

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Aventura Waterways K 8 Center School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	12
III. Planning for Improvement	17
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	26
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Aventura Waterways K 8 Center

21101 NE 26TH AVE, Miami, FL 33180

<http://aventurawaterwaysk8.dadeschools.net>

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission at Aventura Waterways K-8 Center is for our students to attain the highest academic standards, and to provide a multitude of enriching educational, cultural, and social experiences in a safe and inviting educational environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Aventura Waterways K-8 Center, our vision will be to create a setting where students experience both academic and life lessons in a positive and nurturing environment, where integrity, honesty, fairness and a sense of belonging are integral to the school's climate and culture, and where all stakeholders strive to exceed academic, social and professional expectations.

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
Tejeiro, Bisleixis	Principal	Dr. Bisleixis Tejeiro, Principal, schedules and facilitates Leadership Team Meetings. Meetings are held monthly and are guided by an agenda. At these meetings, items discussed are student data/trends, the progress of the lowest 35%, Topic Assessments, student and teacher attendance, Walkthrough observations, Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, MTSS student concerns, curricular concerns, before and after school tutoring, and monitors available financial resources available.
Cardona, Diane	Assistant Principal	Diane Cardona, Assistant Principal, monitors the implementation of the resources and scheduling of elementary personnel to ensure that the academic focus is in place for student success, provides updates on K-3 instructional programs and walkthrough observations, schedules and facilitates regular RtI/MTSS meetings and monitors student attendance in K-3.
Lane, Sylvia	Assistant Principal	Sylvia Lane, Assistant Principal, monitors the implementation of the resources for the middle school academies and 8th grade students to ensure that the academic focus is in place for student success, provides updates on academy and 8th grade instructional programs and Walkthrough observations, schedules and facilitates regular RtI/MTSS meetings and monitors student attendance.
Watson, Darius	Assistant Principal	Darius Watson, Assistant Principal, monitors the implementation of the resources and scheduling of middle school personnel to ensure that the academic focus is in place for student success, provides updates on 4th-7th grade instructional programs and walkthrough observations, oversees security personnel and monitors student attendance.
Ramirez, Jesenia	Teacher, K-12	Jesenia Ramirez, Kindergarten Chair, attends monthly Leadership Meetings, provides information on Kindergarten data, Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, MTSS student concerns, curricular concerns, and before and after school tutoring.
Rachman, Marci	Teacher, K-12	Marci Rachman, 2nd Grade Chair, attends monthly Leadership Meetings, provides information on 2nd Grade data, Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, MTSS student concerns, curricular concerns, and before and after school tutoring.
Abijalil, Janisse	Teacher, K-12	Janisse Abijalil, 3rd Grade Level Chair and PLST member, attends monthly Leadership Meetings, provides information on 3rd grade data, Tier 2 and Tier 3 information, MTSS student concerns, and curricular updates and needs.
Martinez, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Jennifer Martinez, 4th Grade Chair, attends monthly Leadership Meetings, provides information on 4th Grade data, Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, MTSS student concerns, curricular concerns, and before and after school tutoring.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Sagaro, Angie	Teacher, K-12	Angie Sagaro, 5th Grade Level Chair, attends monthly Leadership Meetings, provides information on Kindergarten data, Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, MTSS student concerns, curricular concerns, and before and after school tutoring.
McBride, Kathleen	Teacher, K-12	Kathleen McBride, ELA Middle School Chair, attends monthly Leadership Meetings, provides information on ELA middle school data, Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, MTSS student concerns, curricular concerns, and before and after school tutoring.
Bormann, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	Michelle Bormann, 1st Grade Level Chair, attends monthly Leadership Meetings, provides information on 1st grade data, Tier 2 and Tier 3 information, MTSS student concerns, and curricular updates and needs.
Piatt, Brandi	Teacher, K-12	Brandi Piatt, STEAM School Liaison and 3rd Grade Teacher of the Gifted, oversees the school-wide STEAM program, provides Science professional development and collaborates with Grade Level/Department Chairs to plan science inquiry lessons based on the grade level standards.
Iacone, Chantelle	Teacher, ESE	Chantelle Iacone, LEA/ESE Teacher and Chess Club Facilitator, provides support to the ESE teachers to ensure compliance, conducts professional development sessions on classroom management and ESE accommodations and strategies.
Krutchik, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	Stephanie Krutchik, Media Specialist, and Special Area Chairperson, oversees the Media Center at the Main Campus, is the Gradebook Manager and provides assistance with testing. She meets with the Special Area Teachers to provide information on school-wide initiatives and to share information from the Leadership Team Meetings.
Osejo, Ana	Teacher, K-12	Kathleen McBride, Science Middle School Chair and STEAM co-chair, attends monthly Leadership Meetings, provides information on Science middle school data, curricular concerns, and before and after school tutoring. She provides support to the Middle School Science teachers as needed.

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.

Stakeholders, such as teachers, students, parents, and business and community representatives will be involved in the SIP process through formally scheduled meeting in which include a SIP review is part of

the agenda. The SIP plan and data will be reviewed, and stakeholder input will be part of the revision 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 SIP will be monitored through ongoing progress monitoring. Core curriculum progress monitoring and topic assessment data will be analyzed after each administration for timely remediation and to determine adjustments in instructional focuses and differentiation groups and to provide needed interventions. FAST, STAR, iReady and Mid-Year assessment data will be shared and used to monitor progress towards the SIP goals, make adjustments to instructional focuses, and to determine additional interventions and extended learning opportunities.

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)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	61%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	53%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) 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	2	27	37	28	26	27	29	34	36	246
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3	6	12
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	10	21	5	23	16	2	0	77
Course failure in Math	0	0	5	6	2	16	27	5	32	93
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	35	43	58	60	40	250
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	35	43	58	60	40	244
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	44	59	61	44	70	83	110	109	584
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	2	1	8	20	28	44	54	43	45	245

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	1	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	24
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	28	26	12	24	29	31	34	50	234
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	18	12	34
Course failure in ELA	0	5	9	15	6	29	20	1	0	85
Course failure in Math	0	2	5	5	7	42	31	35	16	143
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	25	36	35	50	51	218
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	27	36	61	73	47	256
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	18	45	35	53	57	79	72	363
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	7	9	22	22	48	46	63	51	268

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	9	12	22	4	1	0	5	0	53
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2

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	26	12	24	29	31	34	50	234
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	18	12	34
Course failure in ELA	0	5	9	15	6	29	20	1	0	85
Course failure in Math	0	2	5	5	7	42	31	35	16	143
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	25	36	35	50	51	218
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	27	36	61	73	47	256
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	18	45	35	53	57	79	72	363
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	7	9	22	22	48	46	63	51	268

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	9	12	22	4	1	0	5	0	53
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2

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*	67	61	53	69	62	55	67		
ELA Learning Gains				69			61		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				61			47		
Math Achievement*	64	63	55	66	51	42	57		
Math Learning Gains				70			38		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59			32		
Science Achievement*	60	56	52	58	60	54	59		
Social Studies Achievement*	81	77	68	81	68	59	83		
Middle School Acceleration	81	75	70	69	61	51	78		
Graduation Rate		76	74		53	50			
College and Career Acceleration		73	53		78	70			
ELP Progress	60	62	55	60	75	70	70		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	487
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	662
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	36	Yes	2	
ELL	58			
AMI				
ASN	70			
BLK	64			
HSP	68			
MUL	74			
PAC				

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%
WHT	72			
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	38	Yes	1	
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN	67			
BLK	61			
HSP	65			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	60			

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	67			64			60	81	81			60
SWD	34			31			32	55			6	39
ELL	52			54			44	71	71		7	60
AMI												
ASN	84			75			50				3	
BLK	61			50			57	68	83		5	
HSP	67			62			60	82	81		7	59

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
MUL	78			70							2	
PAC												
WHT	68			69			63	80	82		7	63
FRL	61			57			56	75	80		7	55

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	69	69	61	66	70	59	58	81	69			60
SWD	31	53	50	30	47	42	24	50				11
ELL	54	68	61	56	66	56	42	62	33			60
AMI												
ASN	71	56		76	71		50	80				
BLK	62	65	52	53	68	64	48	74				
HSP	69	69	62	65	71	59	55	80	62			60
MUL	70	69		60	69							
PAC												
WHT	70	71	64	69	69	57	66	82	76			60
FRL	64	66	58	58	68	61	47	75	57			47

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	67	61	47	57	38	32	59	83	78			70
SWD	35	44	29	33	34	26	34	58				39
ELL	56	60	54	51	33	29	40	76	70			70
AMI												
ASN	81	75		65	38		90					
BLK	59	50	36	44	34	22	55	77	69			
HSP	66	62	50	57	37	32	58	83	74			74
MUL	62	60		69								
PAC												
WHT	70	63	45	62	40	36	62	83	84			67

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
FRL	60	53	39	51	32	29	53	80	74			77

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	60%	56%	4%	54%	6%
07	2023 - Spring	52%	50%	2%	47%	5%
08	2023 - Spring	59%	51%	8%	47%	12%
04	2023 - Spring	61%	58%	3%	58%	3%
06	2023 - Spring	53%	50%	3%	47%	6%
03	2023 - Spring	63%	52%	11%	50%	13%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	49%	58%	-9%	54%	-5%
07	2023 - Spring	48%	48%	0%	48%	0%
03	2023 - Spring	65%	63%	2%	59%	6%
04	2023 - Spring	66%	64%	2%	61%	5%
08	2023 - Spring	59%	59%	0%	55%	4%
05	2023 - Spring	54%	58%	-4%	55%	-1%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	35%	40%	-5%	44%	-9%
05	2023 - Spring	56%	50%	6%	51%	5%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	90%	56%	34%	50%	40%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	52%	46%	48%	50%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	65%	33%	63%	35%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	74%	68%	6%	66%	8%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

Science showed the lowest performance with 45% of the students performing at 3 or above. The contributing factors to this decline are an increase in student enrollment, an increase in students with substantial reading difficulties, an increase in ESOL students, and an increase in student absences.

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

ELA proficiency had the greatest decline from the prior year. The percentage of students performing at proficiency level in ELA decreased by 11% when compared to last year’s data. The factors that contributed to this decline are an increase in student enrollment, an increase in ESOL students, and an increase in student absences.

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.

8th grade Science had the greatest gap of 10% when compared with the State. The 8th graders are at 34% proficiency and the State is at 44%. The contributing factors for this decline are an increase in student enrollment, an increase in students with substantial reading difficulties, an increase in ESOL students, and an increase in student absences.

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

Middle School Acceleration showed the most improvement with an increase of 3 percentage points when compared to last year. Additional data points were used to identify students for advanced courses and extended learning opportunities were provided to support the students.

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

An increase in the number of students with a Substantial Reading Deficiency is an area of concern.

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

The highest priorities for school improvement in the upcoming school year are improving student performance in ELA and Science. Another priority is ELA for the SWD subgroup.

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 ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Instructional Practices specifically relating to ELA was selected based on the 2023 data review. According to the 2023 proficiency data, 58% of students performed on level or above. This was a 10% decrease from 2022 and a 6% decrease from 2021. According to the 2023 data, 59% of 8th graders, 52% Of 7th graders, 53% of 6th graders, 60% of 5th graders, 61% of 4th graders and 63% of 3rd graders% were proficient in ELA. The 2023 data also indicated that 32% of Students with Disabilities, 42% of English Language Learners, 58% of Black, 58% of Hispanic and 56% of White students scored at proficiency level or above.

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 Instructional Focus specifically relating to ELA, our school will increase the level of students scoring at proficiency in ELA by a minimum of 5% points as evidenced by the 2024 FAST PM3 assessment. An emphasis will be made in the individual subgroups to ensure that appropriate strategies are utilized during whole and small group settings to address students' needs.

Monitoring:

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

The ELA Instructional Staff and Administration will monitor student performance on Progress Monitoring Assessments. The Leadership Team will conduct ELA data chats after FAST PM1 and FAST PM2 Assessments. Differentiated instruction, intervention and extended learning opportunities will be utilized aligned to the data to address the identified areas in need of remediation through ongoing progress monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Darius Watson (dwatson@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Within the Targeted Element of ELA, our school will focus on the evidence-based intervention of Student-Centered Learning. Student-Centered Learning instruction will assist in targeting the instructional approaches and delivery, educational programs, and academic support strategies based on students' instructional needs, interests and backgrounds in order to meet the diverse needs of the students. Student progress will be monitored through the use of data trackers to drive instructional planning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Student-Centered instruction will ensure that teachers are using relevant, recent and aligned data to plan lessons that are customized to student needs. 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.

Utilize the 2022-2023 PM3 and the 2023-2024 PM1 assessment data to identify students for DI, Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention, and extended learning opportunities.

Person Responsible: Diane Cardona (dcardona@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/14-9/29

Provide opportunities for ongoing collaborative conversations to assist teachers' lesson planning. As a result, teachers will attend collaborative planning sessions to share best practices, instructional strategies and approaches, and resources to address challenges while taking turns leading and modeling explicit instruction.

Person Responsible: Diane Cardona (dcardona@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/14-9/29

Conduct walkthroughs to monitor small group DI and intervention groups. Walkthroughs will ensure that instructional staff are providing targeted scaffolded lessons and DI groups based on current data.

Person Responsible: Bisleixis Tejeiro (btejeiro@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/14-9/29

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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.

ESSA Subgroup specifically related to Students with Disabilities was selected since this subgroup scored below 41%. The 2023 FAST PM3 data indicates the SWD Students at Level 3 or above at 32% in ELA, 28% in Math and 26% in Science. This is a 1% increase in ELA, a 2% decrease in Math and a 2% increase in Science when compared to the 2022 data. Monitoring the instructional practices and ongoing progress monitoring directly related to the SWD subgroup will provide instructional staff with the appropriate focus to improve student achievement and make learning gains.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we successfully implement instructional practices specifically related to Students with Disabilities, then there will be an increase of 3 percentage points in the number of SWD students that score at Level 3 or above in ELA, Math and as evidenced by the 2024 state assessments.

Monitoring:

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

The Leadership Team will conduct regularly scheduled walkthroughs and provide feedback. Additionally, lesson plans will be monitored to ensure alignment to the District's Pacing Guide and IEP goals with planned student-centered activities based on current data trends. Ongoing progress monitoring and data chats will be conducted to focus instructional practices and educational resources.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Diane Cardona (dcardona@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Within the Targeted Element of SWD, our school will focus on the evidence-based intervention of Student-Centered Learning. Student-Centered Learning instruction will assist in targeting the instructional approaches and delivery, educational programs, and academic support strategies based on students' IEP goals, instructional needs, interests and backgrounds in order to meet the diverse needs of the students through scaffolding and differentiation. Student progress will be monitored through the use of data trackers to drive instructional planning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The evidence-based intervention of Student-Centered Learning was selected in order to meet the diverse needs of the SWD student directly related to their IEP goals and grade level standards. Resources will focus on small-group and individual resources that can be utilized during differentiated instruction, intervention and extended learning 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.

Teachers will review current data and develop lesson plans that address students' needs. As a result, teachers will have scaffolded instruction, student groups, appropriate resources, and lesson plans that reflect differentiation based on current data.

Person Responsible: Diane Cardona (dcardona@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/14-9/29

Teachers will attend collaborative planning meetings with their grade level, ESE department and the curriculum support specialist to collaborate and brainstorm ideas and strategies, challenges and needs, and share best practices.

Person Responsible: Diane Cardona (dcardona@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/14-9/29

The Leadership Team will conduct walkthroughs and give feedback to provide support with lesson planning, instructional delivery and interpreting data from core curriculum progress monitoring assessments. Walkthroughs will ensure that instructional staff are providing targeted lessons based on the District's Pacing Guide and IEPs that are effectively executed resulting in academic gains evidenced by student data. When needed, reflective discussions will be conducted to facilitate effective lesson development and instructional delivery and to provide professional development opportunities.

Person Responsible: Diane Cardona (dcardona@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/14-9/29

#3. 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.

Based on the 2022-2023 Student School Climate Survey results, the area of focus for the Positive Culture and Environment will be Discipline. The survey indicated that 7% of the students stated that they Strongly Agreed and 19% indicated that they Agreed that students in my school usually follow school rules. The survey also indicated that 17% of the student stated that they Strongly Agreed and 24% that they Agreed that Bullying is a problem at my school. This was an increase of 11% and 20% respectively when compared to the Student Climate Survey responses from 2021-2022.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we successfully implement strategies to improve Early Warning Systems, then it is expected that the 2023-2024 Student School Climate Survey will indicate a 9% increase in the number of students who Strongly Agree or Agree that Students in my school follow the rules. There will also be a 6% decrease in the number of students who Strongly Agree or Agree that Bully is a problem at my school.

Monitoring:

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

Discipline will be monitored through the number of monthly behavior referrals. Behavior data will be shared and discussed at Grade Level, Leadership Team and Faculty Meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bisleixis Tejeiro (btejeiro@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 evidenced-based intervention being implemented for Student Discipline is a Positive Behavior Support (PBS) system that includes a schoolwide system of support with proactive strategies for defining, teaching, and supporting appropriate student behaviors to create a positive school environment in the classroom and non-classroom settings (such as hallways, cafeteria, playground and restrooms).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting Positive Behavior Support (PBS) is to create a positive school environment and develop positive relationships to enhance learning and increase academic success.

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.

Share the results of the Student Climate Survey at the Opening of School meeting. Discuss factors leading to the results of the survey by asking staff members to share discipline concerns. Share classroom and schoolwide behavior plan through District PowerPoint.

Person Responsible: Diane Cardona (dcardona@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/14/23-8/16/23

Teachers will develop and post classroom rules and consequences with their students based on the schoolwide behavior plan. Cafeteria, Media Center and transition rules will be reviewed with students.

Person Responsible: Bisleixis Tejeiro (btejeiro@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/17-8/25

The Schoolwide Discipline Committee will meet to review the Schoolwide Discipline Plans and develop Teacher-Student Agreements that will be shared with all stakeholders. Input will be gathered, and revisions made as needed. As a result, a School-wide Discipline Plan and Agreements will be developed, shared and put in place throughout the school. Grade level/class assemblies will be used to share the plan which will lead to a reduction in inappropriate behaviors and referrals.

Person Responsible: Darius Watson (dwatson@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/14/23-9/29/23

#4. 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.

Instructional Practices specifically relating to 8th Grade Science was selected based on the 2023 data review. According to the 2023 proficiency data, 34% of 8th Grade students performed on level or above. This was a 15% decrease from 2022 and a 19% decrease from 2021. The 2023 data also indicated that 26% of Students with Disabilities, 42% of English Language Learners, 47% of Asian, 54% of Black, 55% of Hispanic, and 51% of White students scored at proficiency level or above.

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 Instructional Focus specifically relating to 8th Grade Science, our students will increase the level of students scoring at proficiency in Science by a minimum of 10% points as evidenced by the 2024 state assessment. An emphasis will be made on addressing the individual subgroups to ensure that appropriate strategies are utilized during whole and differentiated group settings to address students' needs.

Monitoring:

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

The Leadership Team will conduct quarterly Science data chats based on current data in real time. Differentiated instruction and extended learning opportunities will be utilized aligned to the data to address the identified areas in need of remediation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sylvia Lane (smartel@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Within the Targeted Element of Science, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of Data-Driven Instruction. Data-Driven instruction will assist in accelerating students to proficiency as it is a systematic approach of instruction to meet students' needs. Data-Driven instruction will be monitored through the use of data trackers to drive instructional planning and data driven conversations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Data-Driven instruction will ensure that teachers are using relevant, recent and aligned data to plan lessons that are customized to student needs. 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.

Utilize data from 2023 8th Grade Science assessment and the District's Science Pretest to have data-driven conversations with the Leadership Team and instructional staff to develop targeted lesson plans and provide resources directly related to the current data aligned to the District's Pacing Guide.

Person Responsible: Sylvia Lane (smartel@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/14/23

Provide opportunities for collaborative conversations to assist teachers' lesson planning. As a result, teachers will attend collaborative planning sessions to share best practices and address challenges while taking turns leading and modeling explicit instruction.

Person Responsible: Sylvia Lane (smartel@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/14/23-9/29/23

Conduct walkthroughs to monitor targeted Science lessons with opportunities for inquiry and hands-on activities to extend learning. Walkthroughs will ensure that instructional staff are providing targeted lessons based on the District's Pacing Guide that are effectively delivered resulting in academic gains evidenced by students data.

Person Responsible: Sylvia Lane (smartel@dadeschools.net)

By When: 8/14/23-9/29/23

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).

Funding allocations are determined based on current student data. The School Leadership Team and EESAC analyze the current data and ensure that the allocations are used to fund resources directly related to student needs.