
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students		0	13.0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged		0	12.0	0
	Students With Disabilities		0	10.0	0
	English Language Learners		0	8.0	0
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Subgroup Data Review

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
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	30	56	56	37	49	46	41	100			
ELL	33	53	48	44	60	55	40	69	87		
BLK	49	51		54	58		72				
HSP	43	60	51	50	61	58	45	81	90		
WHT	57	59		69	59		67				
FRL	44	59	51	50	62	60	48	82	93		

2018 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	25	49	62	33	50	61	27	79			
ELL	25	50	56	46	62	57	34	77			
BLK	59	44		67	62			100			
HSP	42	55	56	54	64	59	47	86	77		
WHT	66	68		63	77		64	100			
FRL	46	56	62	56	65	58	53	91	84		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	612
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	50
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	55
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	57
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	60
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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
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	62
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	61
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

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?

2019 Data:

In ELA and Math, there is less of an achievement gap between the school and the district in grades 6-8 than grades 3-5.

ELA Achievement: SWD, ELL, and HSP sub-groups increased and BLK, WHT, FRL sub-groups decreased.

All ELA sub-groups in Learning Gains increased except for WHT, which decreased by 9 percentage points.

All ELA sub-groups in Learning Gains L25% decreased.

All Math sub-groups in Achievement decreased except for SWD and WHT, which increased by 4 and 6 percentage points.

All Math sub-groups in Learning Gains decreased.

All Math sub-groups in Learning Gains L25% decreased except FRL, which increased by 2.

All Science sub-groups in Achievement increased except for HSP and FRL.

All Social Studies sub-groups in Achievement decreased except for SWD, which increased by 21 percentage points.

2021 Data:

ELA FSA proficiency decreased by 8 percentage points from 45% in 2019 to 37% in 2021.

ELA Learning Gains decreased by 2 percentage points from 59% to 57%.

ELA Learning Gains for L25% increased by 1 percentage point from 51% to 52%.

Math FSA proficiency decreased by 12 percentage points from 52% in 2019 to 40% in 2021.

Math Learning Gains decreased by 11 percentage points from 61% to 50%.

Math Learning Gains L25% decreased by 7 percentage points from 56% to 49%.

Statewide Science Assessment proficiency decreased by 19 percentage points from 50% in 2019 to 31% in 2021.

Social Studies standardized assessment proficiency decreased by 21 percentage points from 83% in 2019 to 62% in 2021.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

2019 Data Findings:

ELA sub-groups in Learning Gains L25% all decreased demonstrating the greatest need for improvement.

2021 Data Findings:

The percent of students scoring Level 3 or above on the ELA FSA decreased by 8 percentage points from 45% in 2019 to 37% in 2021. ELA Learning Gains also decreased.

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

One of the ways our school provides support for teachers is through interventionists. However, this support is often inconsistent. This leads to difficulty for teachers in instructional planning and implementation of intervention. Classroom teachers will be provided consistent support in the classroom through interventionists and professional development in differentiated instruction. The challenges of MSO and dual-modality instruction as well as the number of students and teachers being quarantined contributed to inconsistency in routine and instruction. MSO instruction and accessing resources online proved difficult for some families.

In the 2021-2022 school year, we have fully-released Math, Reading, and STEAM instructional coaches along with a team of paraprofessionals and interventionists to provide support for teachers and their students. Instructional coaches will facilitate collaborative planning, especially with new teachers since approximately 20% of our school's instructional staff has been teaching for less than 3 years. Additionally, all students receive face-to-face physical instruction and district quarantine protocols are more focused to take vaccination and social distancing into account. Students continue to have widespread access to technology at home and at school through our school's laptop supply.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

2019 Data Findings:

SWD showed the most improvement in nearly every category except for the L25% in ELA and Math Learning Gains.

All ELA sub-groups in Learning Gains increased except for the white sub-group.

All MS Acceleration sub-groups (HSP and FRL) increased.

Biology and Algebra scores significantly outperformed the district and the state. 93% of students performed at a level of 3 or greater in Biology and 80% of students performed at a level of 3 or greater in Algebra.

2021 Data Findings:

ELA Learning Gains for students in the lowest 25% increased by 1 percentage point from 51% on the 2019 FSA to 52% on the 2021 FSA.

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

SWD students were supported by our school's ESE department and dedicated intervention support.

Continued intervention and differentiated instruction in all grade levels contributed to increased student achievement in ELA. We included an hour of small group intervention every morning in ELA for elementary grade levels and provided tutoring opportunities (ex. GEER program and Saturday School) for students in grades 3-8.

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

Strategies will include: extended learning opportunities, differentiated instruction, intervention, collaborative planning, standards-aligned instruction, data-driven instruction, data-driven decision making, modeling, and professional development.

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.

We will host school-based professional development trainings on August 19th and October 29th. Topics will include STEAM, IB, technology integration, and Reading curriculum updates. Monthly faculty meetings will include professional development trainings on evidence-based strategies that have proven effective in accelerating learning. Additionally, grade levels will meet to discuss strategies of implementation (ongoing).

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

Collaborative planning will be scheduled weekly and a member the Leadership Team, such as instructional coaches, will attend to ensure fidelity to the differentiation and data-driven strategies being implemented school-wide that are aligned to school improvement goals. Leadership committees in school pride, discipline, and other areas of need/ interest will continue. Extended Learning opportunities will be provided through Saturday academy, before/ after school tutoring, interventions, and STEAM-based clubs.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Results from the School Climate Survey showed teachers are concerned about the preparation of the students. 63% of teachers agree or strongly agree that students are deficient in basic academic skills and 23% feel neutral. Only 48% of teachers agree or strongly agree that students come prepared academically to class. Leadership development would contribute to addressing all areas of student needs, including professional development, data-monitoring, and collaborative instructional planning. If we successfully implement the Targeted Element of developing our Leadership Team, our teachers will receive support from our Leadership Team in data-monitoring and instructional planning therefore positively impacting student performance.

Measureable Outcome: If we develop our Leadership Team, then at least 15% of teachers participate in leadership roles during the 2021-2022 school year. By providing opportunities, we will involve teachers in leadership activities and support leadership development.

Monitoring: The Leadership Team will help develop teacher leaders. Teachers will be provided various leadership opportunities, such as participation in committees and sharing in delegated responsibilities, to help facilitate collaboration among peers, unity, and professional development. The development of these trained professionals will provide support to classroom teachers and help them monitor student progress in core academic areas during grade level/ department meetings and seminars. We hope to create an environment of shared leadership.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Maria Costa (pr0761@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The school leadership team will focus on providing Consistent, Developmental Feedback to support teachers in their professional development, instructional planning, and meeting their students' academic needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Developing the integration between the classroom teachers and the Leadership Team will provide consistent developmental support and feedback to improve the academic performance of students.

Action Steps to Implement

08/30 - 09/30 - The administration and leadership team will outline individual roles that need to be filled throughout the school year (i.e. instructional coach positions and leadership committee memberships). Teachers will also be given the opportunity to volunteer to serve as grade-level chairs and will be selected via staff feedback and input. As a result, meaningful leadership opportunities that benefit the school will be made available.

Person Responsible David Hart (189497@dadeschools.net)

08/30 - 10/11 (ongoing) - Faculty meeting agendas will clearly indicate activities and opportunities for faculty and staff members to participate in committees and leadership roles. This will maintain faculty and staff participation in the decision-making process by

encouraging all members to serve on a school-wide committee through committee sign-up drives. As a result, teachers will have a variety of leadership opportunities to choose from based on their strengths and interests.

Person Responsible David Hart (189497@dadeschools.net)

08/30 - 10/11 (ongoing) - Teachers will be given opportunities to lead and contribute to the Discipline, Spirit, Parent Engagement, Multicultural Affairs, and/ or School-Wide Incentives committees throughout the school year. As a result, teachers will have a variety of leadership opportunities to participate in throughout the school year.

Person Responsible Maria Costa (pr0761@dadeschools.net)

08/30 - 10/11 (ongoing) - Leadership committees will attend quarterly meetings and meet additionally as needed to discuss and plan for activities and events that contribute to a positive and productive school culture. These developments will be shared with administration for feedback. As a result, school-wide morale and unity will increase.

Person Responsible Maria Costa (pr0761@dadeschools.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Results in the School Climate survey revealed that teachers are concerned about the preparation of the students. 63% of teachers agree or strongly agree that students are deficient in basic academic skills and 23% feel neutral. Only 48% of teachers agree or strongly agree that students come prepared academically to class. Focusing on Early Warning Systems will help us identify and target at-risk students.

Measureable Outcome: If we target at-risk students and provide intervention to address deficiencies in academic skills, then the percent of students scoring in Tier 3 of the i-Ready Diagnostic Assessment will decrease by 8 percentage points in ELA and 10 percentage points in Math, as evidenced by a comparison of i-Ready AP1 to AP3 Diagnostic Assessment data.

Monitoring: Instructional coaches will meet with classroom teachers regularly during grade-level/ department meetings to identify and create an intervention plan for at risk students. Instructional coaches and classroom teachers will continue to monitor student progress on iReady, Performance Matters and other measurable data points. Data chats and retention prevention meetings will be conducted between all stakeholders, including parents and administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Annie Klian (262953@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Response to Early Warning Systems (EWS) involves establishing a system based on student data to identify students who exhibit behavior or academic performance that puts them at risk of dropping out of school. Response EWS utilizes predictive data, identifies off-task or at-risk students, targets interventions and renews patterns and root causes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Early Warning Systems will assist in targeting the needs of the most vulnerable students. The EWS will provide both classroom teachers and instructional coaches with the tools needed to monitor and assist at risk students.

Action Steps to Implement

08/30 - 10/11 (ongoing) - Instructional coaches will meet with classroom teachers monthly and as needed during grade-level/ department meetings to identify and create an intervention plan for at risk students. Students with shortfalls in Reading and Math proficiency will be identified using iReady Diagnostic data reports. As a result, at risk students will be selected for monitoring based on recent and relevant data.

Person Responsible Georgina Fuentes (320491@dadeschools.net)

08/30 - 10/11 - An intervention plan will be created based on areas of need identified in iReady, standardized assessment data, and topic assessment data. Instructional coaches and classroom teachers will meet to update intervention plans based on student progress on iReady reports, District Topic Assessments, and other measurable data points. As a result, students will receive timely interventions based on their academic needs.

Person Responsible Annie Klian (262953@dadeschools.net)

08/30 - 10/11 - Parents will be informed of their students' progress by distributing the iReady Parent Letter, which is instrumental in sharing areas for improvement in ELA and Mathematics. Details in the letter include next steps and how parents may assist teachers in advancing the students' academic progress. Teachers will contact parents to discuss the data. Parents will be encouraged to monitor their child's iReady usage and performance. As a result, parents will be informed and engaged in their child's learning.

Person Responsible Pierrela Jeanbaptiste (pierrelaj@dadeschools.net)

08/30 - 10/11 (ongoing) - Collaborative data chats will be conducted quarterly and as needed between teachers, instructional coaches, and administration to review topic assessment data and progress monitoring data in ELA and Math from iReady and Performance Matters. Data chats will focus on current performance and provided interventions to better address the areas of need for each student. As a result, interventions can be adjusted based on student growth and evidence can be gathered regarding their progress.

Person Responsible Maria Costa (pr0761@dadeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Continuing to integrate Differentiation during instruction and intervention will allow us to identify and meet students' individualized needs and increase their opportunities to succeed academically. According to 2019 standardized testing data, ELA sub-groups in Learning Gains L25% all decreased. 63% of students scored below Level 3 on the 2021 statewide, standardized English Language Arts (ELA) assessment. 34% percent of 3rd grade students scored Level 3 or Above in the 2021 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. According to iReady Spring 2021 Reading Diagnostic data: 31% of kindergarten students, 53% of 1st grade students, 72% percent of 2nd grade students, and 57% of 3rd grade students scored below grade level and therefore may not be on track to score Level 3 or above on the future 3rd grade statewide, standardized ELA assessment. We can close these gaps in instruction through targeted differentiation strategies.
Measureable Outcome:	If we successfully implement differentiation, then we expect that the percent of students in the lowest 25 percentile making learning gains will increase by at least 2 percentage points in ELA.
Monitoring:	Instructional coaches, interventionists, and paraprofessionals will provide consistent support to teachers for intervention and differentiated instruction. Instructional coaches will monitor teacher participation in district-sponsored trainings and provide professional development in regard to changes in the curriculum and intervention programs. The newly adopted Horizons intervention program for Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction in K-5 Reading will focus on reviewing fundamental reading skills related to phonics and phonemic awareness. Classroom teachers will implement differentiation in their classrooms, (i.e. small group instruction, data-driven instruction, student-led projects, and iReady individualized instruction). Instructional coaches and teachers will work together to analyze progress monitoring data from iReady diagnostic assessments, Wonders unit-based assessments, and other data points to track student growth and inform instructional planning.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Georgina Fuentes (320491@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiated Instruction (DI) is a framework for effective teaching that involves providing students with different avenues to learning (often in the same classroom) in terms of acquiring content, processing, constructing, or making sense of ideas, and developing teaching materials and assessment measures so that all students within a classroom can learn effectively, regardless of differences and ability.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will use data and strategies learned during professional development in their instructional planning and delivery in order to effectively implement differentiation strategies that will promote all students' learning and growth in ELA.

Action Steps to Implement

08/30 - 10/11 (ongoing) - Teachers will utilize standards-aligned assessment data, such as Wonders Unit-based Weekly Assessments for K-5, Reading Inventories from the Read 180/ System 44 intervention program for 6-8, Horizons Diagnostic for phonics and phonemic

awareness for K-5, Savvas Selection Tests for 6-8, and iReady Reading Diagnostic assessment data for K-8, to determine and address deficiencies based on student need. As a result, teachers will use various platforms to stay up-to-date with data analysis to inform instruction.

Person Responsible Georgina Fuentes (320491@dadeschools.net)

08/30 - 10/11 (ongoing) - Teachers will create flexible student groupings based on formal and informal formative assessment data in order to address standards-based instructional needs. Evidence-based teaching tools will target Tier 2 & 3 students in K-5 and the lowest 35% in 6-8. As a result, teachers will have student groups that reflect DI instruction.

Person Responsible Georgina Fuentes (320491@dadeschools.net)

08/30 - 10/11 (ongoing) - Instructional Coaches will collaborate with and support teachers in both analyzing student data and planning for differentiated instruction. As a result, teachers will have appropriate resources and lesson plans that reflect DI instruction.

Person Responsible Danae Cid (ciddanae@dadeschools.net)

08/30 - 10/11 (ongoing) - During monthly walk-throughs, administration and instructional coaches will monitor the implementation of small group and differentiated instruction at all academic levels. Flexible student groupings, classroom instructional rotations, student-led projects, and lesson plans that detail differentiated instruction will be observed. As a result, teachers will demonstrate evidence of DI instruction routinely taking place in their class.

Person Responsible David Hart (189497@dadeschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Focusing on developing Instructional Coaching will allow us to support teachers in instructional planning for core subject areas and monitoring student performance and data. According to 2019 standardized testing data, the majority of our subgroups in Math Achievement, Learning Gains, and Learning Gains L25% decreased. ELA sub-groups in Learning Gains L25% all decreased. According to 2021 standardized testing data, we decreased by 2 percentage points from 59% to 57% in ELA Learning Gains and increased by 1 percentage point from 51% to 52% in ELA Learning Gains for students in the lowest 25%. According to 2021 standardized testing data, we decreased by 11 percentage points from 61% to 50% in Math Learning Gains and decreased by 7 percentage points from 56% to 49% in Math Learning Gains for students in the lowest 25%.

Measureable Outcome:

If we successfully implement instructional coaching in Reading, Math, STEAM, and International Baccalaureate (IB), then our L25 students will increase their learning gains by a minimum of 2 percentage points in ELA and 4 percentage points for Math as evidenced by the 2022 state assessments.

Monitoring:

The instructional coaches will participate in common planning meetings, quarterly data chats with grade levels/ departments, adjust groups based on current data in real-time, and participate in regular walk-throughs to ensure that quality instruction is taking place and observe the implementation of differentiated instruction. Coaches will review lesson plans for indication of differentiation, especially for L25 students. Data analysis of assessments, iReady, and Performance Matters will be reviewed with the teachers to observe progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

David Hart (189497@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Instructional Support/ Coaching is when teachers work together to set a measurable goal to improve instructional outcomes. Coaching Cycles focus on the identified goal and increases the achievement and engagement of every student by bringing out the best performance of every teacher. Coaches use both student-centered and teacher-centered methods to help teachers improve the decisions they make about their instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Instructional Support/ Coaching will ensure that teachers are using relevant, recent, and standards-based data in their instructional planning and that the most effective strategies are used in intervention to meet all students' needs.

Action Steps to Implement

08/30 - 09/12 - Instructional coaches will disaggregate and disseminate state assessment data to teachers. Teachers will use this data to identify L25 and at-risk students in order to inform their student groupings and instruction. As a result, teachers will have relevant background knowledge on each student to inform student groupings.

Person Responsible

Georgina Fuentes (320491@dadeschools.net)

08/30 - 10/11 - Instructional coaches will facilitate school-site professional development and collaborative planning sessions on developing I.B. unit planners. During these sessions, multi-disciplinary grade level teams will collaborate to create and update I.B. lessons based on current Primary Years Programme (PYP) and Middle Years Programme (MYP) objectives and key concepts. As a result, teachers will be able to create and implement IB unit planner lessons.

Person Responsible Pierrela Jeanbaptiste (pierrelej@dadeschools.net)

08/30 - 10/11 - Instructional coaches will develop and present ongoing school-site professional development sessions on developing S.T.E.A.M. lessons. During this professional development session, multi-disciplinary grade level teams will engage in collaborative planning to create standards-aligned S.T.E.A.M. lessons. As a result, teachers will be able to create and implement S.T.E.A.M 5.0 matrix lessons.

Person Responsible Renee Carrillo (reneecarrillo@dadeschools.net)

08/30 - 10/11 (ongoing) - Instructional coaches will participate in common planning meetings, co-planning sessions, quarterly data chats with grade levels/ departments, and regular walk-throughs to observe the implementation of differentiated instruction and provide consistent feedback. As a result, teachers will feel supported in effectively meeting students' needs through their instructional practices.

Person Responsible David Hart (189497@dadeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

According to the discipline data in SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, our school reported 1.3 incidents (i.e. violent, property, drug/public order) per 100 students in the 2019-2020 school year. This rate is less than the Statewide combination school rate of 1.6 incidents per 100 students. The primary area of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year is incidents of bullying, which had 0.4 incidents reported per 100 students. The secondary area of concern is incidents of harassment, which had 0.3 incidents reported per 100 students. Behavior and discipline data will be monitored through Early Warning Systems and the school's Discipline Committee. Our school counselor will monitor the incorporation of Restorative Justice Practices, Social Emotional Learning, and Mindfulness in the classroom.

Part IV: 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 to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. 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.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

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

Our strengths within School Culture are Relationships, Physical and Emotional Safety, and an Engaging Learning Environment. Our students are supported through socio-emotional learning programs implemented by our school counselor to grade levels, small groups, and individual students. We include all stakeholders in our decision-making and planning. Staff are provided opportunities to take part in team-building activities and social seminars where we come together to celebrate success. Students are celebrated through award ceremonies and participation in school events to reward student academic performance, attendance, and demonstrations of positive character. We will continue to improve in celebrating successes of students and faculty, as well as increasing opportunities for collaborative planning and professional development.

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

The stakeholders involved in building a positive school culture and environment are the Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coaches, Teacher Leaders, and Counselors (our school Leadership Team). The Principal's role is to monitor and oversee all the school's initiatives and respond to concerns with morale by planning team-building and morale-boosting activities. The Assistant Principals will monitor the mentorship programs and assist in ensuring that all information is shared with stakeholders in a timely manner. Teacher Leaders and Instructional Coaches assist in providing and responding to feedback from stakeholders and providing support to classroom teachers. The school counselor will encourage and support positive academic, social, and personal development for students through a comprehensive school counseling program. The school counselor will also collaborate with educators in PreK-8 classrooms to present and integrate the student development curriculum, which includes lessons centered on anti-bullying, mindfulness, and social-emotional learning, to help students achieve the desired competencies appropriate to their developmental level. All stakeholders are responsible for making specific efforts to connect the school and community.