Dr. Manuel C. Barreiro Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Dr. Manuel C. Barreiro Elementary School

5125 SW 162ND AVE, Miami, FL 33185

http://mcbe.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 Dr. Manuel C. Barreiro Elementary School is to develop motivated children to believe they will excel.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to develop productive, globally-minded citizens, who will have an impact on our environment and who will be prepared to enter an ever-changing, interconnected world.

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
Leal, Deborah	Principal	Ensure the vision and mission is aligned with school and district initiatives, set the purpose for the use of data to make decisions regarding the school, maintain stakeholders informed of current implementation plans, as well as providing documentation that supports progress towards the school's goals, monitor the fidelity of interventions, and provide ongoing staff development based on data trends compiled from student performance indicators.
Ares, Isel	Assistant Principal	Assist in ensuring the vision and mission is aligned with school and district initiatives, set the purpose for the use of data to make decisions regarding the school, maintain stakeholders informed of current implementation plans, as well as providing documentation that supports progress towards the school's goals, monitor the fidelity of interventions, and provide ongoing staff development based on data trends compiled from student performance indicators.
Rodriguez, Aline	Teacher, PreK	Assist in the data collection, provide vital information about curriculum, provide professional development, and assist with the design and implementation for progress monitoring and efficiency of interventions.
Gotay-Cano, Melissa	School Counselor	Fosters family and community partnerships to support the social/emotional and academic development of all students. Infuses cultural competence, ethical and professional competencies in planning, organizing, implementing and evaluating the comprehensive school counseling program.
	Assistant Principal	Assist in ensuring the vision and mission is aligned with school and district initiatives, set the purpose for the use of data to make decisions regarding the school, maintain stakeholders informed of current implementation plans, as well as providing documentation that supports progress towards the school's goals, monitor the fidelity of interventions, and provide ongoing staff development based on data trends compiled from student performance indicators.

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 process of involving stakeholders in the school improvement process begins by identifying key stakeholders, including the school leadership team, teachers, school staff, parents, students, families, and business or community leaders. Engagement methods such as surveys, focus groups, town hall meetings, and individual consultations are utilized to gather their perspectives, needs, and suggestions. Their input is then carefully analyzed and integrated into the school improvement plan, ensuring that it aligns with the diverse needs of the school community. Regular feedback loops and updates are established to maintain open communication, and specific action steps are developed to address the

identified areas of improvement based on the stakeholders' input. This collaborative approach fosters a sense of ownership and commitment among stakeholders, ultimately leading to a more comprehensive and effective school improvement process.

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 undergo consistent monitoring through a multifaceted approach, involving ongoing data collection, regular progress assessments, and frequent stakeholder feedback. Student performance data aligned with the State's academic standards will be analyzed to measure the plan's impact, with particular attention given to students facing achievement gaps. Informed by this data, regular reviews will identify strengths, areas needing improvement, and necessary adjustments to strategies. Collaboration among teachers, administrators, and support staff will drive the revision process, allowing for the adaptation of interventions and approaches based on evidence of effectiveness. This iterative approach will ensure the school's commitment to continuous improvement and its dedication to addressing disparities in student achievement.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	98%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	68%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
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) Hispanic Students (HSP) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	7	7	2	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	3	6	1	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	20	18	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	12	17	0	0	0	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	10	10	9	20	22	28	0	0	0	99

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	1	0	5	13	12	16	0	0	0	47

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	4	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	7	7	7	8	6	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	2	4	5	6	2	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	2	3	5	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	5	7	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	6	10	0	0	0	18
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	6	10	9	10	0	0	0	37

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	2	3	3	5	8	0	0	0	21

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	7	7	7	8	6	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	2	4	5	6	2	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	2	3	5	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	5	7	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	6	10	0	0	0	18
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	6	10	9	10	0	0	0	37

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	2	3	3	5	8	0	0	0	21

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	68	60	53	80	62	56	73		
ELA Learning Gains				77			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				66			33		
Math Achievement*	74	66	59	78	58	50	65		
Math Learning Gains				79			44		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				68			29		
Science Achievement*	59	58	54	68	64	59	60		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					63	52			
Graduation Rate					53	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	56	63	59	73			47		

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	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	331
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	589
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	45			
ELL	64			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	65			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	64			

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	43			
ELL	74			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	73			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	71			

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	68			74			59					56
SWD	41			49							4	38
ELL	64			69			53				5	56
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	67			73			57				5	56
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	66			69			55				5	60

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	80	77	66	78	79	68	68					73
SWD	47	52	42	42	56	44	13					50
ELL	81	81	61	74	82	76	60					73
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	80	76	66	77	79	66	68					72
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	77	76	64	72	78	65	62					73

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	73	48	33	65	44	29	60					47
SWD	33	20	20	30	40	27	27					36
ELL	71	51	35	62	36	15	49					47
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	72	46	32	64	42	27	59					47
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	71	48	36	60	40	28	61					49

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	61%	56%	5%	54%	7%
04	2023 - Spring	68%	58%	10%	58%	10%
03	2023 - Spring	62%	52%	10%	50%	12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	71%	63%	8%	59%	12%
04	2023 - Spring	75%	64%	11%	61%	14%
05	2023 - Spring	69%	58%	11%	55%	14%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	54%	50%	4%	51%	3%

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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance is 5th Grade Science with 54% of students scoring at or above proficiency level. We can attribute last year's low performance to a lack of differentiated instruction.

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

According to the 2022-2023 data, the greatest decline during the 2022-2023 school year was 5th Grade Science. Proficiency data for 5th Grade Science indicates a 14 percentage point decrease in proficiency from 68% to 54%. This decline is attributed to a lack of differentiated instruction.

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.

In reviewing the 2022-2023 data, all of our components achieved higher percentages than the state averages. Our Science average of 54% was the closest to the Science state average of 51%.

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

According to the 2022-2023 FSA, 5th Grade Mathematics Learning Gains increased 3 percentage points to 74% in 2023 as compared to 71% in 2022. For the 2022-2023 school year, we focused on differentiated instruction utilizing data driven instruction, implementing standards-based common planning, and providing targeted extended learning opportunities.

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

According to the EWS data, students scoring a Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment is a potential area of concern. Proficiency data for ELA overall indicates an 11 percentage point decrease in proficiency from 81% to 70%.

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

1. Increase achievement levels in 5th Grade Science
2. Increase overall achievement levels in ELA
3. Increase achievement levels in 5th Grade ELA
4. Increase student attendance
5. Increase staff morale

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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

According to the 2023 School Climate Survey feedback from staff, 71% of teachers feel there are adequate disciplinary measures to deal with disruptive behavior, in comparison to 90% of teachers during the 2022 School Climate Survey feedback, indicating a decrease of 19-percentage points. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of:student readiness levels limit abilities to master grade level tasks leading to challenges in behavior, we will implement the Targeted Element of Character Education/ Values Matter.

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

By implementing positive behavior systems in the classroom, creating a school-wide behavior incentive program, and focusing on character development, we anticipate the amount of teachers who will strongly agree that there are adequate disciplinary measures to deal with disruptive behavior will increase by a minimum of 10 percentage points by June 2024 on the School Climate Survey.

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

Common planning meetings will consist of positive behavior systems and classroom counseling instruction will focus on character development. This will be monitored by the school counselor during classroom counseling sessions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Gotay-Cano (195928@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 strategies of Character Education and Values Matter. Character Education/Values Matter is an educational movement that supports the social, emotional, and ethical development of students. It is the proactive effort by schools, districts, and states to instill in students important core, ethical, and performance values such as caring, honesty, diligence, fairness, fortitude, responsibility, and respect for self and others. Character Education/Values Matter provides long-term solutions to moral, ethical, and academic issues that are of growing concern in our society and our schools. Character Education/Values Matter teaches students how to be their best selves and how to do their best work.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Increasing ethical, moral, social, and emotional skills in our students through Character Education and Values Matter will enable them to develop increased social skills, which in turn will decrease the frequency of disruptive behaviors.

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.

Teachers will implement positive behavior systems in their classrooms to create positive learning environments.

Person Responsible: Melissa Gotay-Cano (195928@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14 - September 29

The leadership team will discuss and create a school-wide incentive program to establish and foster positive student behavior.

Person Responsible: Melissa Gotay-Cano (195928@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14 - September 29

The school counselor will conduct classroom counseling sessions a minimum of once a month to focus on character development.

Person Responsible: Melissa Gotay-Cano (195928@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14 - September 29

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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

According to the 2022-2023 5th Grade Science Statewide Assessment data, 54% of students scored proficiency compared to 68% in 2021-2022, a decrease of 14-percentage points, due to a lack of differentiated instruction. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of: high number of Level 1 and 2 ESOL students, 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 the science intervention program, Edusmart, 5th Grade Science Statewide Assessment proficiency will increase by a minimum of 5-percentage points as evidenced by the 2024 Science State Assessment.

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

Administrators will conduct periodic checks on usage of Edusmart. In addition, weekly lesson plans will be used to indicate what method of differentiated instruction will be used (content, process, or product). Data Analysis of formative assessments will be reviewed monthly to observe progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Isel Ares (iselares@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.)

Our school will focus on the evidence based strategy of Differentiated Instruction. Differentiated Instruction is a framework or philosophy for 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. Research demonstrates this method benefits a wide range of students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Differentiated Instruction, using Edusmart as a tool, will ensure effective teaching that involves providing different students with different avenues to learning. Teachers will continually make adjustments to their instruction, plans, and instructional delivery as new data becomes available.

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.

All Science teachers (grades K-5) will be trained on Edusmart, as a tool for differentiated instruction to increase student achievement.

Person Responsible: Isel Ares (iselares@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14 - September 29

Teachers will work collaboratively with the school's leadership team to discuss data strengths and weaknesses, as a grade level and individual classrooms. A variety of instructional strategies and resources will be made available to the teachers to implement and to increase student achievement.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: August 14 - September 29

Differentiated activities will be planned by teachers during collaborative planning to support targeted implementation to efficiently use for reinforcement.

Person Responsible: Isel Ares (iselares@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14 - September 29

#3. 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.

A comparison of scores from 2022 to 2023 indicates our overall ELA achievement decreased 11-percentage points indicating the importance of aligning curriculum to benchmark-aligned instruction. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of: high number of Level 1 and 2 ESOL students, we will implement the Targeted Element of Effective Questioning/Response Techniques.

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

If we successfully implement Benchmark-Aligned Instruction, then our overall ELA achievement proficiency level will increase by a minimum of 5-percentage points as evidenced by the 2024 FAST Assessment.

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

The Leadership Team will participle in weekly common planning meeting to review lesson plans, alignment of resources, and monitor fidelity to the Pacing Guide(s).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Isel Ares (iselares@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 will be Effective Questioning/Response Techniques. Effective Questioning and Response Techniques are an important part of classroom instruction which is used to develop higher-order thinking skills, promote critical thinking, and/or gauge whether students understand what is being taught (formative assessment).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By developing effective questioning and response techniques, teachers will have a clear gauge on students' understanding of benchmark-aligned instruction.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

The leadership team will conduct walk throughs to analyze work products, ensuring completion of benchmark-aligned lessons to increase student achievement.

Person Responsible: Deborah Leal (pr6221@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14 - September 29

Administration and Grade Level Chairs will participate in weekly common planning meetings, and the teams will develop effective questioning and response techniques and share instructional practices to support learning for all students.

Person Responsible: Isel Ares (iselares@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14 - September 29

Teacher leaders will attend professional developments provided by the district regarding benchmark-aligned instruction and share information learned from the gatherings and best practices during common planning time and faculty meetings. This will give teachers the opportunity to teach from a variety of teaching strategies.

Person Responsible: Deborah Leal (pr6221@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14 - September 29

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

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 data, 66% of 5th grade students were proficient in ELA, a 13-percentage point decrease from the 2021-2022 proficiency of 79%. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of: high number of Level 1 and 2 ESOL students, we will implement the Targeted Element of Establishing and Implementing Instructional Frameworks.

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

With the implementation of Establishing and Implementing Instructional Frameworks, we will increase a minimum of 5-percentage points in 5th Grade ELA 2024 FAST PM3 Assessment.

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

Collaborative planning will be monitored through the implementation of weekly scheduled meetings with teacher attendance, agendas, and walk throughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Isel Ares (iselares@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 Intervention we will implement is Establishing and Implementing Instructional Frameworks. Establishing and Implementing Instructional Frameworks is a planning tool for promoting and sustaining a set of inquiry practices that result in the achievement of all students during the instructional block. The content period is separated into blocks of time to maximize learning for all students. It may include: an opening routine, whole group, small group, and closing activity that promotes bell-to-bell instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Providing weekly support to teachers during collaborative planning to implement explicit, systematic, scaffolded, and differentiated instruction will further support student learning because collective and individual needs will be addressed.

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.

A 5th Grade ELA collaborative planning schedule will be developed to ensure weekly sessions, promoting the sharing of ideas within teachers.

Person Responsible: Isel Ares (iselares@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14 - September 29

Administration will conduct walk-throughs for benchmark-aligned instruction and execution of instructional planning to increase student achievement.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: August 14 - September 29

Teacher Leaders will attend professional developments provided by the district regarding Instructional Frameworks and share information learned from the gatherings and best practices during common planning time and faculty meetings, which will facilitate meeting the needs of all students in the classroom.

Person Responsible: Isel Ares (iselares@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14 - September 29