

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# Brucie Ball Educational Center



## 2022-23 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>R.A.I.S.E</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>22</b>

## Brucie Ball Educational Center

11001 SW 76TH ST, Miami, FL 33173

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

### Demographics

Principal: Amrita Prakash J

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2020

<b>2021-22 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Function</b> (per accountability file)	ESE
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	Special Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	2021-22: I 2020-21: No Rating 2018-19: Maintaining 2017-18: Maintaining 2016-17: Maintaining
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating</b>	2023-24: No Rating

### School Board Approval

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

## **SIP Authority**

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

## **Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

The mission of Brucie Ball Educational Center is to provide a quality educational program that maximizes the potential of our students with special needs. Individualized instruction in the school, home and/or hospital environment is designed to target each student's unique needs. Our mission includes providing an educational experience which will enable each student to participate in the community to the fullest extent possible and to achieve their academic goals.

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

Our school creates safe learning environments in multiple educational settings for students living in Miami-Dade County. The Computer-Based Instruction programs encourages students to feel comfortable and safe verbalizing school and/or personal issues. Itinerant Hospitalized/Homebound and Community Based teachers respect the environment and culture of the home/educational setting of their students.

**Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.**

Brucie Ball Educational Center has been meeting the needs of students who are Homebound or Hospitalized, students with disabilities, and alternative education students for over 30 years. We provide various modes of instruction, computer-based or in-person. We welcome the opportunity to provide the best in educational services for our students.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Prakash, Amrita	Principal	Principal, Dr. Prakash, is the school's instructional leader. She provides a mission and shapes a vision for academic success for all students. Data is utilized to drive decision-making, cultivate leadership in others, and provide the appropriate curriculum offerings. Dr. Prakash establishes high expectations for all students and ensures that the school-based team is implementing Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) and the appropriate Response to Intervention (RtI).
Sardinas, Alex	Assistant Principal	Mr. Sardinas, the school's assistant principal, works in collaboration with the principal in implementing the vision and mission for the school. He ensures fidelity of the MTSS monitoring by evaluating the following: instructional staff's implementation of tiered instruction, process of administering assessments, and the alignment of professional development with faculty needs.
Ruiz, Jennifer	Other	Mrs. Ruiz serves as the department chairperson for itinerant teachers . In her role as chairperson, she provides direct instruction to students to improve and support students' academic success. In addition, Ms. Stille is an integral part of the MTSS team that uses data-based problem-solving to integrate academic and behavioral instruction and intervention.
Corbin, Maria	Other	As an ESE instructor, Ms. Corbin provides direct instructional to student to improve and support students' academic success. In addition she is an integral part of the MTSS team that uses data-based problem-solving to integrate academic and behavioral instruction and intervention.

**Is education provided through contract for educational services?**

No

**If yes, name of the contracted education provider.**

Not applicable.

**Demographic Information****Principal start date**

Wednesday 7/15/2020, Amrita Prakash J

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

461

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

42

**Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?**

42

**Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?**

0

**Number of teachers with ESE certification?**

40

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

6

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

12

**Demographic Data****Early Warning Systems****2022-23****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	12	28	32	63	9	21	40	35	35	29	37	45	64	450	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	6	6	14	3	7	6	12	12	13	15	18	9	121	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	4	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	3	0	1	1	2	1	2	2	6	19	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	2	0	1	4	0	2	1	0	3	16	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	2	6	0	2	2	1	2	5	0	23	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	4	5	4	2	3	3	4	5	0	32	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	6	3	7	6	11	9	6	6	9	15	78	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	10	5	5	2	6	5	5	9	8	10	65

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	32	0	0	1	1	4	0	0	0	14	52	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	1	3	7	3	9	28	

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

Thursday 9/15/2022

**2021-22 - 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	28	30	29	37	19	37	35	34	27	30	36	24	33	399	
Attendance below 90 percent	7	7	8	10	6	5	12	13	20	18	17	9	2	134	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	2	0	0	8	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	3	2	3	4	1	18	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	0	0	2	2	2	1	0	1	1	14	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	6	2	2	2	1	3	7	0	0	28	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	6	6	5	2	3	3	5	6	0	0	36	

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	15	5	2	4	6	10	10	12	2	7	73	

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	32	0	0	1	1	4	0	1	0	14	53	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	2	2	7	3	1	6	24	

## 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%	55%					63%	61%
ELA Learning Gains								61%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile								57%	54%
Math Achievement		51%	42%					67%	62%
Math Learning Gains								63%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile								56%	52%
Science Achievement		60%	54%					56%	56%
Social Studies Achievement		68%	59%					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	23%	60%	-37%	58%	-35%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	24%	64%	-40%	58%	-34%
Cohort Comparison		-23%				
05	2022					
	2019	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%
Cohort Comparison		-24%				
06	2022					
	2019	15%	58%	-43%	54%	-39%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019	52%	56%	-4%	52%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-15%				
08	2022					
	2019	46%	60%	-14%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

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	15%	67%	-52%	62%	-47%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	18%	69%	-51%	64%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		-15%				
05	2022					
	2019	0%	65%	-65%	60%	-60%
Cohort Comparison		-18%				
06	2022					
	2019	17%	58%	-41%	55%	-38%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019	50%	53%	-3%	54%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-17%				
08	2022					
	2019	32%	40%	-8%	46%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	13%	43%	-30%	48%	-35%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	48%	68%	-20%	67%	-19%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	48%	73%	-25%	71%	-23%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	50%	71%	-21%	70%	-20%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	29%	63%	-34%	61%	-32%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	28%	54%	-26%	57%	-29%

### 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	23	41		11	30		18	32		35	
ELL	21			8			8				
BLK	10			6							
HSP	25	37		12	23		14	29		37	
FRL	22	43		8	36		11	43		35	
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	43	36		30	31					60	
HSP	41	36		31	40					38	
FRL	47	38		31	33					22	
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	36	57		29	43	27	27	42		32	
ELL	26	74		17	35		17				
BLK	33	36		35	42						
HSP	39	63		27	44		32	43		15	
FRL	39	63		30	44		29	42		19	

### 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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	22
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	153
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	63%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
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	12
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	8
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	25
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	28
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### Data Analysis

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

**Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place related to the Areas of Focus?**

The progress monitoring our school had in place was i-Ready, progress monitoring, performance matters, baseline and mid-year assessments, and teacher observation checklists.

**Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

The data component that showed the most improvement was the 10th grade FSA ELA, with an increase of 10% proficiency. New actions our school implemented in this area was offering extended learning opportunities, remediation for learning loss.

**What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?**

The area in the greatest need of improvement is the FSA Math Algebra 1, based on FSA EOC Scores. Although the percentage increased by 1% from 2021 to 2022, the overall percentage of proficiency is 15%.

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

There was an increase of 21 percentage points when comparing the 2022 FSA ELA scores to the 2021 FSA ELA scores, indicating a positive trend. Also, there was an increase of 7 percentage points when comparing the 2022 EOC Science scores to the 2021 EOC Science scores, indicating a positive trend.

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

The strategies needed to be implemented in order to accelerate learning is increasing progress monitoring throughout the school year. Also, Implementing a variety of District-provided programs, such as: IXL, Khan Academy, and i-Ready.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided to support teachers and leaders.**

Professional development opportunities will focus on job-embedded professional development and ongoing progress monitoring which directly influences data-driven decision making.

**Areas of Focus:**

**#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.

The area of focus is differentiated instruction (DI) which is geared towards student centered learning. Differentiated instruction is the instructional practice that will be implemented based on current student data and designed to remediate skills not mastered in the whole group setting. If DI is implemented with fidelity and explicitly instructed using the appropriate resources aligned to standards, students will make notable progress. We chose this as an area of focus because our data indicates that given our high number of medically fragile students in 10th grade, this data affirms that student-centered instruction/DI has positively impacted the learning gains of students with special medical conditions and special needs.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

If Student-Centered Learning practices are employed to include: taking ownership for students' learning and believing in students' ability to learn regardless of barriers, then students' learning needs will be met as evidenced by increased performance on bi-weekly assessments and academic progress can be tracked to ensure that students meet the 41% threshold per Federal Index of the Every Student Succeeds Act. Through the delivery of differentiated instruction with fidelity, students will demonstrate a minimum proficiency increase of 5% as evidenced by the 2023 State Assessment.

**Monitoring:**

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

Quarterly data chat sheets will serve as a guide for students to help them take ownership of their learning and monitor their progress. Teachers can use this tool to adjust instructional focus according to the student's areas of academic strengths and areas in need of improvement.

**Person responsible for  
monitoring outcome:**

Amrita Prakash (pr9732@dadeschools.net)

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

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

Despite differences in ability through a focus on differentiated instruction, students will be provided with various learning opportunities. Teachers will have the opportunity to adjust their lesson plans and instruction as new data becomes available

**Rationale for Evidence-  
based Strategy:**

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

Differentiated instruction will ensure that teachers are using relevant, recent, and aligned data to plan lessons that are customized to student needs. Teachers will adjust their lesson plans and instruction as new data becomes available. This strategy will work best for our school as it can effectively utilized throughout the various departments at our school.

**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.

Teachers will engage in collaborative planning and identify best practices for differentiated instruction.

**Person Responsible**

Jennifer Ruiz (jruiz@dadeschools.net)

Administration and members of the Leadership Team will provide professional development on differentiated instruction strategies.

**Person Responsible**

Alex Sardinas (asardinas1@dadeschools.net)

Administration will conduct on-going walkthroughs to ensure teachers are using differentiation instruction with fidelity

**Person Responsible**      Alex Sardinias (asardinias1@dadeschools.net)

**Monitoring ESSA**

**Impact:**

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

Teachers will review and compare data during collaborative planning. In addition, Progress monitoring assessments and iReady AP assessments will be used to monitor growth for our Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, Black, Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged Students, as these subgroups did not meet the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.



**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Provide targeted interventions in addition to support and services during the school day that are beyond Tier I instruction. In addition to support and services that take place throughout the school day, targeted interventions will be provided for our Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, Black, Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged Students, as these subgroups did not meet the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

If targeted intervention is provided to students with learning disabilities, then students' learning needs will be met as evidenced by increased performance on bi-weekly assessments and academic progress can be tracked to ensure that students meet the 41% threshold per Federal Index of the Every Student Succeeds Act. Through the delivery of targeted interventions, students in each ESSA subgroup will demonstrate a minimum proficiency increase of 5% as evidenced by the 2023 State Assessment.

**Monitoring:**

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

To provide the best method of individualized intervention for each student, quarterly data chat sheets will allow teachers to adjust instructional focus according to the student's areas of academic strengths and areas in need of improvement. Ongoing progress monitoring assessments will be used to monitor growth.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Amrita Prakash (pr9732@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Provide targeted interventions to students with learning disabilities in addition to the support and provide services students receive during the school day that are above and beyond Tier 1 instruction. With teachers and leaders conducting on-going progress monitoring, they are more prepared to support student progress with updates individualized data. Targeted interventions will be implemented with our ESSA subgroups with a focus on identified areas of deficiencies.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Interventions will ensure that students' learning and behavior needs will be supported where data is used to make decisions on what is best for students

**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.

Administration will conduct on-going walkthroughs to ensure teachers are using interventions with fidelity

**Person Responsible**

Alex Sardinas (asardinas1@dadeschools.net)

Administration will conduct quarterly Data Chats with teachers to monitor student progress.

**Person Responsible**

Alex Sardinas (asardinas1@dadeschools.net)

Teachers will be provided professional development on the effective implementation of interventions aligned to the schools' goal based on data.

**Person Responsible**

Alex Sardinas (asardinas1@dadeschools.net)

**Monitoring ESSA Impact:**

This Area of Focus is directly related to our Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, Black, Hispanic and Economically

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

Disadvantaged Students, as these subgroups did not meet the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

## RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

### Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

According to the 2022 SAT-10, the K-2 median percentile for Reading proficiency school-wide is 21%. A focus will be placed on Standards-Based Collaborative Planning to address this critical need.

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

Based on the results of the 2022 ELA FSA for grades 3-5, the median percentile for Reading proficiency school-wide is 14%. A focus will be placed on Standards-Based Collaborative Planning to address this critical need.

**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)**

At least 10% of K-2 students demonstrating a lack of proficiency will exhibit growth in ELA as evidenced by growth monitoring assessments and iReady AP assessments.

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

At least 10% of 3-5 students demonstrating a lack of proficiency will exhibit growth in ELA as evidenced by growth monitoring assessments and i-Ready AP assessments. A focus will be placed on Standards-Based Collaborative Planning to address this critical need.

**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.

Student proficiency growth will be monitored by use of weekly informal assessments, progress monitoring assessments, and iReady AP assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Sardinas, Alex, asardinas1@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?

Standards-Based Collaborative Planning will be implemented across grade levels to improve collaboration among teachers and promote learning. Through the use of McGraw-Hill's weekly progress monitoring assessments, Reading Horizon's quarterly assessments, growth monitoring assessments and i-Ready AP

assessments, student growth percentages will be monitored in compliance with B.E.S.T. practices and state standards.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

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

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

In an effort to address the students' lack of proficiency, resources including the Reading Horizons Intervention Program, McGraw-Hill ELA materials and iReady path and assigned lessons, students will be exposed to numerous resources that will effectively prepare them for related growth monitoring assessments.

**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
Literacy Leadership #1: The Assistant Principal will facilitate literacy leadership team meetings where there will be opportunities for teachers to lead discussions, collaborate, and discuss academic needs and lesson pacing for hospital/homebound students.	Sardinas, Alex, asardinas1@dadeschools.net
Literacy Leadership #2: The Assistant Principal will facilitate monthly literacy council leadership team meetings to provide an opportunity for community based instruction teachers to lead discussions, collaborate, and discuss academic and life skills pacing for IND hospital/homebound students.	Sardinas, Alex, asardinas1@dadeschools.net
The department chairperson will provide teacher shadowing opportunities monthly in order to see best practices being used in student centered instruction and learning settings.	Sardinas, Alex, asardinas1@dadeschools.net
The department chairperson will provide teacher shadowing opportunities monthly in order to see best practices being used in IND student centered instruction and learning settings.	Sardinas, Alex, asardinas1@dadeschools.net
Assessment #1: Teachers will discuss data from assessments with their students, but not limited to the following subgroups of students: Black, Hispanic, Students with Disabilities, Economically Disadvantaged, and English Language Learners, in order to help students take ownership of their learning and determine his or her areas of academic strengths and areas in need of improvement.	Sardinas, Alex, asardinas1@dadeschools.net
Assessment #2: Teachers will discuss data from assessments with their students, including but not limited to the following subgroups of students: Black, Hispanic, Students with Disabilities, Economically Disadvantaged, and English Language Learners, and their parents in order to help students take ownership of their learning and determine how to reduce his or her level of assistance on teacher made assessments for IND students on modified curriculum	Sardinas, Alex, asardinas1@dadeschools.net
Professional Learning #1: Facilitate opportunities for teachers to present new knowledge learned at district trainings and professional developments to their colleagues during monthly faculty meetings.	Sardinas, Alex, asardinas1@dadeschools.net
Professional Learning #2: Provide opportunities to attend monthly Professional Development (PD) activities for teachers to integrate instructional technology, such as Gizmos and Nearpod in to the classroom.	Sardinas, Alex, asardinas1@dadeschools.net

## Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment is critical in supporting sustainable schoolwide improvement initiatives. When schools implement a shared focus on improving school culture and environment, students are more likely to engage academically. A positive school culture and environment can also increase staff satisfaction and retention.

**Select a targeted element from the menu to develop a system or process to be implemented for schoolwide improvement related to positive culture and environment.**

Student Attendance

**Describe how data will be collected and analyzed to guide decision making related to the selected target.**

Data will be collected and analyzed to guide decision making related to the selected target by creating an attendance review committee to meet once a grading period to discuss effective strategies for maintaining consistent attendance for hospital/homebound students.

**Describe how the target area, related data and resulting action steps will be communicated to stakeholders.**

The target area, related data and resulting action steps will be communicated to stakeholders by daily attendance bulletins, automated phone calls to parents, school counselor and/or social works will provide support.

**Describe how implementation will be progress monitored.**

Alex Sardinas, Assistant Principal, will monitor the implementation of this step monthly through the use of attendance database monitoring to ensure that attendance issues are being addressed daily.

### 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.

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Maintain a database of students with multiple absences to allow for accurate and close monitoring of these students on a weekly basis.	Sardinas, Alex, asardinas1@dadeschools.net