

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

James H. Bright Elementary/ J.W. Johnson Elementary



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	26
VI. Title I Requirements	29
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

James H. Bright Elementary/J.W. Johnson Elementary

2530 W 10TH AVE, Hialeah, FL 33010

<http://bright.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.

At James H. Bright / J. W. Johnson Elementary School, we collaborate with parents and the community to help our students succeed academically, socially, and emotionally in a positive and safe learning environment. We strive to provide them with the knowledge and skills they need to think critically and make wise decisions in a multicultural world. We aim to empower our students to meet the challenges of the 21st Century. James H. Bright/J. W. Johnson Elementary School is privileged to have served our community for over fifty (50) years, and we are dedicated to continuing this service into the new millennium, guiding our students' mission to academic excellence. This is our commitment to each child entrusted to us.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At James H. Bright / J. W. Johnson Elementary School, all stakeholders maintain the highest expectations for students with the belief that they can and will realize their full potential. Staff members ensure that all students feel safe, secure and empowered by providing a nurturing school environment. Students will LEARN today to LEAD tomorrow at James H. Bright / J. W. Johnson Elementary School,

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
Winsor, Claudine	Principal	Administrator at James H. Bright/J.W. Johnson Elementary, Claudine Winsor (Principal), serves as the Instructional Leader by developing and implementing policies, programs, curriculum activities in a manner that promotes the educational development of each student and professional staff members. She conducts data analysis meetings, prepares the school's budget, monitors student attendance, and leads school reform in an effort to increase student achievement. Ms. Winsor also ensures the safety and mental health of all students and staff.
Fernandez, Eduardo	Assistant Principal	Mr. Eduardo Fernandez (Assistant Principal) assists the Principal in overseeing the standard academic program for students in grades 1-5 and the academic programs for ASD students. He supports the ELL program to meet the needs of ELL students and ensures ESOL compliance. He provides technology and instruction support to teachers and students, facilitates the acquisition and distribution of mobile devices, and serves as testing coordinator for the school site. Mr. Fernandez implements the initiatives to the school-wide discipline plan, ensures student schedules are in compliance, serves as a member on the PLST team and the Attendance Review Committee.
Garcia, Lissette	Assistant Principal	Ms. Lissette Garcia (Assistant Principal) assists the Principal in overseeing the Early Childhood Program for PK and Kindergarten, conducts data analysis with stakeholders to provide assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning, and works closely with the school LEA to ensure early childhood students' IEPs are followed with fidelity. Ms. Garcia leads the Literacy Leadership Team/Curriculum Council and serves as the Cognia School-Site Coordinator and Title 1 Facilitator.
Rodriguez, Gladys	Reading Coach	Ms. Gladys Rodriguez (Literacy Coach) analyzes Reading data used for progress monitoring, models lessons, and provides small-group and Intervention support to teachers and students through strategies that will best meet the needs of learners in the area of Reading/Language Arts. She is a member of the Leadership Team, plans collaboratively with teachers, and conducts data analysis meetings with administrators and stakeholders.
Delgado, Denise	Math Coach	Ms. Denise Delgado (Mathematics Coach / Science Liaison) analyzes Mathematics and Science data used for progress monitoring, models lessons, and provides small-group support to teachers and students in grades 3-5 through strategies that will best meet the needs of learners. She is a member of the Leadership Team, plans collaboratively with teachers, and conducts data analysis meetings with stakeholders.
Rios, Marta	School Counselor	Ms. Marta Rios (School Guidance Counselor) is an essential member of the Attendance Review Committee, provides support/resources to parents regarding student behavior and social and emotional growth, implements peer mediation, and provides counseling to students as needed. She provides

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		support to families through Project Upstart, maintains a school pantry for families in need, and assists in the implementation of the Values Matters initiative, the Do the Right Thing initiative, and Student of the Month recognition.

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.

To initiate the School Improvement Process, the School Leadership Team (SLT) will meet to analyze data and identify areas in need of improvement for the upcoming school year. The SLT will then meet with Grade Level Chairpersons during Curriculum Council meetings to share data findings and work collaboratively to develop Action Steps for the Areas of Focus identified. Updates regarding the School Improvement Process will be provided to school staff members during faculty meetings and to all other stakeholders (parents, community members, students) during EESAC meetings.

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 SLT will monitor the School Improvement Process during weekly Leadership Team Meetings to ensure that the action steps in place are implemented with fidelity. Additionally, the SLT will monitor student performance on all school-wide assessments to ensure that they are demonstrating academic growth, and will revise the plan as needed to ensure continuous improvement.

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	100%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No

<p>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)</p>	<p>Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Hispanic Students (HSP) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)</p>
<p>School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.</p>	<p>2021-22: A 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C</p>
<p>School Improvement Rating History</p>	
<p>DJJ Accountability Rating History</p>	

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	15	12	13	14	7	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	4	7	10	3	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	0	5	10	9	10	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	35	41	0	0	0	86
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	21	29	0	0	0	56
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	27	35	40	43	45	0	0	0	190

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	5	15	26	26	0	0	0	72

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	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	7	7	24	5	12	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	4	20	12	9	0	0	0	45
Course failure in Math	0	0	6	14	5	17	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	22	29	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	14	27	0	0	0	47
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	11	36	32	35	0	0	0	114

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	6	24	19	28	0	0	0	77

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	1	15	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	4

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	16	10	13	17	7	14	0	0	0	77
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	2	1	17	5	6	0	0	0	31
Course failure in Math	0	3	9	12	11	15	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	52	45	51	0	0	0	148
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	30	33	51	0	0	0	114
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	29	35	36	64	52	60	0	0	0	276

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	3	6	41	30	51	0	0	0	131

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	42	60	53	52	62	56	47		
ELA Learning Gains				68			50		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				77			44		
Math Achievement*	57	66	59	61	58	50	49		
Math Learning Gains				84			32		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				75			11		
Science Achievement*	48	58	54	58	64	59	33		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					63	52			
Graduation Rate					53	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	57	63	59	51			33		

** 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	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	229
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	526
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	33	Yes	1	
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	46			
MUL				
PAC				

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
WHT				
FRL	45			

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	58			
ELL	64			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	66			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	66			

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	42			57			48					57
SWD	27			40			27				5	48
ELL	41			54			43				5	57
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	43			57			48				5	57

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	43			56			48				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	52	68	77	61	84	75	58					51
SWD	40	71	69	47	82	67	48					43
ELL	51	66	71	59	84	72	55					51
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	53	69	77	62	84	75	59					51
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	50	67	77	61	84	77	57					51

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	47	50	44	49	32	11	33					33
SWD	38	35	27	49	35		25					13
ELL	43	46	43	47	33	14	32					33
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	62			31								
HSP	46	51	47	50	34	11	33					33
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
FRL	46	49	41	48	32	13	32					34

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	40%	56%	-16%	54%	-14%
04	2023 - Spring	28%	58%	-30%	58%	-30%
03	2023 - Spring	14%	52%	-38%	50%	-36%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	43%	63%	-20%	59%	-16%
04	2023 - Spring	45%	64%	-19%	61%	-16%
05	2023 - Spring	38%	58%	-20%	55%	-17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	30%	50%	-20%	51%	-21%

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 for the 2022-2023 school year was Grade 3 ELA. The contributing factors responsible for student performance were deficiencies in basic Foundational Skills that affected their ability to read and comprehend grade level content with fluency and understanding.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was Grade 3 ELA. The percent of students demonstrating proficiency declined 20 percentage points when compared the prior year. The contributing factors responsible for student performance were deficiencies in basic Foundational Skills that affected their ability to read and comprehend grade level content with fluency and understanding.

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 Grade 3 ELA. The percent of students demonstrating proficiency is 30 percentage points less than the state average. The contributing factors responsible for student performance were deficiencies in basic Foundational Skills that affected their ability to read and comprehend grade level content with fluency and understanding.

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 Grade 5 ELA, as the percent of students demonstrating proficiency in this area was 5 percentage points higher than the state average. Consistent interventions and collaboration among teachers ensured that students were prepared to master grade level concepts in ELA.

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

According to school-wide data, 190 students are identified as having a substantial reading deficiency. Additionally, 72 students are identified as having 2 or more Early Warning indicators.

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

Our school's highest priorities for school improvement begin with supporting teachers and students in ELA, specifically in Grade 3, while also supporting the instruction of Mathematics and Science across all grade levels.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

According to the 2023 FAST PM3 data, 42% of students in grades 3-5 were proficient in ELA, as compared to the state average of 54%. The identified contributing factors that affected student performance include high numbers of Level 1 and 2 ESOL students, student readiness levels which limited their abilities to master grade level content, and inconsistent student interventions. As a result, we will implement the Targeted Element of the Gradual Release of Responsibilities Model during ELA to ensure that students receive explicit instruction and are better equipped to master grade level content.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of Gradual Release of Responsibilities Model, students in Kindergarten through 5th grade will increase at least 25 percentage points when comparing the results of the FAST PM1 and PM3 Assessments.

Monitoring:

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

School administrators will monitor the implementation of the Gradual Release of Responsibilities Model by attending collaborative planning meetings and conducting classroom walkthroughs. The Leadership Team will monitor student progress by conducting data analysis of formative assessments on a monthly basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Claudine Winsor (pr0481@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 evidence-based intervention of the Gradual Release of Responsibilities Model, our teachers will focus on delivering explicit instruction and guiding students through the learning process until they are able to perform independently. The Literacy Coach will assist teachers in setting student-centered goals to improve instructional outcomes and will ensure that lessons are aligned to focus standards. Coaching cycles will also be implemented to increase the achievement and engagement of students by ensuring the best performance of teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Gradual Release of Responsibilities Model was selected to ensure that teachers deliver explicit instruction to students and guide them through the learning process so they are able to master grade level concepts independently.

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.

Aug. 14 – Sept. 29: The Literacy Coach will provide ELA teachers with a Professional Development session on the Gradual Release of Responsibility Model.

Person Responsible: Claudine Winsor (pr0481@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 1, 2023

Aug. 14 – Sept. 29: Administrators along with the support of the Literacy Coach will conduct classroom walkthroughs and develop a needs assessment for teachers in need of additional support. They will also monitor the implementation of Interventions to ensure fidelity.

Person Responsible: Claudine Winsor (pr0481@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 8, 2023

Aug. 14 – Sept. 29: The Literacy Coach, along with the support of teacher leaders, will begin implementing support plans. Additionally, the Literacy Coach will ensure that all low-performing students are receiving Interventions and will monitor student data to ensure progress.

Person Responsible: Gladys Rodriguez (gmrodriguez@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

#2. 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 2023 FAST PM3 data, 55% of students in grades 3-5 were proficient in Mathematics, as compared to the state average of 58%. The identified contributing factors include high numbers of Level 1 and 2 ESOL students, student readiness levels which limit their abilities to master grade level content, and a new Mathematics curriculum. As a result, we will implement the Targeted Element of Collaborative Data Chats to ensure that student progress is monitored that students receive intervention and support as needed.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of Collaborative Data Chats, students in Kindergarten through 5th grade will increase at least 25 percentage points when comparing the results of the FAST PM1 and PM3 Assessments.

Monitoring:

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

The Mathematics Coach will collaborate with school administrators to conduct Collaborative Data Chats. She will also provide support to teachers through collaborative planning and facilitate classroom modeling sessions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Denise Delgado (denisedelgado@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 Collaborative Data Chats, our school will focus on analyzing student performance data to drive instruction and discuss activities/strategies to use with students in need of remediation and/or enrichment. The Mathematics Coach will work collaboratively with administrators and teacher leaders to provide the needed support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Collaborative Data Chats were selected to ensure that all teachers, especially those who are new to the profession or a particular grade level, are supported during their collaborative planning time. Teacher leaders will share best practices during collaborative planning sessions and release time will be provided to model effective lesson delivery strategies that will enhance student learning and 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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

Aug. 14 – Sept. 29: The Mathematics Coach will collaborate with school administrators to develop a schedule of Collaborative Data Chat meetings.

Person Responsible: Denise Delgado (denisedelgado@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 1, 2023

Aug. 14 – Sept. 29: During the first Data meeting, the Mathematics Coach and school administrators will discuss initiatives and goals with teachers, review data, and identify students in need of intervention.

Person Responsible: Denise Delgado (denisedelgado@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 15, 2023

Aug. 14 – Sept. 29: Administrators along with the support of the Mathematics Coach will conduct classroom walkthroughs and develop a needs assessment for teachers in need of additional support. They will also monitor the implementation of Interventions to ensure fidelity.

Person Responsible: Denise Delgado (denisedelgado@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

#3. 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, 47% of students in grade 5 were proficient in Science, as compared to previous year's proficiency of 58%. The identified contributing factors include high numbers of Level 1 and 2 ESOL students, student readiness levels which limit abilities to master grade level content, and limited Science vocabulary knowledge. As a result, we will implement the Targeted Element of Goal Oriented Learning to ensure that students have a higher understanding of science vocabulary and concepts.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of Goal Oriented Learning, students in Kindergarten through 5th grade will increase at least 20 percentage points when comparing the results of the Baseline Science Assessment (grade 5) / Science Pretest (grades K-4) with the end of year Posttests.

Monitoring:

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

The Leadership Team will collaborate with teachers during collaborative planning sessions to monitor the implementation of Goal Oriented Learning. School administrators will also conduct walkthroughs to ensure fidelity to goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Denise Delgado (denisedelgado@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 Goal Oriented Learning, our school will focus on ensuring that students have a clear understanding of Science goals as they relate to labs and Science vocabulary. Additionally, the Leadership Team will facilitate collaboration between teachers to ensure that best practices are shared and implemented.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Goal Oriented Learning was selected to ensure that teachers set clear goals and objectives for Science instruction, with a focus on Science vocabulary and labs, so that students have a strong foundation in Science.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Aug. 14 - Sept. 29 - The Science Liaison and administrators will meet with grade levels during collaborative planning sessions to discuss Goal Oriented Learning in Science with a focus on vocabulary and labs.

Person Responsible: Denise Delgado (denisedelgado@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 1, 2023

Aug. 14 – Sept. 29: School administrators and the Science Liaison will conduct walkthroughs during Science instruction.

Person Responsible: Denise Delgado (denisedelgado@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 15, 2023

Aug. 14 - Sept. 29: The Science Liaison will provide support to select teachers during Science instruction.

Person Responsible: Denise Delgado (denisedelgado@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

According to schoolwide data from the 2022-2023 school year, an average of 15% of students in grades K-5 had more than 10 absences as compared to 12% of students with more than 10 absences from the previous year. The contributing factors include the observed lack of prioritization of school attendance by some parents within our school boundary. As a result, we will implement Attendance Initiatives to increase student attendance at our school.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of Attendance Initiatives, the percent of students in Kindergarten through 5th grade with more than 10 absences will decrease by 5 percentage points when comparing this year's attendance data with the previous year's data.

Monitoring:

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

The Attendance Review Committee (ARC) with the support of the teachers will monitor/report student attendance on a daily basis. The teachers will also follow the 2023-2024 Attendance Action Plan to ensure implementation with fidelity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lissette Garcia (lmgarcia@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 Attendance Initiatives, our school will focus on ensuring that parents are aware of the importance of high student attendance, as well as implementing school-wide initiatives to motivate students to come to school each day.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The implementation of Attendance Initiatives was selected due to the fact that the percentage of students with more than 10 absences increased during the prior two school years.

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.

Aug. 14 – Sept. 29: The Principal and the Attendance Review Committee Chairperson will meet to select the members of the Attendance Review Committee for the 2023-2024 school year.

Person Responsible: Lissette Garcia (lmgarcia@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 8, 2023

Aug. 14 – Sept. 29: During the September Faculty Meeting, teachers will receive the 2023-2024 Attendance Action Plan.

Person Responsible: Lissette Garcia (lmgarcia@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 13, 2023

Aug. 14 – Sept. 29: The ARC will meet to discuss roles and responsibilities of the ARC members and incentives to motivate students to come to school each day.

Person Responsible: Lissette Garcia (lmgarcia@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

#5. 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 schoolwide data from the 2022-2023 Staff Climate Survey, an average of 76% of teachers reported that they feel satisfied concerning how their career is progressing at the school. This percentage represents a decrease of 11 percentage points when compared to the same response from the previous school year. Based on the gathered data and an analysis of contributing factors, including the need for greater collaboration and shared decision-making, we will implement initiatives for increasing staff morale at our school.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of initiatives designed to increase staff morale at our school, the percent of teachers who will report that they are satisfied concerning how their career is progressing at the school will increase by a minimum of 5 percentage points.

Monitoring:

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

Curriculum Council meetings will take place to ensure that teacher leaders meet with the SLT on a regular basis to engage in shared decision-making and address areas of concern.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Claudine Winsor (pr0481@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 interventions being implemented for this Area of Focus is Shared Leadership and Rewards/Incentives.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Involving teachers in shared decision-making empowers them to have a voice in matters that directly impact their classrooms and the teaching process. Additionally, providing teachers with incentives acknowledges their dedication and hard work, which will positively impact staff morale.

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.

Aug. 14 – Sept. 29: Staff members with summer and August birthdays will be recognized and given an incentive at the August faculty meeting. Staff members with September birthdays will be recognized and given an incentive at the September faculty meeting.

Person Responsible: Claudine Winsor (pr0481@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 29, 2023

Aug. 14 – Sept. 29: The Leadership Team will meet to discuss the activities and incentives that will be implemented to improve staff morale.

Person Responsible: Claudine Winsor (pr0481@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 8, 2023

Aug. 14 – Sept. 29: A September Curriculum Council meeting will take to ensure that teacher leaders are able to collaborate with the Leadership Team.

Person Responsible: Claudine Winsor (pr0481@dadeschools.net)

By When: September 13, 2023

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 PowerBI student data (August 22, 2023), 57% of students are not on track to score a Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment. The identified contributing factors that affected student performance include high numbers of Level 1 and 2 ESOL students, student readiness levels which limited their abilities to master grade level content, and inconsistent student interventions. As a result, we will implement the Targeted Element of the Gradual Release of Responsibilities Model during ELA to ensure that students receive explicit instruction and are better equipped to master grade level content. Additionally, teachers in grades K-2 will work collaboratively with the school's endorsed Literacy Coach, who will provide instructional support to ensure effective implementation of Foundational Skills in Reading.

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

According to the 2023 FAST PM3 data, 42% of students in grades 3-5 were proficient in ELA, as compared to the state average of 54%. The identified contributing factors that affected student performance include high numbers of Level 1 and 2 ESOL students, student readiness levels which limited their abilities to master grade level content, and inconsistent student interventions. As a result, we will implement the Targeted Element of the Gradual Release of Responsibilities Model during ELA to ensure that students receive explicit instruction and are better equipped to master grade level content.

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 F.A.S.T. PM3 ELA student data, approximately 55% of current 1st grade students, 52% of current 2nd grade students, and 57% of current 3rd grade students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment. As a result of effective implementation of the Gradual Release of Responsibilities Model, we expect an increase at least 25 percentage points when comparing the results of the FAST PM1 and PM3 Assessments.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

According to 2023 F.A.S.T. PM3 ELA student data, approximately 80% of current 4th grade students, and 59% of current 5th grade students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment. As a result of effective implementation of the Gradual Release of Responsibilities Model, we expect an increase at least 25 percentage points when comparing the results of the FAST PM1 and PM3 Assessments.

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.

School administrators will monitor the implementation of the Gradual Release of Responsibilities Model by attending collaborative planning meetings and conducting classroom walkthroughs. The Leadership Team will monitor student progress by conducting data analysis of formative assessments on a monthly basis.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Winsor, Claudine, pr0481@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 evidence-based intervention of the Gradual Release of Responsibilities Model, our teachers will focus on delivering explicit instruction and guiding students through the learning process until they are able to perform independently. The Literacy Coach will assist teachers in setting student-centered goals to improve instructional outcomes and will ensure that lessons are aligned to focus standards. Coaching cycles will also be implemented to increase the achievement and engagement of students by ensuring the best performance of teachers.

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?

The Gradual Release of Responsibilities Model was selected to ensure that teachers deliver explicit instruction to students and guide them through the learning process so they are able to master grade level concepts independently.

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
Aug. 14 – Sept. 29: The Literacy Coach will provide ELA teachers with a Professional Development session on the Gradual Release of Responsibility Model.	Winsor, Claudine, pr0481@dadeschools.net
Aug. 14 – Sept. 29: Administrators along with the support of the Literacy Coach will conduct classroom walkthroughs and develop a needs assessment for teachers in need of additional support. They will also monitor the implementation of Interventions to ensure fidelity.	Winsor, Claudine, pr0481@dadeschools.net
Aug. 14 – Sept. 29: The Literacy Coach, along with the support of teacher leaders, will begin implementing support plans. Additionally, the Literacy Coach will ensure that all low-performing students are receiving Interventions and will monitor student data to ensure progress.	Winsor, Claudine, pr0481@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.

Dissemination of the School Improvement Plan to stakeholders will take place during the 2023-2024 Annual Parent Meeting About the Benefits of the Title 1 School Program, EESAC meetings, and Faculty Meetings. The initiatives and data analysis will be explained to parents and translated for non-English speakers.

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))

Frequent communication between the school’s full-time Community Involvement Specialist (CIS) and parents will take place throughout the course of the school year. Additionally, Parent Academy meetings will be held at the school to ensure parents are updated and informed on school and family-related matters.

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 Instructional Coaches will collaborate with teachers on a regular basis, and provide support to ensure that students receive rigorous instruction that is aligned to state standards.

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))

Not Applicable.