

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Maya Angelou 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	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	25
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	25
VI. Title I Requirements	28
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	30

Maya Angelou Elementary School

1850 NW 32ND ST, Miami, FL 33142

<http://maya.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.

The mission of Maya Angelou Elementary School is to work together with the home and the community to empower our students to achieve educational success through a diverse curriculum, while providing a nurturing environment that consistently identifies and addresses the needs of the whole child, fosters multicultural understanding, and fuels the desire for life-long learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Maya Angelou Elementary School is to strive to develop a community of life-long learners instilled with the belief that a positive outlook, hard work, perseverance, and respect for humanity are the keys to a successful future.

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
Gancedo, Maria	Principal	The principal oversees all of the major systems (budgetary, personnel, academic, cultural) aspects of the schoolhouse. The principal guides the development of school-wide initiatives and ensures all stakeholders are working collaboratively towards those overarching goals. The principal ensures that the appropriate personnel oversee the implementation of all District Initiatives so that the school's programs and curriculum are aligned to those of the District. Furthermore, the Principal analyzes progress monitoring data and conducts frequent data chats in order to ensure students are mastering concepts and that intervention programs are effective.
Blanc, Renee	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal, Maria Gancedo-Guzman, assists with the management of all the major systems (personnel, academic, cultural) of the school house. The assistant principal assists with the development of school-wide initiatives and works with all stakeholders towards achieving those overarching goals. The assistant principal oversees curriculum planning to ensure that State Standards and District Pacing Guides are being followed. The assistant principal assists with the collection of progress monitoring data in order to analyze the effectiveness of grade level instruction and/or intervention programs. In addition, the assistant principal is a member to the MTSS team to ensure that early interventions are in place to assist all students who need additional learning opportunities.
Juan, Kirsten	Reading Coach	The Reading Coach works collaboratively with the leadership team and teachers in Kindergarten to Grade 5 to ensure that the Reading Program is being implemented with fidelity. The Reading Coach spearheads professional development initiatives and provides support on an individual basis. The Reading Coach leads collaborative planning sessions to ensure that ELA lessons are standards-based and aligned to District Pacing Guides. In addition, the Reading Coach oversees intervention programs and assists with collecting and disaggregating OPM data to ensure that intervention programs are effectively implemented.
Nunez, Melissa	Math Coach	The Mathematics Coach works collaboratively with the leadership team and teachers in Kindergarten through Grade 5 to ensure that the Math Program is being implemented with fidelity. The Math Coach spearheads professional development initiatives and provides support on an individual basis. The Math Coach leads collaborative planning sessions to ensure that lessons are standards-based and aligned to District Pacing Guides. In addition, the Math Coach conducts data chats and assists teachers with planning for Differentiated Instruction.
Stephens, Angela	School Counselor	The school counselor, along with the MTSS Team, oversees intervention strategies to ensure students receive the academic and behavior support needed. The school counselor participates in data chats in order to evaluate the effectiveness of intervention

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		programs and identify students in need of additional services. The school counselor also coordinates additional support with private agencies and oversees wellness plans for the school's at-risk students. In addition, the school counselor is part of the Attendance Review Committee and communicates with parents to ensure additional resources are provided, when needed, to students with high rates of absenteeism.
Rivera, Sonia	Instructional Technology	The Instructional Technology person is in charge of overseeing all of the school's electronic devices. The IT Tech troubleshoots computer/promethean errors in the classrooms, oversees the deployment of district devices, and intergrates technology into school-wide presentations and professional learning activities.

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 SIP is created, monitored, and revised throughout the year by the Leadership Team, the faculty, and the EESAC. The SIP is initially created during Synergy by the Leadership Team. Data from the previous year, along with input from the staff, is used to create an initial plan which is then shared with the staff at the Opening of School Meetings. Input is collected and the Phase I of the SIP is adjusted as necessary. The SIP is then presented to the EESAC (which includes parents and community representatives) who provides further input and, ultimately, approves the SIP. After each Implementation Period (nine weeks), the SIP is reviewed and adjusted by the Leadership Team. Each time this occurs, the SIP is once again presented to the staff and EESAC.

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))

Each Implementation Period for the SIP is aligned to On-going Progress Monitoring Data. At the end of each Implementation Period, the data is analyzed, and walk-throughs and product reviews are conducted. The information gathered from these processes was analyzed by the Leadership Team and guided the discussion as action steps, goals and targets were reviewed and adjusted. This ensures that actions steps are being monitored for both fidelity and effectiveness.

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	95%
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: B 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: B
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	20	34	35	27	20	15	0	0	0	151	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	9	35	35	9	17	0	0	0	105	
Course failure in Math	0	18	43	35	23	20	0	0	0	139	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	54	32	36	0	0	0	122	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	42	36	30	0	0	0	108	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	31	63	60	64	44	49	0	0	0	311	

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	11	30	58	38	34	0	0	0	171

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	0	1	21	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2

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	0	28	23	18	11	11	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	22	46	20	12	0	0	0	100
Course failure in Math	0	0	25	37	18	27	0	0	0	107
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	30	20	28	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	18	18	31	0	0	0	67
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	39	80	27	32	0	0	0	178

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	23	46	27	32	0	0	0	128

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	14	32	0	0	0	0	0	46
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	0	28	23	18	11	11	0	0	0	91	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	22	46	20	12	0	0	0	100	
Course failure in Math	0	0	25	37	18	27	0	0	0	107	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	30	20	28	0	0	0	78	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	18	18	31	0	0	0	67	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	39	80	27	32	0	0	0	178	

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	23	46	27	32	0	0	0	128

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	14	32	0	0	0	0	0	46
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*	43	60	53	45	62	56	37		
ELA Learning Gains				68			56		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55			67		
Math Achievement*	57	66	59	52	58	50	35		
Math Learning Gains				70			31		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62			54		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	46	58	54	41	64	59	23		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					63	52			
Graduation Rate					53	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	58	63	59	56			57		

* 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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	243
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	449
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
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	32	Yes	1	
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	57			
HSP	48			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	50			

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	57			
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	65			
HSP	56			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	57			

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	43			57			46					58
SWD	21			39							4	48
ELL	36			52			37				5	58
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	43			71							2	
HSP	43			56			43				5	58
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	45			59			48				5	58

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	45	68	55	52	70	62	41					56
SWD	25	63		42	88							65
ELL	39	62	52	48	71	59	35					56
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50	85		46	80							
HSP	45	66	53	53	70	61	41					55
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	46	69	58	54	70	61	42					56

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	37	56	67	35	31	54	23					57
SWD	7	26		15	18		5					61
ELL	33	54	64	35	36	55	19					57

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												
BLK	42			21								
HSP	37	57	65	36	32	52	24					56
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	38	56	65	36	34	57	22					57

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	45%	56%	-11%	54%	-9%
04	2023 - Spring	38%	58%	-20%	58%	-20%
03	2023 - Spring	31%	52%	-21%	50%	-19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	49%	63%	-14%	59%	-10%
04	2023 - Spring	48%	64%	-16%	61%	-13%
05	2023 - Spring	50%	58%	-8%	55%	-5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	38%	50%	-12%	51%	-13%

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.

Grade 3 Reading Proficiency (FAST PM3 Assessment) is 39%, which is 8 percentage points below Grade 4 proficiency and 16 percentage points below Grade 5. The Grade 3 Cohort has a large percent of students who are below grade level in phonemic awareness and phonic skills (based on I-Ready Diagnostic 2 data). Due to this, students demonstrate deficits in pre-reading and basic comprehension skills. There was a strong emphasis on phonics and decoding during Differentiated Instruction and Intervention for this cohort but this did not yield higher levels of proficiency for 61% of students. Trend data indicates that this cohort demonstrated only 38% proficiency (Green) on I-Ready PM3 when they were in second grade. This indicates that proficiency levels have remained constant with no upward trend. It also indicates that explicit instruction on Grade Level text and Differentiated Instruction with comprehension strategies would benefit students of all proficiency levels.

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

All data components demonstrated growth when comparing the 2021-2022 proficiency levels with that of 2022-2023. The component to demonstrate the least amount of growth, however, was Reading Proficiency with an increase of 3 percentage points. Further breakdown of the data indicates that Grade 3 proficiency levels scored below those of Grade 4 and 5. Trend data indicates that Reading Proficiency scores below that of Mathematics and Science at the school. This is impacted by the large number of students who are learning English as a second language at the school. Students who are Limited English Proficient struggle with academic vocabulary and comprehension.

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 component that had the greatest gap when comparing school data to state data is in the number of students who scored a Level 1 on the Reading Assessment. The school had 46% of students score a Level 1 on the FAST PM3 Spring Reading Assessment, as compared to the state's average of 27%. This is a difference of 19 percentage points. A contributing factor to this lies in the Intervention and small group instruction that was provided for these students. Students in this group received additional instruction in phonics and foundational skills for most of the school year. While these skills are important, the lack of direct and explicit instruction in comprehension strategies and vocabulary did not enable these students to score at higher proficiency levels.

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

Mathematics demonstrated the highest levels of growth, with the average proficiency (Grades 3-5) surpassing the school's goal by 5 percentage points. (School goal was 55%). This is in part due to the Mathematics Coach consistently providing assistance with "Dig In" and "Explore" sections of the instructional framework, which led to most classrooms implementing the mathematics instructional framework with fidelity. In addition, classroom instruction in Grades K-5 was aligned to grade level benchmarks and was taught to the depth of the standards. There was an emphasis on teaching towards proficiency in all grade levels.

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

Student attendance continues to be a concern at the school. The number of students with 31+ absences is as follows: K-21%, 1st-22%, 2nd-24%, 3rd-17%, 4th-14%, and 5th-7%. The number of students with 16-30 absences is as follows: K-47%, 1st 48%, 2nd-44%, 3rd-30%, 4th-26%, and 5th-30%. Parents at the school keep the students at home when they are slightly sick. In addition, parents, especially in primary grades, do not realize the importance of having students in school everyday. Finally, many school families travel for extended periods of time.

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

1. Proficiency in Grade 3 need to increase and, at least, be commensurate to proficiency in Grades 4 and 5. This is especially true due to the performance levels of rising 2nd Grade, which are equally low.
2. Maintain or surpass the current level of Reading Proficiency in Grade 4, due to the fact that there are 24 rising 3rd graders who were promoted due to a Good Cause but who scored a Level 1 on the FAST Assessment.
3. Strengthen Science Instruction in Grades K-4 in order to provide a solid foundation for the Grade 5 Science Assessment.
4. Decrease the number of students at the school who have 10 or more unexcused absences on a yearly basis.

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 FAST PM3 data, 40% of 3rd Grade students were proficient in ELA as compared to the state average of 50% and district average of 51%. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of: data trends which indicate low levels of proficiency on 2nd Grade assessments, limited Reading fluency for incoming 3rd Grade students, and high levels of ELL students with limited vocabulary; we will implement the Targeted Element of Data-Driven Decision Making.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of Data-Driven Decision Making, Grade 3 Reading Proficiency will increase by 5 percentage points by FAST PM3.

Monitoring:

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

The Leadership Team will use FAST PM Assessments, I-Ready Diagnostic Data, and On-going Progress Monitoring Assessments (Unit Assessments and Topic Assessments) to assess student mastery of Grade Level Standards. Data will also be used to provide re-teaching opportunities and to analyze whether instruction is being taught to the depth of the standard.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Maria Gancedo (mgancedo@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.)

Data-Driven Decision Making is a process embedded in the culture of the school where data is used at every level to make informed decisions on what is best for students. This includes goal setting, interventions, teacher placement, coursework, differentiating instruction, etc.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When analyzing the data of the incoming cohort, only 13% of students scored proficiency on the 2022-2023 STAR PM3. This lack of preparation for grade level benchmarks creates a disparity between other grade levels and their ability to impart Tier I Instruction. By making Data-Driven decisions to enhance Tier I Instruction through the use of prerequisite benchmarks, students will be exposed to Grade Level Benchmarks with the scaffolds necessary for them to be successful.

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.

8/17/23-9/29/23 - Use collaborative planning to identify, review, and clarify Grade Level Benchmarks on a weekly basis. As a result, Tier I Instruction will meet the depth of benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Maria Gancedo (mgancedo@dadeschools.net)

By When: On-Going

8/17/23-9/29/23 - During Collaborative Planning, utilize the Horizontal Alignment of benchmarks, to present the focus benchmark at a lower level of complexity. As a result, teachers will provide students with a scaffolded activity that will prepare them for benchmarks that are on grade level.

Person Responsible: Kirsten Juan (kjuan71@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/17/23-9/29/23 - Utilize PM1 FAST data to assign students to appropriate Intervention Groups. As a result, students will receive additional learning opportunities based on their area of need.

8/17/23-9/29/23 - Utilize data from FAST PM1 to finalize intervention groups. Use the intervention decision tree to ensure that students are grouped by instructional need when being placed in intervention groups. As a result, students will receive additional learning opportunities that are aligned to their instructional needs.

Person Responsible: Kirsten Juan (kjuan71@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

#2. 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 2022-2023 FAST ELA PM3 data, 43% of rising 4th Grade students, and 38% of rising 5th Grade students remained at a Level 1 proficiency level from the 2022 FSA to the 2023 FAST. Likewise, on the 2022-2023 FAST Mathematics Assessment, 37% of rising 5th Grade students remained at a Level 1 proficiency. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of: limited explicit instruction, inconsistency and misalignment of ELA intervention programs, and inconsistency of DI in Mathematics; we will implement the Targeted Element 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 implementation of Differentiated Instruction, the percent of students in each grade level and subject area who remain a Level 1 will decrease by 5 percentage points in each category by FAST PM3.

Monitoring:

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

Administration will participate in collaborative planning where teachers will plan for Differentiated Instruction. In addition, administrators will conduct walk-throughs and review student DI folders and journals. Walk-throughs and product reviews should indicate that students are being grouped based on data and the activities and assignments are aligned to the needs indicated by the data points.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Maria Gancedo (mgancedo@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.)

Differentiated Instruction is a framework or philosophy of effective teaching that involves providing different students with different avenues to learning (often in the same classroom) in terms of: acquiring content, processing, constructing, or making sense of ideas, and developing teaching materials and assessment measures so that all students within a classroom can learn effectively, regardless of differences in ability.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Although the school demonstrated increases in all reporting categories, 54% of students scored below proficiency in Reading and 40% of students scored below proficiency in Mathematics. With a large percent of students scoring below proficiency in Reading and Mathematics, explicit instruction for weak benchmarks is necessary to increase learning gains and, ultimately, proficiency 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.

8/17/23-9/8/23 - Disaggregate data in each classroom in both Reading and Mathematics to identify which students were proficient, which were Level 2, and which were Level 1 on the 2023 FAST PM3. Group students by profile and create a plan of action which indicates the strategies to be used with each group. As a result, each group of students will have remediation or enrichment strategies aligned to their instructional need.

Person Responsible: Maria Gancedo (mgancedo@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 8, 2023

8/17/23-9/29/23 - Use Progress Monitoring Assessment (PMA) Data in Reading to identify which students need DI on specific grade-level benchmarks. As a result, remediation will occur directly after a topic is taught.

Person Responsible: Kirsten Juan (kjuan71@dadeschools.net)

By When: On-going

8/17/23-9/29/23 - Use Topic Assessment Data in Mathematics to identify which students need DI on specific grade-level benchmarks. As a result, remediation will occur directly after a topic is taught.

Person Responsible: Melissa Nunez (melissanunez@dadeschools.net)

By When: On-going

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**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 School Climate Survey, only 14% of teachers strongly agree that school personnel work together as a team. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of limited communication in a timely manner and inconsistent messages from the leadership team, we will implement effective communication with stakeholders.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of communication with stakeholders, the percent of teachers who strongly agree that school personnel work together as a team will increase by 10 percentage points on the 2024 School Climate Survey.

Monitoring:

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

Administration will ensure that systems for communication are in place at the school by scheduling consistent Leadership Team Meetings and utilizing a school-wide calendar to schedule and plan for events. This will lead to more timely communication between the Leadership Team and the staff.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Maria Gancedo (mgancedo@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.)

Communicate with Stakeholders is the establishment of well-designed communication protocols which keep students, parents, stakeholders, and the community abreast of the positive things that are happening at the school. This includes, but is not limited to, recurring meetings, an up-to-date website, e-mails, phone calls, message boards/marquis, monthly newsletters, and other printed/digital materials. When school leaders communicate effectively, students learn, parents and community members understand and support what the school is doing, and the process of teaching and learning moves forward. When a school leader ensures that students, staff, and parents are not only informed but have an active voice in their school community, they build a culture of inclusivity, eliminating feelings of distrust, uncertainty, and hostility.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Results of the climate survey and the 2023 SIP Reflection Tool both indicated that teachers are frustrated with the lack of communication between the Leadership Team and the Staff. Teachers feel that they have too little time to prepare for events and that, at times, they receive conflicting messages from the Leadership Team. This frustration lowers staff morale which, in turn, leads to lower performance levels and higher teacher turn around.

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.

8/17/23-9/29/23 - Schedule and conduct Leadership Team Meetings on a bi-weekly basis. Review all up-coming events so that events can be planned for in a timely manner and all stakeholders can be aware of which events are up-coming. As a result, teachers will receive information that is timely and cohesive.

Person Responsible: Maria Gancedo (mgancedo@dadeschools.net)

By When: On-going

8/17/23-9/29/23 - Create a master calendar of school events and initiatives to alleviate planning. As a result, communication about event logistics can occur with enough time for teachers to plan for the event.

Person Responsible: Maria Gancedo (mgancedo@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

8/17/23-9/29/23 - Create a Weekly Bulletin that will be sent out on a weekly basis so that all staff members can be aware of what is scheduled for the up-coming week. As a result, staff members will have a resource to gather information about any and all events that are occurring at the school.

Person Responsible: Renee Blanc (281514@dadeschools.net)

By When: On-going

#4. 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 attendance data from the 2022-2023 school year, 38% of students were absent 16 or more days. Based on the contributing factor of lack of knowledge about the effects of poor attendance (on the part of the parents), we will implement attendance initiatives.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of attendance initiatives, the number of students who are absent 16 or more days will decrease by at least 8 percentage points during the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Attendance will be monitored on a daily basis. The school will begin the year by sharing attendance policies and procedures with parents and then monitor the attendance of each student. Once students have 5 absences, the Attendance Review Committee will begin to work closely with parents to ensure that further absences are limited.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Renee Blanc (281514@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.

If students are not in school they are not learning. Furthermore, frequent absences disrupt the continuity of lessons and impede students from mastering complex skills. With such a large percent of the student population missing more than 16 days of the school year, proficiency levels and learning gains will be impacted as these students are not receiving all available instructional opportunities.

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.

8/30/23 - Present parents with a comprehensive overview of attendance policies and procedures during the Open House Meeting. As a result, all parents will be aware of attendance guidelines for the 2023-2024 school year.

Person Responsible: Maria Gancedo (mgancedo@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 30, 2023

8/17/23-9/29/23 - Celebrate classes with 100% attendance daily to promote coming to school. As a result, students will be encouraged to come to school every day and will be aware that the school is monitoring attendance daily.

Person Responsible: Maria Gancedo (mgancedo@dadeschools.net)

By When: On-going

8/17/23-9/29/23 - Monitor students who are absent daily and begin to meet with parents at the fifth absence. As a result, communication between parents and the school will begin before students become truant (10 days - excessive absences).

Person Responsible: Renee Blanc (281514@dadeschools.net)

By When: On-going

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

Student analysis of I-Ready data (January 2023) indicates that 65% of kindergarten students (current 1st Grade) and 80% of 1st Graders (current 2nd Grade) scored one or more years below grade level. A large number of those students are English Language Learners who have very limited school readiness.

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

Analysis of FAST PM3 data indicates that 53% of students in Grades 3-5 scores below proficiency on the spring assessment. A large number of those students are English Language Learners who require direct instruction in academic vocabulary and benefit from activities which include visuals and graphic organizers.

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 implementation of anchor charts, at least 50% of students in Grades K-2 will score at a proficient level on the Spring PM3 Star Assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

With the implementation of anchor charts, at least 50% of students in Grades 3-5 will score at a Level 3 or higher on the FAST PM3 Reading Assessment, a three percentage point increase.

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 use of anchor charts, specifically to increase visual representation of abstract ideas and provide academic vocabulary, will be planned for during collaborative planning. These anchor charts will be evident in classrooms.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Gancedo, Maria, mgancedo@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?

Anchor Charts serve as artifacts of classroom learning. Like an anchor, they holds 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.

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?

With such a large number of students who are scoring below grade level, teachers must present information and processes in a manner which is concrete and visually appealing. In addition to this, students who are learning English as a Second Language also need the academic vocabulary which is presented on anchor charts as they attempt to comprehend stories and question stems which are on grade level.

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
During collaborative planning, teachers will identify the targeted benchmark for the week and the academic vocabulary associated with it. If applicable, anchor charts that provide students with a visual and organization tool for comprehending the benchmark will be selected. As a result, all students will have visual prompts to enable them to access the skill being taught. (K-5)	Gancedo, Maria, mgancedo@dadeschools.net
In grades K-2, Anchor Charts will be developed to identify and teach crucial vocabulary. As a result, anchor charts will be used to assist student who are learning English with comprehension strategies.	Gancedo, Maria, mgancedo@dadeschools.net
In Grades 3-5, Anchor Charts will be used to assist students with gathering information to answer more complex questions. As a result, learners of all proficiency levels will be able to access information through graphic organizers.	Gancedo, Maria, mgancedo@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.

The SIP is reviewed at every faculty meeting and every EESAC Meeting. All staff members are provided the opportunity to contribute to the development of the SIP and all faculty members receive an electronic copy. At the EESAC Meeting, there are parent representatives and community partners who take part in approving the different stages of the SIP Process. In addition a copy of the SIP is available on the school website so that all stakeholders can review the plan.

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))

The school attempts to include parents in all decision making processes. The SIP is primarily developed between the Leadership Team and the EESAC. Parents are encouraged and invited to participate on the EESAC so that they too will have a say on school goals. In addition to this, the school's Family Engagement Plan is reviewed at the Title I meeting and parents are invited to contribute ideas, concerns, and suggestions. The Family Engagement Plan is also presented for approval at the EESAC meeting. All of these documents are shared electronically via the website so that they are readily available to all stakeholders.

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))

The school is committed to increasing student proficiency each and every school year. The school ensures that there is bell to bell instruction and that the systems are in place so that all students have access to the curriculum. In addition, the school uses Title I funds to provide students with intervention and tutorials that allow students the opportunity to receive additional instruction in core content areas.

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 School Improvement Plan is developed with the assistance and review of the District and the Region. In addition, the SIP includes guidelines that allow the school to set goals that are aligned to Federal and State laws.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

N/A

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/a

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

N/A

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

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: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$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.

Yes