Jann Mann Educational Center

2022-23 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Jann Mann Educational Center

16101 NW 44TH CT, Opa Locka, FL 33054

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jamarv Dunn R　　　　　　　　Start Date for this Principal: 8/23/2022

2021-22 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Function (per accountability file)	Alternative
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School 1-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: Maintaining 2020-21: No Rating 2018-19: Maintaining 2017-18: Unsatisfactory 2016-17: Maintaining
DJJ Accountability Rating	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 Jan Mann Educational Center is to provide a positive learning environment where students are motivated to learn new strategies for overcoming dysfunctional interpersonal patterns and to improve academically, socially, and vocationally so that they may, without difficulties, become productive members in an emerging global economy.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Jan Mann Educational Center sees our students emerging into the world as holistic, culturally tolerant citizens who can contribute, compete and acquire the unique skills critical to becoming world class citizens in an international economy.

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

The student body at Jan Mann Educational Center (JMEC) consists of students from multi-ethnic and economically disadvantaged backgrounds. Students are administratively assigned as a result of level four or five violations of the Miami Dade County Public Schools (MDCPS) Student Code of Conduct. Students usually have behavioral and attendance challenges. Seventy-eight percent of JMEC students have been retained more than once. Parental involvement and unstable housing are family-specific challenges for students at Jan Mann Educational Center. However, Jan Mann has a Student Services Department which includes a Guidance Counselor, a TRUST Counselor, Social Worker, and School Psychologist to support students. Additionally, 80% of instructional staff has over ten years of experience working with at-risk populations. Jan Mann Educational Center also supports students though the Educational Excellence School Advisory Council (EESAC) and Parent Teacher Student Association (PTSA). Our ultimate goal is to transition 100% of students back to the traditional school setting.

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
Dunn, Ja Marv	Parent Engagement Liaison	As principal, Ja Marv Dunn serves as school's instructional leader. Mr. Dunn provides a mission and shapes a vision for academic success for all students. He uses data to drive decision-making, cultivate leadership in others, and provide the appropriate curriculum offerings. Mr. Dunn 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).
Green, Geneva	Assistant Principal	As the assistant principal Ms. Green assists the principal in implementing the vision and mission for the school. She ensures the fidelity of the MTSS model by monitoring and evaluating the following: instructional staff's implementation of tiered instruction, process of administering assessments, and the alignment of professional development to faculty needs.
Morris, Catherine	Administrative Support	As the Administrative Support, Ms. Morris provides support to ESE students and their families. She also serves as the Title I liaison and as a point of contact for all our community partners. She schedules meetings and maintains appointment calendars, prepares reports, correspondence, memoranda and other documents, and may draft responses to routine correspondence to ensure that there is a smooth operation of the school.
Walker, Andrea	Administrative Support	As the Administrative Support, Ms. Walker Initiates requisitions for textbooks, requests for maintenance service, requests for personnel action and other support services, and compiles and maintains inventory of property and textbooks. She schedules meetings and maintains appointment calendars, prepares reports, correspondence, memoranda and other documents, and may draft responses to routine correspondence to ensure that there is a smooth operation of the school.
Pierre, Charline	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Pierre is responsible for managing Schoology, the learning management system. She provides support to teachers in using technology in the classroom. She also provides intervention to middle school students using data to provide enrichment and remediation to students.
Joseph, Elliot	Psychologist	As the school psychologist, Dr. Joseph provides social emotional support to students. He oversees our Threat Assessment Team and is our Restorative Justice Coordinator. He is also the sponsor of the mental health club.

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

No

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

N/A

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/23/2022, Jamarv Dunn R

Total number of students enrolled at the school.

64

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.

22

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?

21

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?

1

Number of teachers with ESE certification?

5

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

0

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

0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	17	19	12	4	5	64
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	39	36	19	8	8	124
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	58	52	18	6	4	166
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	18	14	5	6	47
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	12	4	5	29
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	43	14	6	0	84
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	49	51	17	4	0	125
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	19	9	3	4	51

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	0	0	0	0	22	60	53	23	7	6	171

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	0	0	0	0	4	1	2	4	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	7

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/25/2022

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	16	7	8	5	52
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	10	5	4	4	32
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	2	4	3	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4	2	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	7	4	4	3	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	3	2	3	18
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	10	0	0	0	22

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	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4	5	5	32

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	0	0	0	7

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					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019	0%	58%	-58%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019	0%	56%	-56%	52%	-52%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	11%	60%	-49%	56%	-45%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					

				MATH		
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019	0%	58%	-58%	55%	-55%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019	0%	53%	-53%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	3%	40%	-37%	46%	-43%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

				SCIENCE		
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	10%	43%	-33%	48%	-38%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

			BIOLOGY EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	68%	-68%	67%	-67%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	73%	-73%	71%	-71%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	71%	-71%	70%	-70%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	25%	63%	-38%	61%	-36%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	21%	54%	-33%	57%	-36%

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
FRL										29	
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
BLK										8	
FRL										17	
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
BLK										27	
FRL										21	

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	27
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	27
Total Components for the Federal Index	1
Percent Tested	

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students 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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Hispanic Students	
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

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	29
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	3

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?

During the 2021-22 school year, an area of focus was increasing the percent of students earning a learning gain in Reading and Math to improve from unsatisfactory to maintaining. The progress monitoring that was in place was weekly collaborative planning sessions and monthly data chats with administration and with students.

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 math. Learning gains increased from 26% to 29%. Push-in interventions for math were facilitated twice per week with students and students participated in topic assessments. Data from topic assessments was reviewed and enrichment and remediation was provided during intervention sessions.

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 greatest need of improvement is middle school Reading. The learning gains for middle school reading remained at 22% from 2019-2020 to 2020-2021.

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

The trend that emerged across grade levels is middle school reading students did not make significant learning gains. Additionally, the economically disadvantaged subgroup did not make significant gains on the Florida Standards Assessment in Reading and Math.

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

The strategies that need to be implemented include higher order thinking questions in Reading and an increase in real world applications in math. Additionally, intervention and enrichment through small group instruction, after school tutoring and and Saturday School will be implemented.

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 that will be offered to teachers include professional development on Schoology and the new Florida BEST Standards. Additionally, support will be provided to teachers on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking, the new progress monitoring system,

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Did not meet the 41% Federal Threshold
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	50% of Economically Disadvantaged students will earn a learning gain in Reading and/or Math.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Student data will be monitored monthly using IReady(middle school), Read 180 (high school literacy), Topic Assessments in math and FAST assessments PM1, PM2 and PM3 (literacy and math).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Geneva Green (genevagreen@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Students will receive interventions via push-in and pull-outs weekly. Students will also receive additional tutoring after school program, winter and spring break academy.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Students who are performing two or more grades levels below and not responding to tier 1 instruction, need additional support via tier 2 intervention at least once per week for one hour.

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.

Analyze student data to identity students and determine the intervention needed for students in the subgroup

Person Responsible	Catherine Morris (catherine_morris@dadeschools.net)

Based on data and student needs, determine materials that will be used to provide intervention to students.

Person Responsible	Andrea Walker (andreawalker@dadeschools.net)

Create intervention schedule and provide intervention to students via push-in, pull-out, and after school.

Person Responsible	Andrea Walker (andreawalker@dadeschools.net)

Conduct monthly progress monitoring data chats with students and interventionists to determine impact of the intervention and make adjustments.

Person Responsible	Geneva Green (genevagreen@dadeschools.net)

Students will participate in Winter Break Academy and Spring Break Academy

Person Responsible	Geneva Green (genevagreen@dadeschools.net)

Implement Literacy across the curriculum initiative with elective teachers to support literacy for ESSA Subgroup students.

| **Person Responsible** | Andrea Walker (andreawalker@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.

#2. 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.	On the 2022 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment, 22% of students earned a learning gain in Reading. This represents no change from 2021.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	50% of students will earn a learning gain on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking from Progress Monitoring 1 to Progress Monitoring 3.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The area of focus will be monitored through weekly common planning sessions and monthly progress. monitoring data chats.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Geneva Green (genevagreen@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	The evidence based strategy being implemented is collaborative planning where teachers will share best instructional strategies and data- driven instruction through small and whole group instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Collaborative planning and data-driven instruction will be implemented to provide intervention and enrichment to students. I-Ready and Read 180 will be the resources used to provide instruction to 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.	

Create a collaborative planning schedule.

Person Responsible	Geneva Green (genevagreen@dadeschools.net)

Use collaborative planning to review the BEST Standards and disaggregate data to develop rigorous and meaningful learning experiences for students in literacy.

Person Responsible	Catherine Morris (catherine_morris@dadeschools.net)

Review student end products to provide enrichment and remediation for students.

Person Responsible	Geneva Green (genevagreen@dadeschools.net)

Implement push-in interventions during the literacy block based on data from PM1.

Person Responsible	Geneva Green (genevagreen@dadeschools.net)

Target students based on PM 1 data to participate in Winter Break Academy and provide remediation and enrichment activities.

Person Responsible	Geneva Green (genevagreen@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.

Students in the subgroup will be monitored via monthly data chats with teachers and students.

#3. Other specifically relating to Graduation Rate

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

Based on a review of the data, the graduation rate is 27%.

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

The graduation rate will increase from 27% to 50%.

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

This area of focus will be monitored by monitored by monthly meetings with Senior students and parents to ensure they remain on track to graduate.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ja Marv Dunn (pr8101@dadeschools.net)

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

Data-Chats with parents and students.

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

As students and parents are updated on their graduation status, they will work with the guidance counselor to develop an action plan to complete tasks to move towards being graduation ready.

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.

Students will participate in the SAT and ACT during the school day.

Person Responsible

Andrea Walker
(andreawalker@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.

Students in the subgroup will engage in these monthly data chats as well. They will also participate in monthly meetings with their counselor and review a checklist of all steps needed for graduation.

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

Not applicable-

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

Not applicable

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)

Not applicable

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Not applicable

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.

Not applicable

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §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?

Not applicable

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?

Not applicable

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

Not applicable

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.

Other

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

The school-based leadership team engages in weekly meetings to progress monitor the implementation of strategies aligned to priorities. Additionally, biweekly needs assessment surveys will be sent to faculty and staff to progress monitor school wide initiatives and programs.

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

Data from the biweekly needs assessment surveys will be shared with stakeholders during collaborative planning sessions and faculty meetings. Adjustments a will be made to ensure the achievement of goals and priorities based on the data from surveys.

Describe how implementation will be progress monitored.

Survey results will be gathered and reviewed by the leadership team. Results will be shared with all stakeholders at faculty meetings and EESAC meetings as applicable to school-wide initiatives and programs.

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
Biweekly needs assessment surveys will be provided to faculty and staff on school-wide initiatives, programs, and program implementation.	Green, Geneva, ggreen@dadeschools.net
Analyze Data and share with stakeholders at faculty and EESAC meetings.	Green, Geneva, genevagreen@dadeschools.net
Make adjustments to program implementation based on feedback from stakeholders.	Green, Geneva, ggreen@dadeschools.net
Implement Making Connections Initiative- Each faculty meeting will begin with faculty members sharing a connection made with a student or one they witnessed with a colleague.	Dunn, Ja Marv, pr8101@dadeschools.net
Implement Monthly recognitions of faculty and staff based on recommendations from faculty, staff and students during faculty meetings.	Dunn, Ja Marv, pr8101@dadeschools.net