

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# Air Base K 8 Center For International Education



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>29</b>

## Air Base K 8 Center For International Education

12829 SW 272ND ST, Homestead, FL 33032

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

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Dade County School Board on 10/11/2023.

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

#### Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

#### Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

#### Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

## **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 Department 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.

## I. School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

Air Base K-8 (ABK-8) is a leader in the International Education Magnet Program. Our mission is to integrate academic rigor with cultural competency, intensive language immersion, and globally responsive ecological studies.

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

Air Base K-8 provides a relevant, data-driven curriculum that fortifies the investment in cultural sensitivity, character education, and eco-literacy. The primary goal of our challenging academic magnet program is for students to become bilingual (listeners and speakers) and bi-literate (readers and writers). Our primary objective is to deliver a fully integrated international program; one that facilitates innovative curricular design. The Florida Standards alignment with global magnet themes strengthens the valuation of universal exchanges thus promoting reflective learners empowered with skills to engage in the 21st Century.

### School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

**School Leadership Team**

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Pendergrass, Alonza	Principal	As the instructional leader, the Principal at Air Base K-8 Center guides the school's vision and mission, oversees the implementation of the School Improvement Plan (SIP), MTSS/Rtl framework, leads the School Leadership Team, and facilitates effective communication with stakeholders through targeted professional development opportunities. This comprehensive approach promotes a cohesive and supportive environment for students and contributes to the school's overall success.
Gibson-Carvalho, Angella	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principals serve as supportive figure for instructional leaders and the MTSS/Rtl team as well as ensure the effective distribution and collection of data, oversee intervention implementation, monitor intervention groups, and promote fidelity in applying professional development strategies in classrooms. Additionally, they share district-mandated initiatives and research-based approaches with faculty, enhancing the implementation of differentiated instruction across the curriculum. Through these efforts, the Assistant Principals contributes to the overall academic success and growth of students at Air Base K-8 Center.
Milian, Niki	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principals serve as supportive figure for instructional leaders and the MTSS/Rtl team as well as ensure the effective distribution and collection of data, oversee intervention implementation, monitor intervention groups, and promote fidelity in applying professional development strategies in classrooms. Additionally, they share district-mandated initiatives and research-based approaches with faculty, enhancing the implementation of differentiated instruction across the curriculum. Through these efforts, the Assistant Principals contributes to the overall academic success and growth of students at Air Base K-8 Center.
Monge, Carmen	Magnet Coordinator	The Magnet Coordinator at Air Base K-8 Center is dedicated to maintaining curriculum fidelity, collaborating with teachers and departments, cultivating community partnerships, and promoting a positive educational experience for all stakeholder.
Portuondo, Laurie	School Counselor	The school counselors at Air Base K-8 Center interpret data, identify at-risk students, conduct screening programs, support students qualifying for special services, and address the socio-emotional and developmental needs of diverse student populations. Their efforts contribute to the overall well-being and academic success of students at the school.
Fordik, Chrisanne	School Counselor	The school counselors at Air Base K-8 Center interpret data, identify at-risk students, conduct screening programs, support students qualifying for special services, and address the socio-emotional and developmental needs of diverse student populations. Their efforts contribute to the overall well-being and academic success of students at the school.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Vior-Gonzalez, Joanna	Teacher, ESE	The ESE (Exceptional Student Education) teachers, along with chosen grade level representatives, are responsible for collecting student data, integrating core instructional activities, and incorporating supplemental materials into Tiered instructions. They collaborate with teachers to implement co-teaching engagements as necessary and serve as liaisons between instructors and the MTSS/RtI Leadership Teams.
Polo, Elizabeth	Teacher, ESE	The ESE (Exceptional Student Education) teachers, along with chosen grade level representatives, are responsible for collecting student data, integrating core instructional activities, and incorporating supplemental materials into Tiered instructions. They collaborate with teachers to implement co-teaching engagements as necessary and serve as liaisons between instructors and the MTSS/RtI Leadership Teams.

### Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school leadership team proactively engages stakeholders by communicating the SIP development process and their important role in providing input. This communication occurs through various channels, including faculty meetings, grade level/department meetings, the School Advisory Council (EESAC), and surveys. These avenues of engagement are designed to gather diverse perspectives and ensure that stakeholders have opportunities to contribute to the development of the SIP.

### SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

By following this systematic approach, the school will actively monitor the SIP's implementation, evaluate its impact on student achievement, and make necessary revisions to promote continuous improvement by collecting and analyzing data, progress monitoring, assessing areas for improvement such as interventions and enrichment strategies, meet with stakeholders to review and revise as indicated by SIP areas of needs.

### Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8



<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	92%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	69%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	Yes
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<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 (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

### Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	7	2	4	1	2	3	2	0	21	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	5	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	9	
Course failure in Math	0	2	0	0	0	3	2	2	1	10	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	10	14	14	1	3	42	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	17	20	4	4	51	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	5	5	5	10	17	21	11	11	85	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	5	0	0	4	8	8	2	2	29

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

#### Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	8	4	6	3	9	3	4	1	6	44	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	1	0	6	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	1	9	3	1	2	22	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	5	25	6	2	4	43	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	2	1	6	1	9	3	1	2	26	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	6	3	11	1	0	2	24

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

#### Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	7	2	3	2	2	3	2	0	5	26	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	4	
Course failure in ELA	0	6	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	10	
Course failure in Math	0	2	0	1	3	4	4	1	1	16	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	15	15	2	3	4	48	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	17	21	4	5	6	59	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	7	6	9	18	23	12	11	10	100	

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	5	0	4	8	9	3	2	1	32

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

## II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

### ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

**On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.**

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	77	61	53	85	62	55	85		
ELA Learning Gains				70			67		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				65			69		
Math Achievement*	76	63	55	80	51	42	74		
Math Learning Gains				75			44		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64			52		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	69	56	52	76	60	54	69		
Social Studies Achievement*	94	77	68	98	68	59	92		
Middle School Acceleration	85	75	70	82	61	51	71		
Graduation Rate		76	74		53	50			
College and Career Acceleration		73	53		78	70			
ELP Progress	59	62	55	54	75	70			

\* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

#### ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	78
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	543
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	75
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	749
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**

<b>2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY</b>				
<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	40	Yes	1	
ELL	65			
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	81			
HSP	76			
MUL	73			
PAC				
WHT	92			
FRL	78			

<b>2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY</b>				
<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	58			
ELL	66			
AMI				
ASN	79			
BLK	78			
HSP	75			
MUL	85			
PAC				
WHT	83			
FRL	72			

**Accountability Components by Subgroup**

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	77			76			69	94	85			59
SWD	45			53			21				3	
ELL	67			69							3	59
AMI												
ASN	78			83							2	
BLK	75			71			64	100	86		6	
HSP	77			77			68	93	81		7	57
MUL	77			69							2	
PAC												
WHT	85			87			90	92	100		6	
FRL	78			73			65	96	81		7	65

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	85	70	65	80	75	64	76	98	82			54
SWD	65	50	50	51	54	47		90				
ELL	84	75	69	79	72	50	45					54
AMI												
ASN	90	72		81	72							
BLK	85	78	82	71	76	68	62	100	82			
HSP	84	69	60	80	74	62	78	99	81			58
MUL	100			70								
PAC												
WHT	91	64		93	87		82					
FRL	82	68	62	77	72	62	69	97	80			55

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	85	67	69	74	44	52	69	92	71			
SWD	63	61	68	49	57	56	50					
ELL	80	71	88	74	47	67	40	90				

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN	76	58		90	42							
BLK	78	53	79	67	37	47	47	88	50			
HSP	86	69	71	74	44	52	72	93	73			
MUL	80			70								
PAC												
WHT	90	74		82	57	55	80	91	79			
FRL	81	63	68	70	40	49	65	89	64			

### Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	71%	56%	15%	54%	17%
07	2023 - Spring	83%	50%	33%	47%	36%
08	2023 - Spring	85%	51%	34%	47%	38%
04	2023 - Spring	75%	58%	17%	58%	17%
06	2023 - Spring	78%	50%	28%	47%	31%
03	2023 - Spring	83%	52%	31%	50%	33%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	87%	58%	29%	54%	33%
07	2023 - Spring	63%	48%	15%	48%	15%
03	2023 - Spring	84%	63%	21%	59%	25%
04	2023 - Spring	68%	64%	4%	61%	7%
08	2023 - Spring	86%	59%	27%	55%	31%
05	2023 - Spring	66%	58%	8%	55%	11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	76%	40%	36%	44%	32%
05	2023 - Spring	57%	50%	7%	51%	6%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	89%	56%	33%	50%	39%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	91%	52%	39%	48%	43%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	65%	35%	63%	37%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	94%	68%	26%	66%	28%

### III. Planning for Improvement

#### Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

SCIENCE

Overall 69% proficiency; Grade 5- 57% proficiency

READING

Grade 1- 68% proficiency, Grade 5- 71% proficiency, Grade 4- 75% proficiency, Grade 6- 78% proficiency

MATH

Grade 5- 67% proficiency, Grade 4- 68% proficiency



For science, change in teacher mid-year; lack of participation in science iCADs. For reading and math, new standards and assessment. Change in teacher mid-year in grade 5 math. In grade 1, additional teacher being assigned to the grade level in SY23-24 to reduce class size and promote additional opportunities for individualized reading instruction.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.**

#### SCIENCE

Overall decline of 7 percentage points, from 76% to 69% proficiency. In grade 5, a decline of 11 percentage points, from 68% to 57% proficient.

#### READING

All grade levels declined when comparing the same student's proficiency performance in Spring 22 vs. Spring 23:

Gr. 3 in 22- 77%; Gr. 4 in 23- 75%

Gr. 4 in 22- 82%; Gr. 5 in 23- 71%

Gr. 5 in 22- 87%; Gr. 6 in 23- 78%

Gr. 6 in 22- 89%; Gr. 7 in 23- 83%

Gr. 7 in 22- 88%; Gr. 8 in 23- 85%

Overall grade level proficiency declined as follows in Spring, 2023:

Reading, Grade 5 declined 16 percentage points, from 87% to 71% Reading,

Grade 6 declined 11 percentage points, from 89% to 78%

Math, Grade 5 declined 17 percentage points, from 84% to 67% Math,

Grade 4 declined only 3 percentage points, but remained with low performance, from 71% to 68%

Further progress still needed in closing learning gaps due to Covid. Current year's 3rd graders were in Kindergarten when we went home in March due to Covid shut down. Many were MSO during 1st grade. Many of the current 4th graders were MSO during 2nd grade. Of the current 5th graders, many were MSO during 3rd grade. Additionally, this year the state adopted new standards and assessment.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

All proficiency indicators were higher than the State across the board. However, our school data demonstrated the smallest outperformance of the State in:

Grade 5, Science, outperformed the State by 6 percentage points, from 57% ABK8 vs. 51% State

Grade 4, Math, outperformed the State by 7 percentage points, from 68% ABK8 vs. 61% State

Grade 5, Math, outperformed the State by 12 percentage points, from 67% ABK8 vs. 55% State

Grade 5 Science is historically one of our lower scoring indicators. Grade 4 Math and Grade 5 Math continue to underperform other grade levels in the school.

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

Grade 3 Reading, increased by 6 percentage points, from 77% to 83% proficiency

Math increased by 21 percentage points, from 63% to 84% proficiency

Implementing the accelerated curriculum in grade 3 math; staffing changes.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.**

The number of students scoring at Level 1 in Reading and Math has increased dramatically since pre-Covid, and have continued to rise.

2019 2020 2021 2022 2023

RDG 6 none 15 22 48

MATH 19 none 56 44 59

**Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.**

1. Science, Grade 5
2. Reading, Grade 5
3. Math, Grade 4
4. Math, Grade 5
5. Reading, Grade 6

#### **Area of Focus**

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

**#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

According to the 2022-2023 Early Warning System Student Attendance Data, 16% of the student population was absent 11-15 times throughout the school year as compared to the 2021-2022 school year, where 11% of the student population was absent 11-15 times, an increase of five percentage points. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of excessive absences, we will implement the strategic attendance initiative.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

With the implementation of a strategic attendance initiative, a projected decrease of at least five percentage points in the percent of students who are absent 11-15 times during the 2023-2024 school year by June, 2024.

**Monitoring:**

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

To cultivate a supportive environment between parents and the school, the assistant principals, together with the elementary and middle school counselors/teachers, will establish a dynamic collaboration to enhance the monitoring of attendance data on a monthly basis. This dedicated attendance team will proactively engage in meetings with students and parents, aiming to effectively address any concerns related to attendance. These meetings will serve as valuable opportunities for parents to voice their concerns, propose potential solutions, and actively collaborate with the school to enhance their child's attendance.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Alonza Pendergrass (pr0041@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Strategic Attendance Initiatives involve close monitoring and reporting of student absences, calls to parents, and more direct measures including home visits, counseling and referrals to outside agencies as well as incentives for students with perfect attendance.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By establishing a well-designed communication and motivational program with all stakeholders to promote student attendance, coupled with close monitoring and reporting of student absences, overall school attendance will improve.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

### 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.

The attendance team will complete monthly attendance monitoring and report to regional and/or district offices. As a result, attendance monitoring will be consistent throughout the school year.

**Person Responsible:** [no one identified]

**By When:** 08/14-09/29

Counselors and PTSA will collaborate to provide quarterly attendance incentives for students.

**Person Responsible:** Laurie Portuondo (laportuondo@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 08/14-09/29

Students and parents will have a clear understanding of the district and school's attendance guidelines and expectations.

**Person Responsible:** [no one identified]

**By When:** 08/14-09/29

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

According to the 2022 and 2023 ELA State Assessment data, 79% of third through eighth grade students scored between levels 3-5, a decrease of six percentage points. Based on the data and the identified contributing factor of a newly implemented state assessment, we will implement Student-Centered Learning in ELA.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

With the implementation of student-centered learning, a projected increase of five percentage points in the percent of third through eighth grade students demonstrating proficiency on the ELA State Assessment by Spring, 2024.

**Monitoring:**

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

To promote student-centered learning, the administration at Air Base K-8 Center will facilitate data chats with educators to focus on academic-support strategies that are intended to target students in need of remediation, enrichment, and intervention.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Alonza Pendergrass (pr0041@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Within the targeted element of ELA, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategies of student-centered learning.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Due to the newly implemented F.A.S.T. ELA state assessments in grades three through eight, students had to readjust and analyze new standard benchmarks. Students will acquire strategies to increase proficiency in ELA and close the achievement gap.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**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.

To ensure fidelity with delivery of student-centered instructional practices, teachers will facilitate and guide meaningful collaboration/communication empowered by attendance at iCADs and Turn Key opportunities.

**Person Responsible:** Alonza Pendergrass (pr0041@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/17-9/29

Students will be encouraged to ask questions, investigate and seek answers through inquiry-based approaches.

**Person Responsible:** Angella Gibson-Carvalho (angellagibsoncarvalho@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/17-9/29

Students will be engaged via active participation focused on addressing district learning needs in conjunction with their unique interests, aspirations, and or cultural backgrounds.

**Person Responsible:** [no one identified]

**By When:** 8/17-9/29

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

According to the Spring 2023 Science State Assessment Data, 57% of fifth grade students and 76% of eighth grade students were proficient in science as compared to Spring 2022, where 68% of fifth grade students and 80% of eighth grade students demonstrated proficiency, a decrease of 11 and four percentage points respectively. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of mid-year staffing changes and inconsistent attendance and dissemination of science iCADs information, we will implement the targeted element of science.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

With the implementation of standards-aligned instruction, including critical thinking strategies and essential labs, a projected increase of five percentage points in science proficiency will be demonstrated by Spring, 2024.

**Monitoring:**

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

Administrators will ensure that fifth and eighth grade science teachers are utilizing essential labs and plan collaboratively to create effective lessons that target science proficiency. Administrators will monitor science topic assessment scores and meet with teachers monthly to review data for teachers to modify instruction as necessary, adjust science intervention groups as necessary, and for teachers to target re-teach lessons to the appropriate students. Teachers will meet with students quarterly to review their data, inform progress, and set goals. This data driven monitoring technique will provide guidance, support, and targets for improvement.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Alonza Pendergrass (pr0041@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Within the targeted element of science, our school will focus on the evidence-based intervention of standards-aligned instruction.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Due to a mid-year staffing change in grade 5 science, students had to readjust to a different teaching style. Attendance at iCADs was inconsistent and fidelity to instruction of the science standards was also inconsistent. Instruction focused on the standards needs to be emphasized consistently amongst all teachers and across grade levels.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

### 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.

Identify a science iCADs representative so our school will have appropriate science content information.

**Person Responsible:** Alonza Pendergrass (pr0041@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14-8/18

Provide turn-key of ICADS information to teachers to improve teaching pedagogy.

**Person Responsible:** Angella Gibson-Carvalho (angellagibsoncarvalho@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/17-9/29

Identify and procure resources for standards-aligned science instruction to help teachers with enrichment and intervention strategies.

**Person Responsible:** Angella Gibson-Carvalho (angellagibsoncarvalho@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/17-9/29

Develop a plan for providing science intervention for students to increase student proficiency on state assessments..

**Person Responsible:** Angella Gibson-Carvalho (angellagibsoncarvalho@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/17-9/1



**#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

According to the 2023 Staff School Climate Survey, 35% of the teachers agree or strongly agree with the statement "I feel a lack of support/concern from parents." This reflects a 31 percentage point increase as compared to the results from the 2022 Staff School Climate Survey. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of teachers feeling a greater lack of support/concern from parents in 2023, we will implement the evidenced based strategy of Family Engagement.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

With the implementation of family engagement strategies , an increase of five percentage points of teachers who indicate that they feel support/concern from parents is projected on the 2024 Staff School Climate Survey.

**Monitoring:**

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

Family engagement will be monitored via collaboration with stakeholders as evidenced by communication logs, social media communications, and attendance and participation in school functions.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Alonza Pendergrass (pr0041@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Family Engagement studies show that parent involvement is a major factor in student outcomes, including closing the achievement gap between various groups of students. Different families have different capacities for involvement, meaning schools should provide a range of ways for parents to be involved. Examples of Family Engagement activities include, but are not limited to, open houses, orientations, parent workshops, home visits, volunteer opportunities, and community events. The most important elements of a Family Engagement program are (1) creating genuine and collaborative relationships with families, (2) creating interactive sessions between staff and families, and (3) linking all interactions to learning to help build families' capacities in supporting their students' academic growth.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

More effective commitment and communication between stakeholders will yield higher academic successes and positive family engagement.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**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.

Acknowledging the need to nurture connections and communication. We will continue to engage in Open House, orientations, parent workshops, volunteer opportunities and Cambridge events.

**Person Responsible:** Carmen Monge (cmonge@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14-9/29

Workshops will be provided to empower/support families towards ensuring academic success, strengths, SEL initiatives and enhance their commitment/ability to address their child's uniqueness.

**Person Responsible:** Elizabeth Polo (epolo1@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14-9/29

Teachers will provide all opportunities to directly communicate their needs/concerns. Every effort will be made to provide face-to-face encounters ensuring security understanding, commitment and connections.

**Person Responsible:** Alonza Pendergrass (pr0041@dadeschools.net)

**By When:** 8/14-9/29

### CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

N/A

## Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

### 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

Based on the 2023 ELA F.A.S.T. STAR/Early Literacy Reading data, 72% of students in grade 1 are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, ELA F.A.S.T. STAR/Early Literacy assessment.

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

Based on the 2023 ELA F.A.S.T. STAR/Early Literacy Reading data, 72% of students in grade 1 are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, ELA F.A.S.T. STAR/Early Literacy assessment.

### 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 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 Measurable Outcomes

If we successfully develop and monitor Tier 2/3 instruction, utilizing Data Driven Instruction, then our ELA Proficiency will increase by a minimum of 4 percentage points as evidenced by the 2024 F.A.S.T. STAR/ Early Literacy State Assessment Progress Monitoring.

### Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

If we successfully develop and monitor Tier 2/3 instruction, utilizing Data Driven Instruction, then our ELA Proficiency will increase by a minimum of 4 percentage points as evidenced by the 2024 F.A.S.T. STAR/ Early Literacy State Assessment Progress Monitoring.

## Monitoring

### 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 impact student achievement outcomes.

The School Leadership Team (SLT) will conduct weekly collaboration sessions and targeted walk-throughs to ensure that data driven planning aligns with instruction and delivery. Observational data and feedback will guide adjustments to planning and instruction. Data will be analyzed based on progress monitoring assessments. The School Leadership Team will provide teachers with instructional resources that are aligned to the ELA standards.

### Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Pendergrass, Alonza, pr0041@dadeschools.net

## Evidence-based Practices/Programs

**Description:**

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?

Within the Targeted Element of ELA, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy, Data Driven Instruction will be utilized to monitor students progress and increase proficiency. Progress monitoring data will be utilized during planning to align instruction to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards.

**Rationale:**

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Data Driven Instruction will ensure that teachers are utilizing fluid data from progress monitoring to guide instruction. Lessons will be aligned to the B.E.S.T. Standards and instruction will be differentiated based on the needs of the students.

**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**

The School Leadership Team will meet with teachers to conduct data chats, plan for instructions, and collaborate on differentiated lessons to meet individual student needs.

Gibson-Carvalho, Angella,  
angellagibsoncarvalho@dadeschools.net

The PLST will provide Professional Developments and/or Professional Learning Communities on standards-aligned data driven instruction to target B.E.S.T standards.

Polo, Elizabeth ,  
epolo1@dadeschools.net

## Budget to Support Areas of Focus

### Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

### Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No