Van E. Blanton Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Van E. Blanton Elementary School

10327 NW 11TH AVE, Miami, FL 33150

http://vblanton.dadeschools.net/

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The staff at Van E. Blanton works to develop each student's academic, social, physical, and emotional potential in a wholesome, supportive environment to create life-long learners and contributing citizens in a multicultural and changing world. An institution committed to EXCELLENCE; where proficient staff produce proficient students through collaboration and ongoing professional development.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We are committed to increasing student engagement via active learning experiences where they can demonstrate growth towards their academic and social-emotional goals.

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
Laguerre, Fabrice	Principal	Direct and manage instructional programs and supervise operations and personnel at the campus level. Provide leadership to ensure high standards of instructional service. Oversee compliance with district policies, the success of instructional programs, and the operation of all campus activities.
Robinson, Marie	Assistant Principal	The Assistant principal deals with the issues of school management, student activities and services, community relations, personnel, and curriculum instruction. They coordinate with principals and board members to assist in defining and enforcing school policies and guidelines for students, staff, and faculty.
Mathis, Leah	Reading Coach	The Instructional Coach serves as part of the Leadership Team and is responsible for bringing evidence-based practices into classrooms by working with and supporting teachers and administration with the goal of increasing student engagement, improving student achievement, and building teacher capacity.
Brailsford, Ayisha	Math Coach	The Instructional Coach serves as part of the Leadership Team and is responsible for bringing evidence-based practices into classrooms by working with and supporting teachers and administration with the goal of increasing student engagement, improving student achievement, and building teacher capacity.
Hathaway, Keierah	Other	Responsible for providing a comprehensive school counseling program that is preventative in design, developmental in implementation, and supports students in the areas of academic achievement, individual student planning, and personal and social development.

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.

A variety of stakeholders, including the school administration, teachers, parents, families, and community leaders, collaborate to create the School Improvement Plan (SIP). The first phase in the process is to inform the stakeholders of important school business and emphasize the importance of their engagement. An EESAC committee is established to gather a variety of viewpoints in order to understand the current school climate. EESAC meetings and other family involvement activities, such as workshops and surveys, enable the discussion of issues and solutions. Using the feedback that has been gathered, clear objectives, strategic strategies, and improved action plans are then addressed. Feedback is solicited before the SIP is finalized to ensure that it meets stakeholder expectations.

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 (SIP) will be closely monitored to ensure effective implementation and its impact on student achievement, particularly for those with significant achievement gaps. Teachers and stakeholders will routinely assess this data with the school administration to spot trends and gauge the success of SIP strategies. Continuous feedback from teachers, parents, students, and the community will be considered to gain diverse perspectives on the plan's implementation and its effects

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	99%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
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	13	7	8	3	5	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	3	9	13	5	0	0	0	30
Course failure in Math	0	0	4	7	14	7	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	11	9	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	9	13	0	0	0	28
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	6	19	32	17	13	0	0	0	87

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	0	3	14	16	11	0	0	0	44

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	12	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	1	2	0	0	0	6

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	12	7	14	10	15	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	22	11	15	0	0	0	49
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	19	5	9	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	10	27	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	8	23	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	7	37	12	30	0	0	0	86

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	1	2	27	11	29	0	0	0	70

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	15	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	4	3	7	0	0	0	14

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	12	7	14	10	15	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	22	11	15	0	0	0	49
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	19	5	9	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	10	27	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	8	23	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	7	37	12	30	0	0	0	86

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	1	2	27	11	29	0	0	0	70

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	15	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	4	3	7	0	0	0	14

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*	46	60	53	46	62	56	41		
ELA Learning Gains				57			38		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50			39		
Math Achievement*	53	66	59	48	58	50	43		
Math Learning Gains				52			20		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39			30		
Science Achievement*	38	58	54	28	64	59	32		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					63	52			
Graduation Rate					53	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	69	63	59	78			58		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	249
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	398
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	14	Yes	3	2
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	54			
HSP	35	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	49			

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	24	Yes	2	1
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	52			
HSP	42			

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%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	50			

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	46			53			38					69
SWD	16			11							2	
ELL	46			57			39				5	69
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	48			55			45				5	75
HSP	35			45			0				5	64
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	44			51			43				5	67

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	46	57	50	48	52	39	28					78
SWD	14	25		31	27							
ELL	44	60	58	45	50	40	13					78
AMI												
ASN												

| **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
BLK	49	58	52	53	59	38	31					72
HSP	35	53	45	31	31	40	21					83
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	45	57	48	48	53	40	28					79

| **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	41	38	39	43	20	30	32					58
SWD	19			18								
ELL	34	46		44	21		30					58
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	45	35	33	44	16	29	29					61
HSP	25	42		39	32		35					55
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	39	36	39	43	19	30	30					58

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	38%	56%	-18%	54%	-16%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	58%	-3%	58%	-3%

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2023 - Spring	41%	52%	-11%	50%	-9%

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2023 - Spring	55%	63%	-8%	59%	-4%
04	2023 - Spring	46%	64%	-18%	61%	-15%
05	2023 - Spring	49%	58%	-9%	55%	-6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2023 - Spring	32%	50%	-18%	51%	-19%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance in ELA was 5th grade. Students in this grade level demonstrated an overall proficiency of 37%. This percentage falls below the 41% achieved in 3rd grade and 55% attained in 4th grade.

Contributing factors include lack of supplemental learning opportunities for 5th grade students and misalignment between the rigor of questions present in Mcgraw-Hill basal and on the F.A.S.T assessment. Historically, 5th grade data has trended below other grade levels. For example, on last year's FSA, 5th grade students again achieved an overall proficiency of 37%, while 3rd grade earned 41% proficiency, and 4th attained 46% proficiency.

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

When looking at i-Ready data across the past two years, there is no significant decline in any intermediate grade level. The i-Ready proficiency data (students scoring green) across intermediate grade levels during the 2021-2022 school year is as follows: 3rd grade (48%) 4th grade (39%) 5th grade (38%). The i-Ready proficiency data for the 2022-2023 school year is 3rd grade 46%; 4th grade 42%; 5th grade 40%. Based on the data points from both school years, 3rd grade saw a slight decline of two percentage points, from 48% to 46%.

The biggest decline in i-Ready data was seen in first grade. During the 2021-2022 school year, 42% of first graders were proficient in reading on i-Ready AP2. However, during the 2022-2023 school year 33% of students were proficient on i-Ready AP2. That is a decrease of nine percentage points. One possible reason for this decline may be that the kindergarten cohort came into first grade six percentage points lower in proficiency than they did the previous year. Other reasons for the decline can be attributed to the inconsistent implementation and monitoring of DI and failure, in some classrooms, to implement the intervention core 4 model with fidelity.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was 5th grade ELA. The percentage of students in the state scoring level 3 or higher was 54%. However, only 37% of students at our school met this same benchmark. Contributing factors to this low performance include lack of supplemental learning opportunities for 5th grade students and misalignment in the rigor of questions present in Mcgraw-Hill basal and on the F.A.S.T assessment.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the number of students scoring proficient on the 4th grade state assessment. During the previous school year 46% of students were proficient of the statewide assessment. This school year 55% of students were proficient on the statewide assessment. This is an increase of nine percentage points. In addition to students having significant reading difficulties being retained in 3rd grade, having one ELA teacher provide instruction to the entire grade level allowed for targeted and strategic support. Additionally, supplemental learning opportunities were provided to 4th grade students during the school day as opposed to after school or on Saturday.

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

Based on EWS data, the two areas of concern are the number of students in 3rd and 5th grade scoring a level 1 on the ELA statewide assessment and the number of students demonstrating significant reading deficiencies in those same grade levels.

According to the 2022-23 EWS data, the number of students who achieved a level 1 on the 2023 Math F.A.S.T. PM3 (28 students), and the alarming number of students who received a course failure in mathematics (32 students), are potential areas of concern.

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

The top priorities for the upcoming school years are as follows:
1.Consistent monitoring of differentiated instruction and intervention to ensure that all students are introduced to multiple avenues of learning despite varying abilities.
2.Increase the emphasis on the use of Manipulatives to promote Hands-on learning in Mathematics. (Dig-in, Explore)
3. Provide consistent instructional support in 5th grade ELA to ensure that effective questioning and response techniques are utilized to develop critical thinking skills and provide exposure to rigorous assessment items.
4. Coaching support via collaborative planning and coaching cycles for teachers that are new to the content in specific grade levels.
5.Increase the level of support for primary teachers via peer observations, coaching support, and standards- based collaborative planning to support ELL, ESE, and lower performing students.

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 Small Group 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 2023 FAST PM3 data, approximately 37% of 5th grade students were proficient in ELA as compared to the state average of 54%.Contributing factors to this low performance include lack of supplemental learning opportunities for 5th grade students and misalignment in the rigor of questions present in Mcgraw-Hill basal and on the F.A.S.T assessment.

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

With the implementation of small-group instruction, an additional 2% (for a total of 50%) will score at grade level or above in area of ELA, by June 2024.

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

The Leadership Team will follow-up with regular walkthroughs to ensure that differentiated instruction is implemented with fidelity. A Data Analysis of formative assessments will be reviewed during collaborative planning to observe student progress, determine the need for instructional adjustments, and ensure growth on remediated standards. Extended learning opportunities will be provided to those students who are not making adequate progress on common assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marie Robinson (mariesmith@dadeschools.net)

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

Within the Targeted Element of Small Group Instruction, our school will focus on the evidence-based intervention of: Differentiated Instruction. Differentiated Instruction (DI) is a methodical approach to teaching that adapts to each student's individual needs and gives them the challenge or support they require to progress academically. Differentiation will assist in closing the achievement gap among lower performing students.

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

Differentiation will ensure that all students are introduced to multiple avenues of learning despite varying abilities. Through the consistent implementation of Differentiated Instruction, students will see an acceleration in learning gains, and a decrease in skill deficiency.

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.

Ensure that D.I. times are placed on the master schedule. As a result, teachers will have the necessary time to remediate benchmarks and mitigate learning loss for students with substantial academic deficiencies.

Person Responsible: Fabrice Laguerre (flaguerre@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14- September 29

Multi-tiered D.I. packets will be developed to remediate standards at different levels of complexity. As a result, there will be a decrease in skill deficiency and students will improve their understanding of benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Leah Mathis (lmathis@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14- September 29

During collaborative planning, the 5th grade ELA teacher and instructional coach will develop effective questions using the ELA planning cards and plan for varied response techniques that develop critical thinking skills and provide exposure to rigorous assessment items that will be incorporated during small-group instruction.

Person Responsible: Leah Mathis (lmathis@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14- September 29

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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

According to the 2023 FAST PM3 data, 20% of students with disabilities were proficient in ELA, which is below the 41% threshold set by the state of Florida. Based on this data we will focus on students with disabilities. By using research-based teaching strategies such as differentiating lessons and activities, academic gaps can begin to close, which will result in increasing proficiency levels. Increasing opportunities for students to grapple and collaborate with the content being taught will also increase student engagement and comprehension.

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

With the implementation of Response to Intervention, we expect 50% of our students with disabilities to achieve a learning gain based on FAST AP3 during the 2023-2024 school year. Continuous learning gains will eventually contribute to at least 41% of our SWD population achieving and maintaining proficiency on the FAST assessment.

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

The leadership team will conduct weekly walk-throughs to monitor the delivery of whole group and small group instruction. The team will review resources being used with our SWD population to ensure they are aligned to the instructional needs of the students. The assistant principal and counselor, will monitor student data to look for students who may be at risk and need to be screened. Finally, administration will conduct data chats with teachers to review the interventions and strategies being provided to students with disabilities and corresponding data to monitor student progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marie Robinson (mariesmith@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 Response to Intervention. Response to Intervention (RtI) is a structured program designed to help at-risk students make enough progress and ideally achieve comparable results to their peers. It involves screening students to see who is at risk, deciding whether supporting intervention will be given in class or out of class, using research-based teaching strategies within the chosen intervention setting, closely monitoring the progress, and adjusting the strategies being used when enough progress is not being made.

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

Response to Intervention will allow teachers to provide a systematic, data-driven approach to identifying and supporting struggling students, preventing the escalation of academic challenges, and ensuring that all students have access to effective instructional strategies. Response to Intervention will promote early intervention and collaboration among educators to improve student performance.

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 Administration will provide professional development for teachers on RtI to identify, track, and put strategies in place across academic, behavior, and social and emotional learning enabling them to optimize effective interventions and monitor progress for all students.

Person Responsible: Fabrice Laguerre (flaguerre@dadeschools.net)

By When: (August 14- September 29)

Teachers will strategically implement the RtI tiered framework that allows for the delivery of targeted and individualized support based on students' specific needs. Students with disabilities will receive interventions at different tiers based on the intensity and nature of their needs, ensuring that interventions are tailored to their unique circumstances.

Person Responsible: Marie Robinson (mariesmith@dadeschools.net)

By When: (August 14- September 29)

Leadership Team will involve parents and the wider community in the RtI process by keeping families informed about their students' progress,
involve them in decision-making, and offer resources to support their students' learning at home.

Person Responsible: Keierah Hathaway (klhathaway@dadeschools.net)

By When: (August 14- September 29)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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

According to the 2022-2023 School Climate Staff Survey feedback form, approximately 62% of the respondents remained neutral, disagreed, or strongly disagreed with the statement that the staff morale is high. Studies have shown that low teacher morale can lead to teacher retention issues by fostering stress and burnout and creating a negative workplace atmosphere. Addressing teacher morale by celebrating successes is essential not only for retaining teachers but also for a healthy school culture that benefits both educators and students. In order to retain effective teachers, we will create a positive and supportive work environment by celebrating the successes of teachers, administrators, and support staff. We will publicly recognize the achievements of staff members during faculty meetings, collaborative planning sessions, and on the PA system.

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

If we successfully implement the evidence based intervention of celebrating successes, then results from the 2023-2024 School Climate Survey will indicate a 20% decrease in the number of teachers who believe that staff morale is not high.

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

The Leadership Team will conduct monthly data chats to discuss trends and determine methods of incentivizing academic achievement. During faculty meetings teachers will have the opportunity to give special recognition to their peers in the form of a "Shout out" to boost staff morale. The leadership team will survey teachers to learn more about their interests, and garner ideas on incentives they would like to have implemented at our school.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marie Robinson (mariesmith@dadeschools.net)

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

Within the Area of Focus of Teacher Retention and Recruitment, our school will focus on the Evidence-based Intervention of: Celebrating Successes. Celebrating successes in education significantly aids in teacher recruitment and retention by boosting teacher morale, encouraging professional growth, and promoting a collaborative culture. Research shows that celebrating success is an essential element of every classroom. It is the driver behind teacher and student motivation that creates a positive classroom culture.

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

Celebrating successes in education not only boosts teacher morale and job satisfaction but also helps in attracting new talent and fostering a culture of continuous improvement and collaboration. It ultimately contributes to both teacher recruitment and retention efforts by creating a workplace where educators feel valued and motivated to excel in their roles.

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.

Create a committee to plan out staff and student incentives. As a result, teachers will feel valued and motivated to excel in their roles, and a cohesive working environment will be developed.

Person Responsible: Marie Robinson (mariesmith@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14- September 29

Host a First Quarter incentive recognizing academic achievement on common assessment (Math/Science Assessments, ELA PM Assessments) in the form of an Ice Cream, Slushy, or Popcorn Party. As a result, students will develop self-confidence and be motivated to pursue academic excellence.

Person Responsible: Ayisha Brailsford (312637@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14- September 29

Use the PA System to show recognition for academic achievement, staff and student attendance, and exemplary behavior. As a result, staff and student morale will increase.

Person Responsible: Keierah Hathaway (klhathaway@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14- September 29

#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 2023 Statewide Science Assessment data, 36% of 5th grade students were proficient compared to the state average of 51% and district average of 50%. Our school's fifth-grade science achievement differential with the state was about 15%. The emphasis on using science instruction time to accommodate other content areas, lack of science time allotted for fifth-grade classes, and inconsistent monitoring of science in grades K–4 are the main contributors to the achievement gap differential.

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

With the implementation of effective questioning and response techniques in Science, an additional 7% of students for a total of 43% will score at grade level or above grade level on the 2024 Science Statewide Assessment (SSA).

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

The Leadership Team will follow up with regular walkthroughs to ensure that Science Essential Labs are implemented with fidelity. A Data Analysis of formative assessments and student work products (Science Journals) will be reviewed during collaborative planning to assess student knowledge and decide whether instructional revisions are necessary. During collaborative planning, teachers will create targeted questions (open-ended) to gauge student understanding, engage readers, and increase student accountability.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ayisha Brailsford (312637@dadeschools.net)

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

Within the Targeted Element of Science, our school will focus on the evidence-based intervention of: Effective Questioning and Response Techniques. Effective Questioning and Response Techniques are an important part of classroom instruction which is used to develop higher-order thinking skills, promote critical thinking, and/or gauge whether students understand what is being taught (formative assessment). Research shows that questioning and response techniques will increase motivation and promote a student's ability to think critically and creatively.

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

Effective Questioning and Response Techniques is a teaching method that stimulates the mastery of Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS) and empowers students to become active learners.

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.

Plan hands-on experiments for Topics 1 and 2 prior to the beginning of the topic. As a result, students will be able to retain knowledge and develop a deeper understanding of science concepts.

Person Responsible: Ayisha Brailsford (312637@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14- September 29

During collaborative planning, the fifth-grade science team will conduct a product review of the writing analysis for hands-on experiments. As a result, teachers will be able to gauge student understanding, and increase student accountability.

Person Responsible: Ayisha Brailsford (312637@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14- September 29

The science team will develop appropriate targeted questions(open-ended) that are aligned with targeted benchmarks. As a result, teachers will facilitate content specific discussions and support the development of authentic student responses.

Person Responsible: Ayisha Brailsford (312637@dadeschools.net)

By When: August 14- September 29

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).

The school begins by conducting a comprehensive analysis of academic, behavioral, and other relevant data to identify specific areas of need. This includes analyzing standardized test scores, attendance rates, graduation rates, discipline data, and any other data that provides insight into the school's performance. Based on the data analysis, the school conducts a thorough needs assessment. This assessment identifies key areas that require improvement, such as low proficiency in specific subjects, high rates of absenteeism, or persistent achievement gaps among student subgroups. The school establishes clear, measurable goals that align with the areas identified in the needs assessment. The school selects evidence-based interventions and strategies that are likely to address the identified needs and help achieve the established goals. These interventions can range from instructional approaches to professional development for teachers to programs targeting student engagement and well-being. With the selected interventions in mind, the school identifies the necessary resources. This includes personnel, materials, technology, and other assets required to implement the interventions effectively. The school reviews its available funding, which may come from federal, state, and local sources, specifically designated for school improvement efforts. The budget allocation is guided by the needs assessment and the interventions chosen. Funding is allocated to support the implementation of interventions and related activities.

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

Based on the data review, our school will implement Standards-Based Collaborative Planning as related to ELA in K-2. We selected Standards-Based Collaborative Planning based on our findings that only 28% of our second grade students scored at the 50th percentile or above on the 2023 administration of the STAR literacy assessment. Standards-based collaborative planning will focus specifically on core classroom instruction including explicit and systematic attention to foundational reading skills. This instruction should be provided on a daily basis with multiple scaffolds to make learning easier and plenty of opportunities to practice .

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

Based on the data review, our school will implement Standards-Based Collaborative Planning as related to ELA in grades 3-5. We selected Standards-Based Collaborative Planning based on our findings that 39% of our 5th grade students scored a level 3 or above on the 2023 administration of the FAST. Standards-based Planning will focus on developing and explicitly delivering Tier 1 instruction to continue to increase the number of proficient students in ELA.

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

According to 2023 STAR data, it is noted that 28% of our 1st graders scored proficient on the assessment. If we successfully execute Standards-Based Collaborative Planning, focusing on explicit instruction and opportunities for quality teacher feedback, specifically during Tier 1 instruction, then our

proficient students will increase by a minimum of 10 percentage points for our current 2nd graders as evidenced by the 2023 state assessments.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

According to 2023 FAST ELA data, it is noted that 39% of our 5th graders scored proficient on the assessment. If we successfully develop, deliver, and monitor the Standards-Based Collaborative Planning, focusing on explicit instruction and opportunities for quality teacher feedback, then our ELA proficient students will increase by a minimum of 8 percentage points on the reading portion of the FAST assessment.

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 will participate in monthly collaborative planning, followed by targeted monthly walkthroughs that monitor the alignment of planning to instructional delivery. Explicit feedback will be provided and utilized during collaborative planning to make any necessary instructional shifts. Transformation coaches will collaboratively plan with teachers, utilizing instructional resources that define the expectations of the benchmarks. Collection of observational data and explicit feedback will be utilized to adjust planning and instruction. Data analysis of bi-weekly progress monitoring assessments, as well as the review of student products, will be utilized to track progress and determine the effectiveness of instructional delivery and planning.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Robinson, Marie, mariesmith@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?

Within the Targeted Element of Standards-Aligned Instruction, as it relates to ELA, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of Standard-Based Collaborative Planning. Standard-Based Collaborative Planning facilitates the sharing of research-based best practices and helps colleagues learn from and collaborate with each other. These collaborations will result in improved lesson quality, instructional effectiveness, and student achievement. Standard-Based Collaborative Planning will be

monitored by observation of instructional delivery, product reviews, and progress monitoring performance.

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?

Standard-Based Collaborative Planning will ensure teachers function as a cohesive unit, planning rigorous standard-aligned lessons that translate into effective delivery. Consistent planning will ensure that teachers have constant guidance and support with instructional delivery and student performance that will lead to improved student mastery of concepts.

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
Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning sessions, with a focus on benchmark aligned instruction.	Robinson, Marie, mariesmith@dadeschools.net
During collaborative planning, teachers and transformational coaches will utilize the student data, Florida's current benchmarks and clarifications, and pacing guides to plan for the Gradual Release Model and the instruction of stacked benchmarks.	Mathis, Leah , lmathis@dadeschools.net
During walk-throughs, the leadership team will observe the alignment between instructional delivery and benchmarks noted on lesson plans.	Robinson, Marie, mariesmith@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 school will disseminate the School Improvement Plan (SIP), Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) budget, and School Wellness Plan (SWP) effectively to various stakeholders. This will be achieved through a comprehensive approach that involves clear and simple language, diverse communication channels such as the school website, emails, social media, physical copies, information sessions, parent-teacher conferences, and collaboration with local businesses. The goal is to ensure that these documents are accessible, understandable, and engaging to all stakeholders, fostering a sense of partnership and active involvement in the school's improvement efforts.

https://www.veb-bulldogs.com

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's strategy to establish positive relationships with parents, families, and community stakeholders involves transparent communication through diverse channels, fostering a welcoming environment with regular interactions like conferences and orientations, organizing parent engagement activities, sharing student progress reports, offering personalized support, encouraging family involvement, and enabling collaborative decision-making through the EESAC committees, all of which collectively contribute to fulfilling the school's mission, addressing student needs comprehensively, and keeping parents well-informed about their child's progress and educational experience.

https://www.veb-bulldogs.com/

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

The school's plan to bolster its academic program involves adhering to state standards, offering enrichment activities, extending learning time through longer days and supplementary programs, implementing individualized learning plans, integrating technology for interactive learning, providing teacher professional development, and utilizing feedback and assessment to refine strategies. This comprehensive approach seeks to cultivate a dynamic learning environment that empowers students to excel, explore their interests, and reach their academic potential through personalized, enriched, and accelerated learning opportunities.

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

The plan's development is closely coordinated and integrated with Federal, State, and local services and programs, including those supported under ESSA, violence prevention, nutrition, housing, Head Start, adult education, and career and technical education. This collaboration ensures a comprehensive and

holistic approach to education, addressing students' diverse needs while fostering a safe and conducive learning environment. By partnering with these programs, the school leverages resources, and shares data, creating a supportive ecosystem that promotes academic success, overall well-being, and meaningful family engagement.

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 ensures students' holistic development by offering counseling, mental health services, specialized support, mentoring programs, life skills workshops, career guidance, peer support groups, conflict resolution initiatives, community partnerships, and wellness campaigns. These services collectively enhance students' emotional, social, and life skills, fostering a well-rounded educational experience that goes beyond academic subjects.

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

N/A

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

The school implements a comprehensive tiered model to proactively prevent and address problematic behaviors among students, while also aligning with the provisions of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). This model involves multiple tiers of support:

The school establishes a positive and inclusive school climate through universal interventions. This includes implementing schoolwide behavior expectations, social-emotional learning (SEL) programs, and character education. For students showing mild behavioral challenges, the school provides targeted interventions. This might involve small group sessions focusing on social skills, anger management, or self-regulation. Students with persistent or more significant behavior challenges receive individualized and intensive interventions. A personalized behavior intervention plan (BIP) is developed based on a functional behavior assessment (FBA).The school's tiered model aligns with the Early Intervening Services (EIS) provision of IDEA. EIS focuses on providing support to students who have not been identified as needing special education but require additional assistance to succeed academically and behaviorally.

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))

Regular workshops tailored to high-need subjects are conducted for teachers, paraprofessionals, and school personnel to improve instructional strategies, curriculum development, and assessment techniques. These workshops might cover topics like differentiated instruction, active learning methods, technology integration, and culturally responsive teaching practices.Teachers and staff receive training on effectively interpreting and using data from academic assessments to drive instructional decisions.

They learn how to analyze assessment results, identify areas of improvement, and tailor instruction to meet individual student needs.

Recruiting and retaining effective teachers in high-need subjects require a multi-faceted approach that combines specialized professional developments, collaboration with local universities and colleges to identify potential teachers in high-need subject areas, and participation in job fairs and education conferences focused on STEM and other high-demand fields. New teachers will be assigned a mentor teacher to provide guidance and support to them in high-need subjects. In order to retain effective teachers will create a positive and supportive work environment by fostering collaboration among teachers, administrators, and support staff. During faculty meetings we will recognize and reward outstanding teachers in high-need subjects through awards and advancement opportunities.

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))

The school employs a variety of strategies to ensure a smooth and successful transition for preschool children from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs:

The school arranges orientation sessions for both parents and children, allowing them to visit the elementary school before the transition. This helps preschoolers become familiar with the new environment, classrooms, playgrounds, and even meet some of the teachers and staff.

Teachers and staff from both the preschool and elementary school collaborate to ensure a seamless transition. They discuss curriculum alignment, teaching methodologies, and expectations, making sure that the preschool experience smoothly transitions into the early elementary years.

The school maintains open communication with parents, providing information about the transition process, key dates, and expectations. Regular meetings, workshops, and newsletters keep parents informed and engaged in their child's educational journey.

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: Small Group Instruction	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$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.

No