

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Biscayne Beach Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	23
VI. Title I Requirements	26
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Biscayne Beach Elementary School

800 77TH ST, Miami Beach, FL 33141

<http://biscayne.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 Biscayne Beach Elementary School is to provide our students with an educational program that will empower them to make a positive difference our global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision at Biscayne Beach Elementary School is for our home, school, local and global community to cooperate and collaborate in achieving academic excellence in a healthy and safe 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
Belusic, Karen	Principal	Responsible for all school operations, decision-making, and areas of instruction.
Herrera, Ana	Assistant Principal	Responsible for supporting all school operations, decision making, and areas of instruction.
	Assistant Principal	Responsible for supporting all school operations, decision making, and areas of instruction.
Borges, Josefina	Instructional Coach	Reading Coach, coaching observations, data and Performance Matters, PLC support.
Arenas, Tina	Instructional Coach	Math Coach, coaching observations, data and Performance Matters, PLC support.
Garcia, Iris	Instructional Coach	Lead teacher, oversees International Baccalaureate PYP Program, professional development liaison, STEAM Liaison
Quiroz, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	Teacher Leader, PTA President, parent liaison.

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.

During EESAC, PTA meetings, and faculty meetings, parents, students, and teachers provide input on the School Improvement Plan. Stakeholders may also view the SIP through the school website. The school will respond to any such suggestions as soon as practicably possible and reflected on meeting minutes and through email correspondence to suggestions.

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))

On a quarterly basis, the leadership team will assess the Areas of Focus and Action Steps to monitor for progress. The results of assessment will measure the impact of action steps towards the attainment of the outlined goals. It's really important that each task is executed exactly as described, therefore, the leadership team monitors the fidelity of implementation to make sure that the tasks are completed as proposed for the attainment of the initial goals. When an area of focus isn't helping to attain a goal even after it's executed as expected, the team will revise the goals and then continue to monitor and evaluate determine the degree to which each task contributes towards satisfying the predetermined goals.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	90%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	93%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)

School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B
	2019-20: B
	2018-19: B
	2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	16	6	8	11	4	11	0	0	0	56	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	10	6	16	13	6	0	0	0	51	
Course failure in Math	0	6	3	8	10	6	0	0	0	33	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	40	30	19	0	0	0	89	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	33	27	28	0	0	0	88	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	22	40	31	52	40	30	0	0	0	215	
	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	0	5	4	34	28	21	0	0	0	92

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	9	5	10	10	5	16	0	0	0	55	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	3	7	11	4	9	0	0	0	34	
Course failure in Math	0	2	3	10	4	16	0	0	0	35	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	39	26	22	0	0	0	87	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	26	17	33	0	0	0	76	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	6	26	43	28	37	0	0	0	140	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	2	13	21	19	0	0	0	55

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	10	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	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	5	12	6	2	0	0	0	41	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	8	13	8	11	0	0	0	40	
Course failure in Math	0	0	4	4	6	6	0	0	0	20	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	23	27	0	0	0	62	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	21	25	0	0	0	55	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	21	34	41	34	36	0	0	0	166	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	4	16	19	25	0	0	0	64

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	12
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*	52	60	53	55	62	56	55		
ELA Learning Gains				70			59		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				64			64		
Math Achievement*	51	66	59	57	58	50	43		
Math Learning Gains				68			35		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58			22		
Science Achievement*	56	58	54	52	64	59	54		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					63	52			
Graduation Rate					53	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	66	63	59	64			44		

* 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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	272
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	488
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	50			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	54			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	63			

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%
FRL	50			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	46			
ELL	59			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	62			
HSP	60			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	61			

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	52			51			56					66
SWD	37			44							4	52
ELL	47			48			44				5	66
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	45			36							2	
HSP	50			50			56				5	66
MUL												

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
PAC												
WHT	65			60							2	
FRL	48			48			53				5	54

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	55	70	64	57	68	58	52					64
SWD	27	50	53	30	66	73	35					31
ELL	51	69	61	53	70	59	46					64
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	53	82		59	55							
HSP	54	68	63	55	69	59	51					64
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	68	75		68	62							
FRL	53	69	67	55	67	61	51					65

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	55	59	64	43	35	22	54					44
SWD	36	46		31	17		42					41
ELL	52	63	71	45	42	27	60					44
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	64			36								
HSP	53	59	65	42	36	18	54					46
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	63			58								
FRL	52	56	62	41	33	18	49					44

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	57%	56%	1%	54%	3%
04	2023 - Spring	45%	58%	-13%	58%	-13%
03	2023 - Spring	39%	52%	-13%	50%	-11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	47%	63%	-16%	59%	-12%
04	2023 - Spring	52%	64%	-12%	61%	-9%
05	2023 - Spring	40%	58%	-18%	55%	-15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	49%	50%	-1%	51%	-2%

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 lowest performance were the following:

2022-2023 FAST (STAR) ELA 1st Grade - 32% proficient

2022-2023 FAST ELA 3rd Grade - 44% proficient

2022-2023 FAST Math 5th Grade -.41% proficient

A number of factors contributed to the low performing scores: new hires and lack of subject matter expertise, students 3+ year below grade level, vacancies at the school which led to utilizing a Spanish teacher to cover 5th grade, and lack of data-driven instruction.

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

While SAT and FAST are different assessments, 1st Grade ELA proficiency (32% proficient) demonstrated the greatest decline.

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.

1st Grade ELA proficiency (32% proficient) demonstrated the greatest gap.

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

Two data components demonstrated the most improvement:

- 5th Grade Math (64%)

- 4th Grade Math (61%)

Several factors positively impacted the higher proficiency scores: data-driven and differentiated instruction, strong classroom management, and subject matter expertise.

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

The area of concerns are: attendance, low parental involvement, migration, and early literacy.

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

The school has identified several priorities: student academic achievement, attendance, parental engagement, language acquisition to support English literacy, and teacher retention.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

According to the 2022-2023 FAST (STAR) ELA Data, 35% of KG, 1st, and 2nd grade students were proficient in ELA as compared to the district average of 49%. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of: lack of data driven instruction, students do not benefit from adjusted instructional planning and delivery that stems from students formative and summative assessment data, we will implement the Targeted Element of Benchmark-aligned 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 evidence-based intervention of Data-Driven Instruction, KG, 1st, and 2nd grade students will demonstrate a 5 percentile points increase in ELA proficiency by June 2024 as demonstrated by the 2024 FAST (STAR) ELA results.

Monitoring:

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

The Leadership Team, Ms. Belusic (Principal), Dr. Morris (AP), and Dr. Borges (Reading Coach) will conduct by-weekly data chats with grade levels and utilize results of topic assessments to discuss student performance. The meetings will address students specific learning driven from data, while focusing on differentiated planning and delivery. Walkthroughs will ascertain the fidelity of the lesson plans implementation and delivery.

Subsequent student data will be monitored to determine the success of collaboration and plans.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Josefina Borges (jborges@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 intervention of Data-Driven Instruction. Data-Driven Instruction is an educational approach that relies on the teacher's use of student performance data to inform instructional planning and delivery. This systematic approach of instruction uses assessment, analysis, and actions to meet students needs. Data-Driven Instruction may include developing Instructional Focus Calendars (IFC) to inform teachers on specific standards to target during instruction throughout the year, based on data outcomes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Data-driven instruction provides teachers with a framework for student learning, as it gives feedback to know where a student is in their learning process. Teachers analyze data from a variety of formative and summative assessments to accurately understand what a specific student, group of students, or even an entire classroom needs to achieve mastery of a specific topic or subject.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

8/17-9/29 Administer ongoing progress monitoring assessments, STAR ELA to all K-2 students. Develop data sheets that identify students' proficiency levels and learning needs.

Person Responsible: Josefina Borges (jborges@dadeschools.net)

By When: By 9/29 Teachers will provide evidence of data sheets and student grouping in instructional groups as a reflections of monitoring assessment results.

8/15 Provide in-house professional development on data-driven instructional framework. The training will facilitate teachers opportunity to develop lesson plans driven from student performance and that address lessons to target low, mid, and high students.

Person Responsible: Josefina Borges (jborges@dadeschools.net)

By When: By 9/29 Teachers will provide evidence of instructional lessons that use student monitoring data as a reference to generate lessons that are differentiated.

8/17-9/29 Biweekly collaborate planning time with grade level teachers and administration that ensure topic assessment data is used to plan for effective instruction and to impact students' individual learning needs. Data will also identify the impact of lesson plans and whether further changes to instruction are needed.

Person Responsible: Josefina Borges (jborges@dadeschools.net)

By When: By 9/29 Walkthroughs will ascertain the fidelity of the implementation of data-driven lessons.

#2. 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 2022-2023 faculty survey results, 45% of faculty responded positively to the statement: "My administration sets high standards for teaching, learning, and improvement at my school site by providing opportunities for professional learning communities." According to the 2021-2022 faculty survey, 53% of faculty responded positively to the same statement. The results reveal a decrease of 8 percentile points. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of: lack of consistent collaborative planning time, teachers need the space and time to share ideas to enhance their teaching practice and create a learning environment where all students can reach their fullest potential, we will implement the Targeted Element of Collaborative Spaces.

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 evidence-based intervention of Collaborative Spaces, teachers' response to the statement "My administration sets high standards for teaching, learning, and improvement at my school site by providing opportunities for professional learning communities" will increase by 10 percentile points by June 2024 as demonstrated by the 2024 SIP Faculty Survey results.

Monitoring:

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

The Leadership Team, Ms. Belusic (Principal), Ms. Herrera (AP), Dr. Morris (AP), and Ms. Garcia (IB Coordinator and PLC Member) will monitor the mid year Climate Survey as measurement tool for progress in the area of staff collaboration. The data will be used to develop any necessary adjustments to the plan.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen Belusic (pr0321@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The evidence-based strategy of Collaborative Spaces refers to creating a collaborative atmosphere in the school and conducive spaces to engage in projects and/or group work. Effective Collaborative Spaces can promote group work physically or virtually.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Collaborative spaces for teachers provide the platform where teachers work together to lead, instruct, and mentor students with the goal of improving student learning and achievement. In these spaces, teachers can help their colleagues grow by sharing their expertise. It builds confidence for the one sharing his or her knowledge on specific expertise while helping the recipient learn from a different perspective.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

8/17-9/29-The administration will create the time and space for professional learning communities. The Master School Schedule will reflect the opportunity for grade levels to collaborate and meet at least three hours per week.

Person Responsible: Karen Belusic (pr0321@dadeschools.net)

By When: 9/29 The Master School Schedule will reflect three hours of common planning time for each grade level.

9/1-9/29 For each of the faculty meetings during the month of September, each grade level will be asked to develop and share an academic lesson plan that addresses one instructional area of focus for the School Improvement Plan.

Person Responsible: Iris Garcia (irisgarcia@dadeschools.net)

By When: By 9/29 The lesson plans will be collected and shared amongst the staff. The goal is for teachers to rely on other's ideas and lessons to improve teaching.

8/17-9/29-Strategically partner new and experienced teachers to provide opportunities for high quality support and mentorship. This will ensure that new teachers are provided with the necessary support to develop into accomplished educators and remain in the profession.

Person Responsible: Tina Arenas (tarenas@dadeschools.net)

By When: By 9/29-Teachers with three or more years of experience have been matched with teachers that have less than 3 years of experience.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**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 Math Data, 51% of 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students were proficient in Math as compared to the district average of 54%. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of: lack of teacher remediation, students do not have opportunities for reviewing items that were previously introduced but have not been learned, we will implement the Targeted Element of Math.

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 evidence-based intervention of Instructional Coaching, 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students will demonstrate a 5 percentile points increase in Math proficiency by June 2024 as demonstrated by the 2024 FAST Math results.

Monitoring:

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

Ms. Arenas (Math Coach) will attend by-weekly grade level collaborative meetings and demonstrate how to disaggregate student topic assessment data to identify the standards that were taught and students did not master. Ms Arenas, along with the grade level team, will identify instructional tools, such as iReady and iXL that may address the learning gaps. The administration will conduct walkthroughs to ascertain that teachers effectively utilize that resources during lesson engagement. Subsequent grade level meetings will monitor student performance to determine success.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tina Arenas (tarenas@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.)

Instructional Support/Coaching is when teachers work together to set a measurable goal to improve instructional outcomes. Coaching Cycles focus on the identified goal and increases the achievement and engagement of every student by bringing out the best performance of every teacher. Coaches use both student-centered and teacher-centered methods to help teachers improve the decisions they make about their instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Instructional Coaching impacts student learning by supporting teachers' instruction, such as the richness of concepts taught and eliciting student thinking and participation. Coaching can support the school's instructional improvement plan by helping teachers connect the standards-based requirements, students' learning gaps, and higher-level thinking with their day-to-day lesson planning and delivery.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

8/17-9/29-Ms. Arenas, the Math Coach, will attend bi-weekly grade level meetings and coach/support teachers during collaborate math planning. Teachers will collaboratively disaggregate student topic assessment data and identify students learning gaps by standard. The meetings will service to identify instructional resources, such as iXL and iReady, that provide standards-based remediation.

Person Responsible: Tina Arenas (tarenas@dadeschools.net)

By When: By 9/29-Grade levels will demonstrate that they effectively disaggregate data, identify standards that need remediation, identify resources available, and provide lesson plans that incorporate the resources.

8/17-9/29-Weekly classroom walkthroughs will monitor the fidelity of data-driven instructional frameworks.

Person Responsible: Karen Belusic (pr0321@dadeschools.net)

By When: By 9/29-Walkthroughs will demonstrate that instructional coaching has provided the support for teachers to effectively implement resources that remediate learning.

8/17-9/29-During grade level meetings, Ms. Arenas, the Math Coach, will engage on reflection with teachers. Once the topic assessment data is available and disaggregated, learning gaps and standards identified, and resources identified and used during instruction, the impact of student learning will be examined. Are students making progress as measured by subsequent topic assessments? What trends have been identified or sustained? Does the instructional coaching need to be revised? What cohorts of teachers/classrooms have made the most progress from coaching (e.g., by grade/subject or by experience level)?

Person Responsible: Tina Arenas (tarenas@dadeschools.net)

By When: By 9/29-The Leadership Team, Ms. Belusic (Principal), Dr. Morris (AP), and Ms. Arenas (Math Coach) will outline a revised plan and initiative, if needed, to further support teachers and remediation.

#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.

According to the 2022-2023 end of the year Science (FCAT) score, 56% of 5th Graders were proficient in Science. The 2021-2022 end of the year Science (FCAT) score indicated that 54% of 5th Graders were proficient in Science. The results reveal a two percentile point growth. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of: engaging and hands-on science activities, students need additional opportunities hands-on science because these create experiential learning and opportunities to observe, ask questions, and experiment, we will implement the Targeted Element of Science.

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 evidence-based intervention of Student-Centered Learning, 5th Graders will demonstrate a 5 percentile points increase in Science proficiency by June 2024 as demonstrated by the 2024 EOY 5th Grade Science FCAT.

Monitoring:

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

The Leadership Team, Ms. Belusic (Principal) and Dr. Morris (AP), will attend grade level planning meetings to facilitate the collaboration and development of science lessons that incorporate the SAMR model within the 5.0 STEAM lesson plans. Administrators will conduct weekly walkthroughs to ensure that classroom instruction includes SAMR model; student-centered, engaging and inquiry-based. Administrators will provide teachers with prompt feedback to address successes and areas that must be addressed and improved. Data chats and student assessment performance will identify whether the hands-on and engaging science lessons lead to student learning and improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen Belusic (pr0321@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The evidence -based strategy of Student-Centered Learning refers to a wide variety of educational programs, learning experiences, instructional approaches, and academic-support strategies (physical or virtual) that are intended to address the distinct learning needs, interests, aspirations, or cultural backgrounds of individual students and groups of students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Student-Centered Learning is an instructional approach that promotes active learning in which students solve problems, answer questions, formulate questions of their own, discuss, explain, debate, or brainstorm during class. Student-centered activities promote inquiry-based learning, where student learn through discovery and questioning. It also promotes collaborative learning, in which students work in teams on problems and projects.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

8/14-9/29-During grade level meeting teachers will collaborate and develop science lessons that incorporate the SAMR model within the 5.0 STEAM lessons plans to effectively engage students in hands-on and inquiry-based lessons.

Person Responsible: Iris Garcia (irisgarcia@dadeschools.net)

By When: By 9/29-There will be evidence that teacher lessons reflect the incorporation of the SAMR model into the STEAM 5.0 lesson plans, along with evidence of student created projects.

8/14-9/29-Administrators will conduct weekly walkthroughs to ensure that classroom instruction includes SAMR model; student-centered, engaging and inquiry-based. Administrators will provide teachers with prompt feedback to address successes and areas that must be addressed and improved.

Person Responsible: Karen Belusic (pr0321@dadeschools.net)

By When: By 9/29-Based on weekly walkthroughs the administration will identify teachers that need additional support implementing hands-on and student-centered activities. The administration will develop a plan to address the support needed.

9/1-9/29-Administrators will conduct data chats with teachers to determine whether the hands-on and engaging science lessons lead to student learning and improvement.

Person Responsible: Karen Belusic (pr0321@dadeschools.net)

By When: By 9/29-The data chats will identify students who need further remediation and support learning gaps.

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).

NA

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

According to the 2022-2023 FAST (STAR) ELA Data, 35% of KG, 1st, and 2nd grade students were proficient in ELA as compared to the district average of 49%. Based on the data and the identified contributing factors of: lack of data driven instruction, students do not benefit from adjusted instructional planning and delivery that stems from students formative and summative assessment data, we will implement the Targeted Element of Benchmark-aligned instruction.

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

According to the 2023 FAST ELA data, 44% of our students in grade 3 scored proficiency level 3-5. Based on the evidence based strategy of Data-Driven instruction, teachers are enabled to analyze data from a variety of formative and summative assessments to accurately understand what a specific student, group of students, or even an entire classroom needs to achieve mastery of a specific topic or subject.

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

With the implementation of the evidence-based intervention of Data-Driven Instruction, KG, 1st, and 2nd grade students will demonstrate a 5 percentile points increase in ELA proficiency by June 2024 as demonstrated by the 2024 FAST (STAR) ELA results.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

With the implementation of the evidence-based strategy of Data-Driven Instruction, 3rd grade students will demonstrate a 5 percentile points increase in ELA proficiency by June 2024 as demonstrated by the FAST ELA results,

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

The Leadership Team, Ms. Belusic (Principal), Dr. Morris (AP), and Dr. Borges (Reading Coach) will conduct by-weekly data chats with grade levels and utilize results of topic assessments to discuss student performance. The meetings will address students specific learning driven from data, while focusing on differentiated planning and delivery. Walkthroughs will ascertain the fidelity of the lesson plans implementation and delivery.

Subsequent student data will be monitored to determine the success of collaboration and plans.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Borges, Josefina, jborges@dadeschools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Our school will focus on the evidence-based intervention of Data-Driven Instruction. Data-Driven Instruction is an educational approach that relies on the teacher's use of student performance data to inform instructional planning and delivery. This systematic approach of instruction uses assessment, analysis, and actions to meet students needs. Data-Driven Instruction may include developing Instructional Focus Calendars (IFC) to inform teachers on specific standards to target during instruction throughout the year, based on data outcomes.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Data-driven instruction provides teachers with a framework for student learning, as it gives feedback to know where a student is in their learning process. Teachers analyze data from a variety of formative and summative assessments to accurately understand what a specific student, group of students, or even an entire classroom needs to achieve mastery of a specific topic or subject.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
8/14-9/29 Administer ongoing progress monitoring assessments, STAR ELA to all K-2 students. Develop data sheets that identify students' proficiency levels and learning needs.	Morris, Frank, famorris@dadeschools.net
8/14-9/29 Biweekly collaborate planning time with K-2 grade level teachers and administration that ensure topic assessment data is used to plan for effective instruction and to impact students' individual learning needs. Data will also identify the impact of lesson plans and whether further changes to instruction are needed.	Morris, Frank, famorris@dadeschools.net
8/15 Provide in-house professional development on data-driven instructional framework. The training will facilitate 3rd grade level teachers opportunity to develop lesson plans driven from student performance and that address lessons to target low, mid, and high students.	Borges, Josefina, jborges@dadeschools.net
8/14 -9/29 Reading coach will facilitate the use of ELA resources to further classroom instruction targeting Tier 2 and Tier 3 third grade students.	Borges, Josefina, jborges@dadeschools.net

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

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

The SIP is disseminated in various ways. EESAC is the primary way. The EESAC is made up of members from every stakeholder group. EESAC meets regularly to discuss progress of the SIP action steps. In addition, the SIP is shared and discussed at faculty meetings. Copies of the SIP are available in the Parent Resource Center located in the main office and posted on the school website.

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

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

The school maintains a robust PTA that implements school wide family involvement activities that bring parents into the school. Events such as Harvest Festival, Movie Night, and IB Exhibition involve parents in fun and academic activities at school. The family atmosphere lends itself to increased parent involvement.

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

Instructional Coaches will provide academic support for targeted students by pulling small groups for remediation. In addition, instructional coaches work with teachers on planning rigorous lessons to master state standards. Afterschool tutoring provides additional assistance for students to close learning gaps. Gifted/Advanced classes are available and provide enrichment for identified students.

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

Biscayne Beach Elementary is a Community School. In addition to our afterschool program, we offer a plethora of community school classes such as Karate, Soccer, Dance, and Chess. In the evening we house Adult Education courses. The City of Miami Beach also provides robotics programs after school for enrichment.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

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

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

The school counselor supports students on a daily basis through individual and group counseling sessions. In addition, the mental health support liaison provides students and parents with additional resources for support within the community.

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

NA

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

Faculty and staff adhere to the district's Student Code of Conduct when addressing behavior issues.

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

Professional development activities are implemented to improve instruction and enhance school culture and community.

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

Articulation activities between pre-k students and kindergarten classes begin in February and continue through the end of the year. These activities provide opportunities for students to assimilate into their new environments for the following year.