

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Arcola Lake Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 10 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 24 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 24 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 27 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

Arcola Lake Elementary School

1037 NW 81ST ST, Miami, FL 33150

<http://arcolalake.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.

Our mission is to be the beacon of educational excellence. We empower our diverse student population to become effective leaders within the global 21st century. Through equitable access of technology and education, we encourage a positive blended learning climate. Teachers and students are encouraged to reach their full potential in the learning process with reliable solutions by providing a multi-tiered education. We are committed to the growth of all stakeholders through educating our students, families and community members.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We aim to provide the highest quality education so that our students become accomplished individuals and exemplary citizens.

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 |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| Ellis, Yolanda | Principal | The principal 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. Ms. Ellis establishes high expectations for all students, and ensures that the school-based team is implementing Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS). |
| Hill, Leasha | Assistant Principal | The Assistant Principal works in collaboration with the principal in implementing the vision and mission for the school. Ms. Hill 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. Monitoring classroom instruction utilizing the Framework for Effective Instruction through daily walk-throughs focusing on instructional delivery and student work products. Assistant Principal coordinates the implementation of all District and State mandated assessments to ensure students have all required accommodations and resources. |
| Hill, Kennise | Reading Coach | The Reading Coach provides direct instructional services related to improving and supporting classroom instruction. The Reading Coach utilizes the coaching model to support teachers in effective evidenced-based instructional strategies that will improve students' academic success. The Reading Coach conducts collaborative planning sessions, analyzes student data, and provides teachers with professional development on how to effectively select and utilize standard-aligned classroom resources. |
| Clarke, Ginger | School Counselor | The counselor is an integral part of the MTSS team that uses data-based problem-solving to integrate academic and behavioral instruction and intervention. She provides support to individuals and small groups of students. |
| Rutledge, Adriana | Other | The ESE teacher provides support to teachers to ensure that students with disabilities demonstrate increased participation and performance in the standard or access curriculum statewide assessments and school site accountability systems. |

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.

Stakeholder involvement in the development of a school improvement plan includes engaging various groups such as teachers, students, parents, administrators, and community members. They will contribute input, ideas, and feedback to create a comprehensive plan. This collaborative process ensures that the plan addresses the diverse needs and goals of the school community, leading to more effective strategies and a sense of ownership among stakeholders. To engage parents and community

members we send out weekly Class Dojo announcements, where parents have the ability to add comments or suggestions. Teachers and other staff members are involved in the process through monthly faculty meetings where they share Best Practices designed to foster improvement in student achievement.

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))

The school improvement plan will be regularly monitored by the school leadership team through scheduled weekly walk-throughs with a focus on student product reviews, data-chats, and feedback sessions. The school leadership team will track the implementation of strategies, assess whether goals are being met, and make adjustments as needed to ensure continuous improvement during the school leadership team weekly meetings. This process involves collaboration among team members, utilizing performance data, and maintaining open communication with staff and stakeholders through quarterly parent data chats and EESAC meetings.

Demographic Data

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

| | |
|--|--|
| 2023-24 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | Yes |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 99% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 100% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | Yes |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | N/A |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: A |
| School Improvement Rating History | |
| DJJ Accountability Rating History | |

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 | 33 | 19 | 20 | 13 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 109 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 5 | 24 | 16 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 4 | 15 | 9 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 17 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 13 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 4 | 32 | 44 | 32 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 134 | |

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 | 19 | 18 | 19 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87 |

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 | 6 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

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 | 29 | 21 | 20 | 16 | 22 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 25 | 11 | 23 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 16 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 18 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 29 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 99 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 30 | 41 | 42 | 19 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 173 | |

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 | 18 | 10 | 29 | 22 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 116 |

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 | 6 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

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 | 29 | 21 | 20 | 16 | 22 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 25 | 11 | 23 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 16 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 18 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 29 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 99 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 30 | 41 | 42 | 19 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 173 |

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 | 18 | 10 | 29 | 22 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 116 |

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 | 6 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

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* | 53 | 60 | 53 | 43 | 62 | 56 | 38 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 52 | | | 56 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 57 | | | 65 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 57 | 66 | 59 | 48 | 58 | 50 | 41 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 47 | | | 43 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 63 | | | 59 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 41 | 58 | 54 | 27 | 64 | 59 | 33 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 71 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 63 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 53 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 52 | 63 | 59 | 53 | | | 41 | | |

** 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 | 53 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 263 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

| | |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 49 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 390 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
|---------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| SWD | 42 | | | |
| ELL | 39 | Yes | 1 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 54 | | | |
| HSP | 49 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | | | | |
| FRL | 56 | | | |

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 49 | | | |
| ELL | 45 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 49 | | | |
| HSP | 47 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | | | | |
| FRL | 49 | | | |

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 | 53 | | | 57 | | | 41 | | | | | 52 |
| SWD | 42 | | | 44 | | | 43 | | | | 5 | 35 |
| ELL | 41 | | | 50 | | | 24 | | | | 5 | 52 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 53 | | | 58 | | | 47 | | | | 5 | 50 |
| HSP | 53 | | | 57 | | | 28 | | | | 5 | 53 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 56 | | | 59 | | | 45 | | | | 5 | 55 |

| 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 | 43 | 52 | 57 | 48 | 47 | 63 | 27 | | | | | 53 |
| SWD | 39 | 47 | 47 | 56 | 61 | 58 | 44 | | | | | 40 |
| ELL | 36 | 42 | 43 | 39 | 56 | 63 | 27 | | | | | 53 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 44 | 55 | 57 | 51 | 45 | 63 | 29 | | | | | |
| HSP | 43 | 46 | 56 | 42 | 51 | 63 | 24 | | | | | 51 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 44 | 52 | 56 | 48 | 47 | 62 | 28 | | | | | 54 |

| 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 | 38 | 56 | 65 | 41 | 43 | 59 | 33 | | | | | 41 |
| SWD | 27 | 55 | 60 | 42 | 45 | | 14 | | | | | |
| ELL | 36 | 57 | 55 | 39 | 43 | | 33 | | | | | 41 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 39 | 51 | | 39 | 33 | | 27 | | | | | |
| HSP | 38 | 64 | 67 | 46 | 57 | | 45 | | | | | 39 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 38 | 55 | 65 | 41 | 43 | 59 | 32 | | | | | 41 |

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 | 49% | 56% | -7% | 54% | -5% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 43% | 58% | -15% | 58% | -15% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 49% | 52% | -3% | 50% | -1% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 55% | 63% | -8% | 59% | -4% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 50% | 64% | -14% | 61% | -11% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 47% | 58% | -11% | 55% | -8% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 29% | 50% | -21% | 51% | -22% |

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.

According to all data components, the Star K-2 had one of the lowest performances last school year. In Kindergarten, 21% of students were proficient, in Grade 1, 36% were proficient, and in Grade 2, 28% were proficient. One reason for last year's low performance is that many students entered the current grade level one or more grades behind. Particularly in grade 2, the majority of students were ELLs and had yet to undergo the MTSS process. For students in grades K-1, the STAR computer-based test was a brand new, timed test that had never been attempted before. In addition, students in grade one transitioned from STAR Early Literacy to STAR Reading during PM3. In addition, new teachers were unfamiliar with the content and grade level.

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

According to our FSA/FAST three year trend data the greatest decline from the previous year was a 12 percentage point decrease in 3rd grade Math on the 2022-2023 FAST state assessment as compared to the 2021-2022 FSA state assessment. In addition, 4th grade ELA declined 3 percentage points from the previous year. According to 2022-2023 performance by ethnicity, data indicates African American students performed below 41% in the area of Science; Hispanic students in the area of ELA and

Science. Data also indicates the ELL and SWD performed below 41% in all subject areas(ELA, Math, and Science). Data indicates that ELA DI and Math DI although scheduled was not implemented with fidelity in addition to poor student attendance which contributed to the declines.

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.

The data point that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is 3rd grade ELA. In comparison to the state average there is a 20% difference, on PM3 the state average was 27% on level 1

and Arcola's was 47%. The state average on level 2 was 22% and Arcola's average was 9%. The state average on level 3 was 25% and Arcola's average was 17%. The state average on level 4 was 18% and Arcola's average was 17%, and finally, the state average on level 5 was 7% and Arcola's average was 11% in 3rd grade ELA.

Factors that contributed to the GAPs were an increase of students entering 3rd grade reading significantly below grade level based on SAT and I-ready assessment results. Data indicates students were deficient in the areas of vocabulary and reading comprehension.

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

According to FAST PM3 data improvement was shown in all subject categories in grades 3-5. The proficiency level in ELA increased by 4 percentage points from 43% to 47%. There was an increase of 3 percentage points in Math from 48% to 51%. Science increased 11 percentage point from 18% to 29%. The greatest increase was Science, action steps that led to the increase in proficiency were additional district support, targeted Saturday Science Club, STEAM Labs and activities, and parental involvement in afterschool experiments, which increased students' interest in science. Other researched based strategies were also implemented at our school to improve in these areas, including data-driven instruction, differentiated instruction, extended learning opportunities, standards-based collaborative planning, ELA intervention, and professional development opportunities.

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

An area of concern for our school was attendance. We showed an increase in the overall attendance during the 2022-2023 school year. However, student attendance is a continued concern during 2023-2024 school year. As data from the previous school year indicates that 39% (179) of our students had 15 or more absences.

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

Based on STAR ELA data, which indicates that our Kindergarten through 2nd grade population was only at 12% proficient. The top priorities for school improvement in the upcoming school year are building new teacher capacity, providing professional development opportunities in the area of ELA, and providing enrichment resources in an effort to increase levels of proficiency for students that are on or above grade level.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**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 Star PM3 assessment data, our primary students (K-2) scored within the 12th median percentile in ELA as compared to the district's median percentile of 48. Based on the data the identified contributing factors are the following: teachers' new to the grade level and content, student attendance, Lack of consistent Intervention and DI ELA. We will implement in-house professional development opportunities, additional coaching support and K-2 Reading interventions geared toward increasing primary ELA proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of Job Embedded Professional Developments and Gradual Release of Responsibilities Model (GRRM) 95% of the teachers in grades K-2 will implement researched- based strategies geared towards increasing student ELA proficiency to 30% on the 2023-2024 STAR PM3 state assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs to ensure that the GRRM is being implemented with fidelity. The OneNote SharePoint app will be utilized to monitor and track teacher effective implementation. Administration will review lesson plans for evidence of utilization of the GRRM. Online data trackers will be created to monitor ELA progress monitoring assessments. The data will be analyzed during leadership team meetings to ensure students are demonstrating academic growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Leasha Hill (leahill@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 evidenced-based strategy of Job Embedded Professional Developments and the GRRM in the area of ELA with regards to increasing our primary grades levels to 30% proficiency on the 2023-2024 STAR PM3 state assessment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers will utilize evidenced-based strategies of Job Embedded Professional Developments and the GRRM to increase primary students' level of proficiency. Job-Embedded Professional Development (JEPD) refers to teacher learning that is grounded in day-to-day teaching practice and is designed to enhance teachers' content-specific instructional practices with the intent of improving student learning. Furthermore, The Gradual Release of Responsibilities Model (GRRM) is a particular style of teaching which is a structured method of pedagogy framed around a process beginning with explicit instruction. Students are guided through the learning process with clear statements about the purpose and rationale for learning the new skill. The GRRM is distinguished by four phases: I do, We do, They do, and You do, eventually requiring students to demonstrate mastery of the learning target independently. Students will demonstrate mastery of lesson objectives through their work samples and assessment scores.

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.

Job-embedded professional development will be provided on ELA researched based standard-aligned instruction using the GRRM.

Person Responsible: Kennise Hill (khill@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/14-8/30

Additional ELA coaching support will be provided to teachers in grades K-2 with a focus on implementing explicit instructional delivery using GRRM with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Kennise Hill (khill@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/1-9/8

Weekly collaborative planning will be conducted to provide teachers with an opportunity to create lessons aligned to the B.E.S.T standards using GRRM. Teachers will also share evidenced-based strategies that will increase primary students' proficiency level.

Person Responsible: Kennise Hill (khill@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/11-9/29

Leadership Team will conduct weekly walk-throughs with a focus on the implementation of the GRRM during ELA instruction in grades K-2.

Person Responsible: Leasha Hill (leahill@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/30-9/29

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention**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 2023-2024 EWI Dashboard on PowerBI, 66 third graders have a substantial Reading deficiency as compared to the 2022-2023 EWI Dashboard on PowerBI where only 46 third grade students had a substantial reading deficiency. Based on the data the identified contributing factor was the inconsistency of daily scheduled additional reading support not being utilized with fidelity. We will implement the Targeted Element of Reading Intervention.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of targeted Reading Intervention with a focus on Corrective Feedback, planning and pacing, 95% of teachers will be able to effectively deliver Tiered Intervention Instruction in grades K-2, which will increase student ELA proficiency to 30% on the 2023-2024 STAR PM3 state assessment, as evidence through students' skill checks and chapter assessments.

Monitoring:

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

On a weekly basis the leadership team will conduct walk throughs to ensure that Reading Intervention is being implemented with fidelity. Teachers and Students will maintain a Reading Intervention Log/Journal with evidence of activities by standards which will enhance students' identified areas of weakness.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Leasha Hill (leahill@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.)

The evidence based strategy of corrective feedback will be used to provide students with targeted analysis to improve achievement and skill based mastery. In addition, Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) will be used to assess students' academic performance, to quantify a student rate of improvement or responsiveness to instruction, and to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers will utilize the evidence based strategies of corrective feedback and OPM to mitigate learning loss and meet students' individual needs through the implementation of targeted Reading Intervention instruction. Research and effective practice points to the following keys to using targeted feedback to improve student achievement and avoid negative effects: (1) link feedback to objectives; (2) use a formative evaluation approach over a summative approach; (3) make guidance specific (e.g., proofing remarks or codes may not communicate well); (4) provide feedback in a timely manner (not long after assignment is forgotten); and (5) identify how students should use feedback to make improvements. In addition, Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) is used to assess students' academic performance, to quantify a student rate of improvement or responsiveness to instruction, and to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction. These strategies will focus on the students' areas of weakness that were evident during the 2022-2023 school year and based on the increasing amount of students with a substantial reading deficiency as indicated on the Early Warning System data.

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.

We will provide in-house job-embedded professional developments on planning and pacing OPM Reading Intervention .

Person Responsible: Kennise Hill (khill@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/14-8/30

Once OPM's are conducted the Reading Coach and Instructors will analyze assessment data in order to plan and deliver data driven Reading Intervention Instruction with fidelity. Additionally, after OPM's, teachers are provided assistance on Intervention Fridays to receive support in instructional delivery with relevant resources to promote student mastery.

Person Responsible: Kennise Hill (khill@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/30-9/29

The instructor and leadership team will monitor the ongoing progress monitoring data. The instructional reading coach and Interventionists will provide additional assistance in Intervention as needed.

Person Responsible: Kennise Hill (khill@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/14-9/29

Interventionist will push-in during the Reading Intervention instructional block to provide support to Tier 2 students.

Person Responsible: Kennise Hill (khill@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/14-9/29

#3. 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.

Although EWL data indicates a decrease in the percentage of students with more than 15 absences when comparing 2022-2023 to 2021-2022, student attendance is still an area of concern. In the 2022-2023 school year 37 percent of students were absent 15 or more days, which is a 4 percent decrease from the 2021-2022 school year. Historically students that are habitually absent from school do not perform as well as those who are regularly in attendance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we successfully implement the evidence-based strategy of school-wide attendance initiatives the percentage points of students who are absent more than 15 or more days will decrease by 5% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

With the evidence based strategy of Attendance Initiatives teachers will identify students with 5 or more absence and refer to the Attendance Review Committee. Daily calls will be made to parents after each absence. Home visits and referrals to outside agencies will also be conducted for students with excessive absences. In addition quarterly, incentives for students with perfect attendance will be provided.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ginger Clarke (gmclarke@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.)

The leadership team will utilize the evidence based strategy of Attendance Initiatives. 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.

The 2022 - 2023 SIP data indicates that there is a critical need to improve student attendance. Consistently acknowledging and celebrating student attendance will promote a positive school culture and increase student morale. By implementing attendance initiatives students will feel empowered and improve academically.

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.

We will organize an attendance review committee to address students with attendance issues exceeding 5 or more tardies and absences.

Person Responsible: Leasha Hill (leahill@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/14-9/29

Attendance Review Committee will contact parents of students tardy or absent 5 or more days to explain MDCPS Attendance Policies, the importance of students attending school daily, and how it contributes to learning loss.

Person Responsible: Ginger Clarke (gmclarke@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/21-9/29

Students with monthly 100% attendance will receive 4 Golden Tickets and will be able to purchase items from the RAM store.

Person Responsible: Ginger Clarke (gmclarke@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/1-9/29

The class with 100% attendance will receive a class incentive as identified in the Principals 100% attendance 10-Day Challenge.

Person Responsible: Yolanda Ellis (pr0101@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/1-9/29

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**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 FAST PM3 data, 27% of ELL students and 19% of SWD were proficient in ELA as compared to the state average of 50% and district average of 51%. Based on data and identified contributing factors of: high number of Level 1 and 2 ESOL students, student readiness level limit abilities to master grade level tasks. Therefore, we selected the overarching area of Differentiated Instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the evidence based strategy of Differentiated Instruction 32% of ELL students and 24% of SWD students will be proficient on the 2023-2024 FAST PM3 state assessment.

Monitoring:

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

On a weekly basis the leadership team will conduct walk throughs to ensure that DI is being implemented with fidelity. Students will maintain a DI Folder/Journal with evidence of differentiated activities by standards which will enhance their identified areas of weakness. Students that are not progressing on the OPM's will be targeted through Extended Learning Opportunities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Leasha Hill (leahill@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.)

The evidence based strategy of Differentiated Instruction is a framework for effective teaching that involves providing students with innovative educational opportunities for acceleration based on their identified area of weakness.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The evidence based strategy of Differentiated Instruction will be utilized to mitigate learning loss and meet students' individual needs through small group instruction. This strategy will focus on the students' areas of weakness that were evident during the 2022-2023 school year and based on the increasing amount of level 1 students on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking.

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.

Job-Embedded professional development on incorporating effective Differentiated Instruction in Math and ELA.

Person Responsible: Kennise Hill (khill@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/14-9/11

Teachers will be provided with DI folders, student trackers, and resources to implement effective DI.

Person Responsible: Kennise Hill (khill@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/14-9/11

During collaborative planning Coaches and instructors will analyze assessment data in order to plan and deliver data driven Differentiated Instruction and adjust as needed to group students according to specific learning need.

Person Responsible: Kennise Hill (khill@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/14-9/29

Implementation of Instructional Support/Coaching to provide the opportunity for teachers and coaches to collaborate and set a measurable goal to improve instructional outcomes during Differentiated Instruction.

Person Responsible: Kennise Hill (khill@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

According to the 2022-2023 Star PM3 assessment data, our primary students (K-2) scored within the 11th median percentile in ELA as compared to the district's median percentile of 48.

As a result, we will implement the evidence based strategy of utilizing anchor charts. Anchor charts will serve as artifacts of classroom learning. Like an anchor, they hold students' and teachers' thoughts, in alignment to standards and skills, as well as ideas and processes in place. Anchor charts can be displayed as reminders of prior learning and built upon over multiple lessons.

In addition, the evidence based strategy of utilizing graphic organizers is an important tool for guiding student writing. Students will learn how, when, and why to use the strategy of Graphic Organizers to enhance their ability to comprehend various types of text. A graphic organizer is a visual display that organizes ideas and shows the relationships between concepts or information. Graphic organizers guide students' thinking and help them to comprehend what they read.

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

According to the 2022-2023 FAST PM3 assessment data, 47 percent of our intermediate students (3-5) were proficient in ELA, which was 3 percentage points below our goal of 50 percent.

As a result, we will implement the evidence based strategy of utilizing anchor charts. Anchor Charts serve as artifacts of classroom learning. Like an anchor, they hold students' and teachers' thoughts, in alignment to standards and skills, as well as ideas and processes in place. Anchor charts can be displayed as reminders of prior learning and built upon over multiple lessons.

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

With the evidence based strategy of anchor charts and graphic organizers in ELA there will be a increase to 30% proficient students in primary grades on the 2023-2024 STAR PM3 reading state assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

With the the evidence based strategy of anchor charts 50% or more of the 3-5 population will score at grade level or above on the 2023-2024 FAST reading state assessment.

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 leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs to ensure the usage of Anchor Charts and Graphics Organizers are being implemented with fidelity. In addition, the Reading Coach will ensure that

Anchor Charts are being created during collaborative planning and being utilized during the reading block.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Hill, Leasha , leahill@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?

In grades K-5 we will implement goal oriented learning by utilizing the evidenced based strategy Anchor Charts.

Anchor Charts will hold students' and teachers' thoughts in alignment to standards and skills, as well as ideas and processes in place. Anchor charts can be displayed as reminders of prior learning and built upon over multiple lessons. Anchor Charts can guide students thinking in capturing important information before, during, or after reading within each BEST Standard.

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?

In grades K-5 we will implement goal oriented learning by utilizing the evidenced based strategy of Anchor Charts. Anchor Charts serve as artifacts of classroom learning. Anchor Charts hold students' and teachers' thoughts, in alignment to standards and skills, as well as ideas and processes in place. Anchor charts can be displayed as reminders of prior learning and built upon over multiple lessons. The evidenced based strategy will ensure that teachers are effectively implementing appropriate ELA instruction and enrichment opportunities to meet the needs of all 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 |
|---|---|
| 8/14 - 9/11 Literacy Coach will provide a job-embedded PD on creating relevant anchor charts and graphic organizers for current standard/learning target being taught. | Hill, Kennise, khill@dadeschools.net |
| 8/14 - 9/29 Literacy Coach will assist teachers in creating anchor charts during collaborative planning session. In addition, Literacy Coach will provide an Anchor Chart lab after school. | Hill, Kennise, khill@dadeschools.net |
| 8/14 - 9/29 Literacy coach will collaboratively plan on a weekly basis with K-5 teachers with a focus on student work products related to anchor charts. | Hill, Kennise, khill@dadeschools.net |

Title I Requirements**Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Arcola Lake Elementary School will disseminate School Improvement Plan to stakeholders through various channels such as school websites, emails, parent-teacher meetings, and physical copies sent home with students. The plan's objectives, strategies, and progress updates are communicated to parents, teachers, students, and the community to ensure transparency and collaboration in the school's improvement efforts.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Arcola Lake Elementary School will build positive relationships with all stakeholders by implementing strategies such as open communication, regular updates, involving all stakeholders in decision-making processes, addressing concerns promptly, and organizing collaborative events. These efforts will foster a sense of community and mutual trust.

arcolalake.dadeschools.net (Parent Resources)

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(ii))

Arcola Lake Elementary School will strengthen academic programs through various strategies, including curriculum enhancements, teacher training, incorporating new technologies, and collaborating with ETO and after school programs. These efforts aim to improve the quality of education, offer more diverse learning opportunities, and keep up with evolving educational trends.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

The development of a school improvement plan in coordination with other federal programs involves several steps. First, educators and administrators analyze data to identify areas needing improvement. Then, align the plan with federal program requirements and goals, ensuring integration. Collaboration between program coordinators, teachers, and stakeholders is essential to create a comprehensive and unified strategy. Regular communication and assessment help maintain coordination and alignment between the school improvement plan and federal initiatives.