

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Ruth K. Broad Bay Harbor 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	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	26

Ruth K. Broad Bay Harbor K 8 Center

1155 93RD ST, Bay Harbor Islands, FL 33154

<http://rkbbhk8.dadeschools.net/index.htm>

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.

It is our mission to provide a secure, innovative, and challenging environment that affords academic achievement and a technologically-rich program for our students to develop a strong, firm foundation from which to succeed and meet the challenges of the 21st century.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We are committed to being a community of life-long learners and caring individuals. Ruth K. Broad Bay Harbor K-8 Center emphasizes the importance of community! The primary focus is on building a community of learners, where the students' teachers, staff members, parents, and the entire community take the responsibility for the students' education. Every adult who works with the students at Ruth K. Broad Bay Harbor K-8 Center has the highest expectations for the students and the belief that each and every child can and will realize their potential. Staff members endeavor to make each child feel safe, secure, and special by providing a nurturing environment.

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
Saperstein, Scott	Principal	<p>Primary role is to promote the learning and success of all learners through a shared mission and vision. The principal serves as an instructional leader through the provision of a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making while implementing systems that are designed to support instructional goals and offer opportunities to collaboratively improve teaching and learning. The principal forms collaborative structures and establishes processes for faculty to work together to improve instruction and instructional outcomes. Working with the School's Leadership Team, the principal will review and utilize quantitative and qualitative data to inform decisions including those related to professional development and to create Professional Learning Communities. The principal ensures that professional development is ongoing, meaningful and focused towards the goals of RKBBH K-8 Center. The principal ensures that support is available and provided to students and staff and ensure curriculum is aligned with instruction and assessment.</p>
Sosa, Israel	Assistant Principal	<p>Will provide guidance on K-12 comprehensive reading, writing, mathematics, and science plans; facilitate and support data collection activities; assist in data analysis; provide professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data based instructional planning; and support the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans.</p>
	Assistant Principal	<p>Will provide guidance on K-12 comprehensive reading, writing, mathematics, and science plans; facilitate and support data collection activities; assist in data analysis; provide professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data based instructional planning; and support the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans.</p>
Sandoval, Marisol	Teacher, K-12	<p>Teachers will provide information about core instruction, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborate with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrate Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.</p>
Mora, Frances	Teacher, K-12	<p>Teachers will provide information about core instruction, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborate with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrate Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Rodriguez, Dalia	Teacher, K-12	Teachers will provide information about core instruction, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborate with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrate Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.
Perez, Lauren	Teacher, K-12	Teachers will provide information about core instruction, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborate with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrate Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 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 process for involving our stakeholders included our school administration team and school leaders collaborating to develop the School Improvement Plan. Through this collaborative effort they were able to determine areas of focus to develop, strive towards student achievement upon analyzing the data, and input from the stakeholders. Additionally, the school climate survey was analyzed to determine for other areas of improvement. Lastly, various stake holders, staff members, and the EESAC committee will review and adjust the School Improvement Plan as needed.

SIP Monitoring

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

The School Improvement Plan will be regularly monitored through data collection and analysis. The school will use relevant data from student performance to identify areas of growth. Also, we will conduct progress monitoring to ensure students are on track to easily identify areas where differentiated instruction should be implemented. Data will be presented at grade level meetings and feedback will be shared to gain insight and adhere to closing the greatest achievement gap.

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	63%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	47%
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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) 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	0	16	10	7	9	8	11	13	23	97
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	13
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	1	3	2	4	0	0	4	14
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	2	1	5	5	4	7	26
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	12	12	7	12	19	66
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	9	11	20	12	13	69
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	5	10	15	15	18	27	34	125

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	1	1	4	6	11	12	10	16	61

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	1	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1

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	16	10	7	9	8	11	13	23	97
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	3	2	4	0	0	4	14
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	2	1	5	5	4	7	26
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	12	12	7	12	19	66
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	9	11	20	12	13	69
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	5	10	15	15	18	27	34	125
Two or more indicators	0	0	1	1	4	6	11	12	10	61
Retained students (current)	0	0	1	0	4	1	0	0	0	6
Retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1

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	0	10	12	12	9	17	5	67

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	16	10	7	9	8	11	13	23	97	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	13	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	3	2	4	0	0	4	14	
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	2	1	5	5	4	7	26	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	12	12	7	12	19	66	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	9	11	20	12	13	69	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	5	10	15	15	18	27	34	125	
Two or more indicators	0	0	1	1	4	6	11	12	10	45	
Retained students (current)	0	0	1	0	4	1	0	0	0	6	
Retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	

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	0	10	12	12	9	17	5	67	

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	79	61	53	80	62	55	77		
ELA Learning Gains				72			66		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				61			60		
Math Achievement*	86	63	55	84	51	42	77		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Learning Gains				81			59		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				74			58		
Science Achievement*	72	56	52	68	60	54	63		
Social Studies Achievement*	92	77	68	94	68	59	84		
Middle School Acceleration	71	75	70	80	61	51	68		
Graduation Rate		76	74		53	50			
College and Career Acceleration		73	53		78	70			
ELP Progress	77	62	55	63	75	70	81		

* 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	80
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	560
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	757
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
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	59			
ELL	69			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	62			
HSP	78			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	84			
FRL	72			

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	56			
ELL	64			
AMI				
ASN	95			
BLK	66			
HSP	75			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	77			
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	79			86			72	92	71			77
SWD	52			65			57	100			5	
ELL	63			77			53	86	48		7	77
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	62			62							2	
HSP	78			85			71	91	72		7	70
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	80			89			75	94	68		7	96
FRL	69			77			63	87	59		7	62

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	72	61	84	81	74	68	94	80			63
SWD	56	56	40	65	73	67	38					
ELL	59	65	58	75	82	75	44	82	40			63
AMI												
ASN	90			100								
BLK	69	67		57	69							
HSP	79	72	57	83	83	79	69	94	75			60
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	81	72	69	86	77	68	65	94	86			69
FRL	72	67	60	77	77	70	62	90	71			62

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	77	66	60	77	59	58	63	84	68			81
SWD	45	40	33	45	42	26	40	64				60
ELL	56	67	63	63	56	52	32	68	52			81
AMI												
ASN	94			88								
BLK	72	80		56	50							
HSP	74	64	57	76	60	58	59	81	66			80
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	81	68	59	79	59	58	68	88	72			82
FRL	67	61	54	69	55	56	52	80	52			78

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	74%	56%	18%	54%	20%
07	2023 - Spring	77%	50%	27%	47%	30%
08	2023 - Spring	73%	51%	22%	47%	26%
04	2023 - Spring	81%	58%	23%	58%	23%
06	2023 - Spring	74%	50%	24%	47%	27%
03	2023 - Spring	78%	52%	26%	50%	28%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	90%	58%	32%	54%	36%
07	2023 - Spring	81%	48%	33%	48%	33%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	85%	63%	22%	59%	26%
04	2023 - Spring	88%	64%	24%	61%	27%
08	2023 - Spring	91%	59%	32%	55%	36%
05	2023 - Spring	75%	58%	17%	55%	20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	72%	40%	32%	44%	28%
05	2023 - Spring	63%	50%	13%	51%	12%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	56%	42%	50%	48%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	52%	48%	48%	52%

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

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	89%	68%	21%	66%	23%

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 indicates that the lowest proficiency in our assessment was observed in the Florida Statewide Science Assessment (FSSA) for 5th Grade Science, with a score of 63%. Several contributing factors and trends were hands on science labs, language barriers from non-English-speaking backgrounds that potentially impeded their understanding of scientific concepts, and the reintegration from virtual learning. Students may not have been able to cover the same material as they would have in a traditional classroom setting.

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

Based on the 2022-2023 Next Generation Sunshine State Standards FSSA Data, the most significant decrease was observed in the data segment that pertains to 5th-grade proficiency. The scores dropped by 4%, with a proficiency rate of 63%, in contrast to the 67% proficiency rate recorded in the previous year, 2021-2022. Factors that could have contributed to this decline were the individual learning needs of the students, lack of hands on learning activities, and an increase of student-to-teacher ratio.

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 indicates that the most significant disparity in comparison to the state average is observed in 5th grade reading. In this regard, students achieved an average scale score of 331 in FAST PM3, whereas the state average was 320, resulting in a difference of 11 points. Notably, this eleven-point difference reflects the smallest increase in the average scale score when compared to all other grade levels.

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

The area of data that demonstrated the most significant enhancement is the FAST PM3 Math outcomes encompassing grades three to eighth. This category exhibited remarkable progress, with notable rise from 32% during PM1 to an impressive 84% achievement on PM3, marking a substantial 62% increase. In pursuit of these improvements, our school adopted several targeted initiatives. These initiatives encompassed the introduction of differentiated instruction strategies in mathematics, the integration of data-driven instructional approaches, the establishment of regular grade-level meetings to foster collaboration and the initiation of an after-school tutoring program designed to provide additional support to students.

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

The Early Warning Indicator reveals a significant rise to 18.41% for students with 16 to 30 absences, marking a notable increase from the previous rate of 10% recorded in the 2020-2021 academic year.

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

- 1- Low performance in Reading and Science
- 2- Staff Morale
- 3 - Attendance

4 - Celebrate Student Success Initiative

5 - Suspensions

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 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.

In the 2022-2023 NGSSS FSSA Data, fifth-grade students achieved a proficiency score of 63%, indicating a decline of 4 percentage points from the previous year's data (2021-2022 NGSSS FSSA Data), which reported a proficiency score of 67%. Based on the data, students readiness levels in the understanding and application of the scientific process and lack of exposure to an interactive learning environment has limited their abilities to master grade level concepts.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of Interactive notebooks, proficiency level in 5th Grade Science for the 2023-2024 period is projected to rise by 5 percentage points, reaching 68 percent by the state assessment period by June 2024.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored through administrative walkthroughs, review of lesson plans, collaborative planning, vertical planning among grade levels as the year progresses and data chats.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Israel Sosa (irsosa@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.)

Under rationale for increasing science scores is that the 5th grade science scores dropped by 4 percentage points as compared to the previous year. In order to address this issue, the focus will be on improving science education in grade 4, with the aim of better preparing students to tackle the 5th grade science standards.

Interactive notebooks teach students to organize their notes/learning and synthesize their thoughts. These notebooks can be developed and utilized in all content areas. Additionally, the students can take these meaningful resources home for home learning and study guide support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Interactive Notebooks teach students to organize their notes/learning and synthesize their thoughts. These notebooks can be developed and utilized in all the content areas. Additionally, the students can take these meaningful resources home for new situations or settings.

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 action steps towards implementing this strategy is to conduct a 5th grade level meeting to unpack the data from the 5th Grade Science Baseline Assessment.

Person Responsible: Alina Calabresi (acalabresi@dadeschools.net)

By When: October 6, 2023

The 5th grade team will collaborate to develop weekly labs based on the standards that were not proficient on the baseline assessment.

Person Responsible: Alina Calabresi (acalabresi@dadeschools.net)

By When: October 26, 2023

Administration will conduct periodic walk-throughs and provide feedback on the implementation of labs and standards based instruction.

Person Responsible: Israel Sosa (irsosa@dadeschools.net)

By When: November 30, 2023

Fifth grade team will use the feedback provided and make modifications. They will participate in professional development opportunities to support teachers on various elements on the science based standards.

Person Responsible: Israel Sosa (irsosa@dadeschools.net)

By When: January 31st, 2024

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

#2. 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.

Based on the findings of the School Climate Survey, the most significant drop in data compared to previous years pertains to staff morale, which experienced a decline of 22% when compared to the 2021-2022 school years. A notable 37% of the staff expressed disagreement or strong disagreement with the idea that staff morale is high within the school. We hold the perspective that establishing a culture where all parties collaborate to foster a positive and captivating atmosphere will have the effect of boosting staff morale and generating a favorable environment for the student body.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By introducing Team Building Activities aimed at cultivating a positive culture, it is expected that the Staff Morale component of the 2023-2024 School Climate Survey Results will see a noticeable improvement, indicated by a 3 percentage point increase.

Monitoring:

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

Fostering a culture of open communication with all stakeholders, conduct regular surveys, act on feedback to promote a culture that recognizes and supports staff growth, wellness, and development

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Scott Saperstein (pr0241@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.)

Using survey data, and open communication with all stakeholders address staff concerns opens administration to ongoing staff support. The implementation of Team building activities during faculty meetings will also assist in building connections amongst employees.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Communicate with Stakeholders in the establishment of well-designed communication protocols that 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.

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.

Administration team will create a survey and this will lead to the team providing onsite professional development based on a faculty requested area of interest

Person Responsible: Scott Saperstein (pr0241@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 25, 2023

Analyze survey data to identify the two areas of focus and check in with grade levels.

Person Responsible: Scott Saperstein (pr0241@dadeschools.net)

By When: October 9, 2023

Create a committee based on the two areas of need identified on the survey.

Person Responsible: Scott Saperstein (pr0241@dadeschools.net)

By When: October 16, 2023

Share with staff the strategies created by the committee in a staff meeting and follow up by conducting regular one-on-one meetings with employees to discuss their progress, concerns, and aspirations.

Person Responsible: Scott Saperstein (pr0241@dadeschools.net)

By When: October 25, 2023

#3. 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.

In comparing the 2022-2023 FAST 6th Grade Reading PM1 - PM3 Data, students achieved a proficiency score increase of 16% proficiency. Based on the data and identified contributing factors there is a need to help increase student readiness. Such interventions that can help are Differentiated Instruction implemented with fidelity to target standards not being met on a quarterly basis. PM1 showed 65% of students were proficient and PM3 showed 81% of students were proficient.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Through the implementation of the Ongoing Progress Monitoring, there will be the use of evidence based instruction to include intervention and differentiated instruction, students will increase their proficiency by the PM3. The specific measurable outcomes that the school plans to use to achieve is that we will focus on closing this gap by setting clear targets so that each child can work on their areas of growth with a goal tiered to their learning needs.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor students' Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) using the data accrued from I-Ready, Power BI, FAST PM 1 and 2. We will also analyze and examine student trends and provide teachers with the support necessary to meet the needs of the targeted groups. As a result, the leadership team will conduct walk-throughs and data chats to ensure that the ongoing progress monitoring is being conducted.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Scott Saperstein (pr0241@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 goal is to close achievement gaps as seen in the 2023 FAST ELA Assessment. We aim to target and minimize gaps through Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) which will be data driven and tailored to meet all students. The evidence-based interventions are data analysis, differentiated instruction, small groups, and the after school tutoring program. These specific interventions will help students reach their proficiency goals. Therefore, within the differentiated lessons it will address the individual needs of students through the on going progress monitoring which will be implemented to provide feedback and check for the mastery and understanding.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) is used to assess students' academic performance, to quantify a student rate of improvement or responsiveness to instruction, and to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction. OPM can be implemented with individual students or an entire class.

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.

Leadership team will disaggregate the data for each grade level where they will identify the areas of growth.

Person Responsible: Scott Saperstein (pr0241@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 30, 2023

Leadership team will conduct monthly data chats and collaborate through best practices how to target and monitor data-based instruction.

Person Responsible: Scott Saperstein (pr0241@dadeschools.net)

By When: October 11, 2023

The leadership team will develop professionally learning opportunities that align with the standards that need to be targeted based on the grade level.

Person Responsible: Scott Saperstein (pr0241@dadeschools.net)

By When: October 11, 2023

#4. 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 2023 School Climate Survey, 92 percent of staff agree that the overall climate in the school is positive and helps students learn through the celebrate success initiative.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If the leadership team continues to successfully celebrate student success and continue to implement the Bay Harbor Upper Academy Behavior Contract then, we will see an increase of 2 percent in the 2023 - 2024 School Climate Survey in the category 4 related to teaching learning and assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team will survey staff to gather strategies to create a positive environment that will reflect student behavior. These initiatives will create a richer experience for both students and teachers and therefore will reduce negative behavior in the classroom. These initiatives and strategies will be visited quarterly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Scott Saperstein (pr0241@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The leadership team will celebrate success initiative and will highlight staff and student accomplishments during the week (Super Bobcat of the Week Program). In addition to this program we will implement quarterly grade level recognition celebrations. Incentives include school dances, field trips, and grade level based functions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Celebrate Successes is when staff and student accomplishments are given special recognition and achievements are publicly celebrated allowing for encouragement from all stakeholders. Showing the connection between effort and achievement helps students to see the importance of effort and allows them to change their beliefs to emphasize it more. Recognition is more effective if it is contingent on achieving some specified standard.

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 meet with the staff to collaborate and enhance existing student success programs.

Person Responsible: Scott Saperstein (pr0241@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 11, 2023

The staff will receive a survey to garner ideas and possible initiatives on how to develop a positive student climate geared towards student behavior.

Person Responsible: Scott Saperstein (pr0241@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 5, 2023

The leadership team will meet quarterly to discuss strategies and target possible areas of improvement.

Person Responsible: Scott Saperstein (pr0241@dadeschools.net)

By When: (October 30, 2023 - June 7, 2024)

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: Science	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$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